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PREFACE

The text used is (with a few unimportant modifications) that of Kühn (Vol. II), as edited by Georg Helmreich; Teubner, Leipzig, 1893. The numbers of the pages of Kühn's edition are printed at the side of the Greek text, a parallel mark (||) in the line indicating the exact point of division between Kühn's pages.

Words in the English text which are enclosed in square brackets are supplementary or explanatory; practically all explanations, however, are relegated to the footnotes or introduction. In the footnotes, also, attention is drawn to words which are of particular philological interest from the point of view of modern medicine.

I have made the translation directly from the Greek; where passages of special difficulty occurred, I have been able to compare my own version with Linacre's Latin translation (1523) and the French rendering of Charles Daremberg (1854-56); in this respect I am also peculiarly fortunate in having had the help of Mr. A. W. Pickard Cambridge of Balliol College, Oxford, who most kindly went through the
proofs and made many valuable suggestions from the point of view of exact scholarship.

My best thanks are due to the Editors for their courtesy and for the kindly interest they have taken in the work. I have also gratefully to acknowledge the receipt of much assistance and encouragement from Sir William Osler, Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford, and from Dr. J. D. Comrie, first lecturer on the History of Medicine at Edinburgh University. Professor D’Arcy W. Thompson of University College, Dundee, and Sir W. T. Thiselton-Dyer, late director of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, have very kindly helped me to identify several animals and plants mentioned by Galen.

I cannot conclude without expressing a word of gratitude to my former biological teachers, Professors Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson. The experience reared on the foundation of their teaching has gone far to help me in interpreting the great medical biologist of Greece.

I should be glad to think that the present work might help, however little, to hasten the coming reunion between the "humanities" and modern biological science; their present separation I believe to be against the best interest of both.

A. J. B.

22nd Stationary Hospital, Aldershot.
March, 1916.
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INTRODUCTION

If the work of Hippocrates be taken as representing the foundation upon which the edifice of historical Greek medicine was reared, then the work of Galen, who lived some six hundred years later, may be looked upon as the summit or apex of the same edifice. Galen’s merit is to have crystallised or brought to a focus all the best work of the Greek medical schools which had preceded his own time. It is essentially in the form of Galenism that Greek medicine was transmitted to after ages.

The ancient Greeks referred the origins of medicine to a god Asklepios (called in Latin Aesculapius), thereby testifying to their appreciation of the truly divine function of the healing art. The emblem of Aesculapius, familiar in medical symbolism at the present day, was a staff with a serpent coiled round it, the animal typifying wisdom in general, and more particularly the wisdom of the medicine-man, with his semi-miraculous powers over life and death.

"Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves."

ix
The temples of Aesculapius were scattered over the ancient Hellenic world. To them the sick and ailing resorted in crowds. The treatment, which was in the hands of an hereditary priesthood, combined the best of the methods carried on at our present-day health-resorts, our hydropathics, sanatoriums, and nursing-homes. Fresh air, water-cures, massage, gymnastics, psychotherapy, and natural methods in general were chiefly relied on.

Hippocrates, the "Father of Medicine" (5th to 4th centuries, B.C.) was associated with the Asclepieum of Cos, an island off the south-west coast of Asia Minor, near Rhodes. He apparently revitalized the work of the health-temples, which had before his time been showing a certain decline in vigour, coupled with a corresponding excessive tendency towards sophistry and priestcraft.

Celsus says: "Hippocrates Cous primus quidem ex omnibus memoria dignis ab studio sapientiae disciplinam hanc separavit." He means that Hippocrates first gave the physician an independent standing, separating him from the cosmological speculator. Hippocrates confined the medical man to medicine. He did with medical thought what Socrates did with thought in general—he "brought it down from heaven to earth." His watchword was "Back to Nature!"
tendency to mystery-mongering, to exclusiveness, to sacerdotalism. He was, in fact, opposed to the spirit of trade-unionism in medicine. His concern was rather with the physician’s duties than his “rights.”

At the dawn of recorded medical history Hippocrates stands for the fundamental and primary importance of seeing clearly—that is of clinical observation. And what he observed was that the human organism, when exposed to certain abnormal conditions—certain stresses—tends to behave in a certain way: that in other words, each “disease” tends to run a certain definite course. To him a disease was essentially a process, one and indivisible, and thus his practical problem was essentially one of prognosis—“what will be the natural course of this disease, if left to itself?” Here he found himself to no small extent in opposition with the teaching of the neighbouring medical school of Cnidus, where a more static view-point laid special emphasis upon the minutiae of diagnosis.

Observation taught Hippocrates to place unbounded faith in the recuperative powers of the living organism—in what we sometimes call nowadays the vis medicatrix Naturae. His observation was that even with a very considerable “abnormality” of environmental stress the organism, in the large majority of cases, manages eventually by its own inherent powers to adjust itself to the new conditions. “Merely give Nature a chance,” said the father of medicine in effect, “and most
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diseases will cure themselves.” And accordingly his treatment was mainly directed towards “giving Nature a chance.”

His keen sense of the solidarity (or rather, of the constant interplay) between the organism and its environment (the “conditions” to which it is exposed) is instanced in his book, “Airs, Waters, and Places.” As we recognise, in our popular everyday psychology, that “it takes two to make a quarrel,” so Hippocrates recognised that in pathology, it takes two (organism and environment) to make a disease.

As an outstanding example of his power of clinical observation we may recall the facies Hippocratica, an accurate study of the countenance of a dying man.

His ideals for the profession are embodied in the “Hippocratic oath.”

Anatomy. Impressed by this view of the organism as a unity, the Hippocratic school tended in some degree to overlook the importance of its constituent parts. The balance was re-adjusted later on by the labours of the anatomical school of Alexandria, which, under the aegis of the enlightened Ptolemies, arose in the 3rd century B.C. Two prominent exponents of anatomy belonging to this school were Herophilus and Erasistratus, the latter of whom we shall frequently meet with in the following pages (v. p. 95 et seq.).
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After the death of the Master, the Hippocratic The Empirics. school tended, as so often happens with the best of cultural movements, to show signs itself of diminishing vitality: the letter began to obscure and hamper the spirit. The comparatively small element of theory which existed in the Hippocratic physiology was made the groundwork of a somewhat over-elaborated “system.” Against this tendency on the part of the “Dogmatic” or “Rationalist” school there arose, also at Alexandria, the sect of the Empiricists. “It is not,” they said, “the cause but the cure of diseases that concerns us; not how we digest, but what is digestible.”

Horace said “

"Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit." Political domination, the occupation of territory by armies, does not necessarily mean real conquest. Horace's statement applied to medicine as to other branches of culture. The introducer of Greek medicine into Rome was Asclepiades (1st century B.C.). A man of forceful personality, and equipped with a fully developed philosophic system of health and disease which commended itself to the Roman savants of the day, he soon attained to the pinnacle of professional success in the Latin capital: he is indeed to all time the type of the fashionable (and somewhat “faddy”) West-end physician. His system was a purely mechanistic one, being based upon
the atomic doctrine of Leucippus and Democritus, which had been completed by Epicurus and recently introduced to the Roman public in Lucretius’s great poem “De Rerum Natura.” The disbelief of Aselepiades in the self-maintaining powers of the living organism are exposed and refuted at considerable length by Galen in the volume before us.

Out of the teaching of Aselepiades that physiological processes depend upon the particular way in which the ultimate indivisible molecules come together (ἐν τῇ ποίᾳ συνόδῳ τῶν πρῶτων ἐκείνων σωμάτων τῶν ἀπαθῶν) there was developed by his pupil, Themison of Laodicea, a system of medicine characterised by the most engaging simplicity both of diagnosis and treatment. This so-called “Methodic” system was intended to strike a balance between the excessive leaning to apriorism shown by the Rationalist (Hippocratic) school and the opposite tendency of the Empiricists. “A pathological theory we must have,” said the Methodists in effect, “but let it be simple.” They held that the molecular groups constituting the tissues were traversed by minute channels (πόροι, “pores”); all diseases belonged to one or other of two classes; if the channels were constricted the disease was one of stasis (στέγνωσις), and if they were dilated the disease was one of flux (ρύσις). Flux and stasis were indicated respectively by increase and diminution of the natural secretions;
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treatment was of opposites by opposites—of stasis by methods causing dilatation of the channels, and conversely.

Wild as it may seem, this pathological theory of the Methodists contained an element of truth; in various guises it has cropped up once and again at different epochs of medical history; even to-day there are pathologists who tend to describe certain classes of disease in terms of vaso-constriction and vaso-dilatation. The vice of the Methodist teaching was that it looked on a disease too much as something fixed and finite, an independent entity, to be considered entirely apart from its particular setting. The Methodists illustrate for us the tyranny of names. In its defects as in its virtues this school has analogues at the present day; we are all acquainted with the medical man to whom a name (such, let us say, as "tuberculosis," "gout," or "intestinal auto-intoxication") stands for an entity, one and indivisible, to be treated by a definite and unvarying formula.

To such an individual the old German saying "Jedermann hat am Ende ein Bischen Tuberculose" is simply—incomprehensible.

* * * * *

All the medical schools which I have mentioned Galen were still holding their ground in the 2nd century A.D., with more or less popular acceptance, when the great Galen made his entry into the world of Graeco-Roman medicine.
Claudius Galenus was born at Pergamos in Asia Minor in the year 131 A.D. His father was one Nicon, a well-to-do architect of that city. "I had the great good fortune," says Galen,¹ "to have as a father a highly amiable, just, good, and benevolent man. My mother, on the other hand, possessed a very bad temper; she used sometimes to bite her serving-maids, and she was perpetually shouting at my father and quarrelling with him—worse than Xanthippe with Socrates. When, therefore, I compared the excellence of my father's disposition with the disgraceful passions of my mother, I resolved to embrace and love the former qualities, and to avoid and hate the latter."

Nicon called his son Γαληνός, which means quiet, peaceable, and although the physician eventually turned out to be a man of elevated character, it is possible that his somewhat excessive leaning towards controversy (exemplified in the following pages) may have resulted from the fact that he was never quite able to throw off the worst side of the maternal inheritance.

His father, a man well schooled in mathematics and philosophy, saw to it that his son should not lack a liberal education. Pergamos itself was an ancient centre of civilisation, containing, among other culture-institutions, a library only second in importance to that of Alexandria itself; it also contained an Asclepieum.

¹ On the Affections of the Mind, p. 41 (Kühn's ed.).
Galen’s training was essentially eclectic: he studied all the chief philosophical systems of the time—Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, and Epicurean—and then, at the age of seventeen, entered on a course of medical studies; these he pursued under the best teachers at his own city, and afterwards, during a period of Wanderjahre, at Smyrna, Alexandria, and other leading medical centres.

Returning to Pergamom, he received his first professional appointment—that of surgeon to the gladiators. After four years here he was drawn by ambition to Rome, being at that time about thirty-one years of age. At Rome the young Pergamene attained a brilliant reputation both as a practitioner and as a public demonstrator of anatomy; among his patients he finally numbered even the Emperor Marcus Aurelius himself.

Medical practice in Rome at this time was at a low ebb, and Galen took no pains to conceal his contempt for the ignorance, charlatanism, and venality of his fellow-practitioners. Eventually, in spite of his social popularity, he raised up such odium against himself in medical circles, that he was forced to flee the city. This he did hurriedly and secretly in the year 168 A.D., when thirty-six years of age. He betook himself to his old home at Pergamom, where he settled down once more to a literary life.

His respite was short, however, for within a year he was summoned back to Italy by imperial mandate. Marcus Aurelius was about to undertake an
expedition against the Germans, who at that time were threatening the northern frontiers of the Empire, and he was anxious that his consulting physician should accompany him to the front. "Patriotism" in this sense, however, seems to have had no charms for the Pergamene, and he pleaded vigorously to be excused. Eventually, the Emperor gave him permission to remain at home, entrusting to his care the young prince Commodus.

Thereafter we know little of Galen's history, beyond the fact that he now entered upon a period of great literary activity. Probably he died about the end of the century.

Galen wrote extensively, not only on anatomy, physiology, and medicine in general, but also on logic; his logical proclivities, as will be shown later, are well exemplified in his medical writings. A considerable number of undoubtedly genuine works of his have come down to us. The full importance of his contributions to medicine does not appear to have been recognized till some time after his death, but eventually, as already pointed out, the terms Galenism and Greek medicine became practically synonymous.

A few words may be devoted to the subsequent history of his writings.

During and after the final break-up of the Roman Empire came times of confusion and of social re-
construction, which left little opportunity for scientific thought and research. The Byzantine Empire, from the 4th century onwards, was the scene of much internal turmoil, in which the militant activities of the now State-established Christian church played a not inconsiderable part. The Byzantine medical scholars were at best compilers, and a typical compiler was Oribasius, body-physician to the Emperor Julian (4th century, A.D.); his excellent *Synopsis* was written in order to make the huge mass of the Galenic writings available for the ordinary practitioner.

Greek medicine spread, with general Greek culture, throughout Syria, and from thence was carried by the Nestorians, a persecuted heretical sect, into Persia; here it became implanted, and hence eventually spread to the Mohammedan world. Several of the Prophet's successors (such as the Caliphs Harun-al-Rashid and Abdul-Rahman III) were great patrons of Greek learning, and especially of medicine. The Arabian scholars imbibed Aristotle and Galen with avidity. A partial assimilation, however, was the farthest stage to which they could attain; with the exception of pharmacology, the Arabians made practically no independent additions to medicine. They were essentially systematizers and commentators. "*Averrois che il gran comento feo*" ¹

¹ "Averrhoës who made the great Commentary" (Dante). It was Averrhoës (Ebn Roshd) who, in the 12th century, introduced Aristotle to the Mohammedan world, and the "Commentary" referred to was on Aristotle.
may stand as the type _par excellence_ of the Moslem sage.

Avicenna (Ebn Sina), (10th to 11th century) is the foremost name in Arabian medicine: his "Book of the Canon in Medicine," when translated into Latin, even overshadowed the authority of Galen himself for some four centuries. Of this work the medical historian Max Neuburger says: "Avicenna, according to his lights, imparted to contemporary medical science the appearance of almost mathematical accuracy, whilst the art of therapeutics, although empiricism did not wholly lack recognition, was deduced as a logical sequence from theoretical (Galenic and Aristotelian) premises."

Having arrived at such a condition in the hands of the Mohammedans, Galenism was now destined to pass once more to the West. From the 11th century onwards Latin translations of this "Arabian" Medicine (being Greek medicine in oriental trappings) began to make their way into Europe; here they helped to undermine the authority of the one medical school of native growth which the West produced during the Middle Ages—namely the School of Salerno.

Blending with the Scholastic philosophy at the universities of Naples and Montpellier, the teachings of Aristotle and Galen now assumed a position of supreme authority: from their word, in matters...
scientific and medical, there was no appeal. In reference to this period the Pergamene was referred to in later times as the “Medical Pope of the Middle Ages.”

It was of course the logical side of Galenism which chiefly commended it to the mediaeval Schoolmen, as to the essentially speculative Moslems.

The year 1453, when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks, is often taken as marking the commencement of the Renascence. Among the many factors which tended to stimulate and awaken men’s minds during these spacious times was the rediscovery of the Greek classics, which were brought to Europe by, among others, the scholars who fled from Byzantium. The Arabo Scholastic versions of Aristotle and Galen were now confronted by their Greek originals. A passion for Greek learning was aroused. The freshness and truth of these old writings helped to awaken men to a renewed sense of their own dignity and worth, and to brace them in their own struggle for self-expression.

Prominent in this “Humanist” movement was the English physician, Thomas Linacre (c. 1460–1524) who, having gained in Italy an extraordinary zeal for the New Learning, devoted the rest of his life, after returning to England, to the promotion of the litterae humaniores, and especially to making Galen accessible to readers of Latin. Thus the “De Naturalibus Facultatibus” appeared in London in
INTRODUCTION

1523, and was preceded and followed by several other translations, all marked by minute accuracy and elegant Latinity.

Two new parties now arose in the medical world—the so-called "Greeks" and the more conservative "Arabists."

Paracelsus. But the swing of the pendulum did not cease with the creation of the liberal "Greek" party; the dazzling vision of freedom was to drive some to a yet more anarchical position. Paracelsus, who flourished in the first half of the 16th century, may be taken as typifying this extremist tendency. His one cry was, "Let us away with all authority whatsoever, and get back to Nature!" At his first lecture as professor at the medical school of Basle he symbolically burned the works of Galen and of his chief Arabian exponent, Avicenna.

But the final collapse of authority in medicine could not be brought about by mere negativism. It was the constructive work of the Renascence anatomists, particularly those of the Italian school, which finally brought Galenism to the ground.

Vesalius (1514–64), the modern "Father of Anatomy," for dissecting human bodies, was fiercely assailed by the hosts of orthodoxy, including that stout Galenist, his old teacher Jacques Dubois (Jacobus Sylvius). Vesalius held on his way, however, proving, inter alia, that Galen had been wrong.
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in saying that the interventricular septum of the heart was permeable (cf. present volume, p. 321).

Michael Servetus (1509-53) suggested that the blood, in order to get from the right to the left side of the heart, might have to pass through the lungs. For his heterodox opinions he was burned at the stake.

Another 16th-century anatomist, Andrea Cesalpino, is considered by the Italians to have been a discoverer of the circulation of the blood before Harvey; he certainly had a more or less clear idea of the circulation, but, as in the case of the "organic evolutionists before Darwin," he failed to prove his point by conclusive demonstration.

William Harvey, the great Englishman who founded modern experimental physiology and was the first to establish not only the fact of the circulation but also the physical laws governing it, is commonly reckoned the Father of Modern Medicine. He owed his interest in the movements of the blood to Fabricio of Acquapendente, his tutor at Padua, who drew his attention to the valves in the veins, thus suggesting the idea of a circular as opposed to a to-and-fro motion. Harvey's great generalisation, based upon a long series of experiments in vivo, was considered to have given the coup de grâce to the Galenic physiology, and hence threw temporary discredit upon the whole system of medicine associated therewith.

Modern medicine, based upon a painstaking
research into the details of physiological function, had begun.

While we cannot sufficiently commend the results of the long modern period of research-work to which the labours of the Renascence anatomists from Vesalius to Harvey form a fitting prelude, we yet by no means allow that Galen’s general medical outlook was so entirely invalidated as many imagine by the conclusive demonstration of his anatomical errors. It is time for us now to turn to Galen again after three hundred years of virtual neglect: it may be that he will help us to see something fundamentally important for medical practice which is beyond the power even of our microscopes and X-rays to reveal. While the value of his work undoubtedly lies mainly in its enabling us to envisage one of the greatest of the early steps attained by man in medical knowledge, it also has a very definite intrinsic value of its own.

No attempt can be made here to determine how much of Galen’s work is, in the true sense of the word, original, and how much is drawn from the labours of his predecessors. In any case, there is no doubt that he was much more than a mere compiler and systematizer of other men’s work: he was great enough to be able not merely to collect, to digest, and to assimilate all the best of the work done before his time, but, adding to this the outcome of his own observations, experiments, and reflections, to present
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the whole in an articulated “system” showing that perfect balance of parts which is the essential criterion of a work of art. Constantly, however, in his writings we shall come across traces of the influence of, among others, Plato, Aristotle, and writers of the Stoic school.

Although Galen is an eclectic in the best sense of the term, there is one name to which he pays a very special tribute—that of his illustrious forerunner Hippocrates. Him on quite a number of occasions he actually calls “divine” (cf. p. 293).

“Hippocrates,” he says, “was the first known to us of all who have been both physicians and philosophers, in that he was the first to recognise what nature does.” Here is struck the keynote of the teaching of both Hippocrates and Galen; this is shown in the volume before us, which deals with “the natural faculties”—that is with the faculties of this same “Nature” or vital principle referred to in the quotation.

If Galen be looked on as a crystallisation of Greek medicine, then this book may be looked on as a crystallisation of Galen. Within its comparatively short compass we meet with instances illustrating perhaps most of the sides of this many-sided writer. The “Natural Faculties” therefore forms an excellent prelude to the study of his larger and more specialised works.
What, now, is this “Nature” or biological principle upon which Galen, like Hippocrates, bases the whole of his medical teaching, and which, we may add, is constantly overlooked—if indeed ever properly apprehended—by many physiologists of the present day? By using this term Galen meant simply that, when we deal with a living thing, we are dealing primarily with a unity, which, qua living, is not further divisible; all its parts can only be understood and dealt with as being in relation to this principle of unity. Galen was thus led to criticise with considerable severity many of the medical and surgical specialists of his time, who acted on the assumption (implicit if not explicit) that the whole was merely the sum of its parts, and that if, in an ailing organism, these parts were treated each in and for itself, the health of the whole organism could in this way be eventually restored.

Galen expressed this idea of the unity of the organism by saying that it was governed by a *Physis* or Nature (*η φύσις ηπερ διοικει το ζωον*), with whose “faculties” or powers it was the province of *φυσι-ολογία* (physi-ology, Nature-lore) to deal. It was because Hippocrates had a clear sense of this principle that Galen called him master. “Greatest,” say the Moslems, “is Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet.” “Greatest,” said Galen, “is the Physis, and Hippocrates is its prophet.” Never did Mohammed more zealously maintain the unity of the Godhead than Hippocrates and Galen the unity of the organism.
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But we shall not have read far before we discover that the term *Physiology*, as used by Galen, stands not merely for what we understand by it nowadays, but also for a large part of *Physics* as well. This is one of the chief sources of confusion in his writings. Having grasped, for example, the uniqueness of the process of *specific selection* (ἐλκὴ τοῦ οἰκείου), by which the tissues nourish themselves, he proceeds to apply this principle in explanation of entirely different classes of phenomena; thus he mixes it up with the physical phenomenon of the attraction of the lodestone for iron, of dry grain for moisture, etc. It is noteworthy, however, in these latter instances, that he does not venture to follow out his comparison to its logical conclusion; he certainly stops short of hinting that the lodestone (like a living organ or tissue) *assimilates* the metal which it has attracted!

Setting aside, however, these occasional half-hearted attempts to apply his principle of a φύσις in regions where it has no natural standing, we shall find that in the field of biology Galen moves with an assurance bred of first-hand experience.

Against his attempt to "biologize" physics may be set the converse attempt of the mechanical Atomist school. Thus in Aselepiades he found a doughty defender of the view that physiology was "merely" physics. Galen's ire being roused, he is not content with driving the enemy out of the biological camp, but must needs attempt also to
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dislodge him from that of physics, in which he has every right to be.

In defence of the universal validity of his principle, Galen also tends to excessive disparagement of morphological factors; witness his objection to the view of the anatomist Erasistratus that the calibre of vessels played a part in determining the secretion of fluids (p. 123), that digestion was caused by the mechanical action of the stomach walls (p. 243), and dropsy by induration of the liver (p. 171).

While combating the atomic explanation of physical processes, Galen of course realised that there were many of these which could only be explained according to what we should now call "mechanical laws." For example, non-living things could be subjected to φορά (passive motion), they answered to the laws of gravity (ταίς τῶν ὑλῶν οἰακεῖόμενα ῥοταῖς, p. 126). Furthermore, Galen did not fail to see that living things also were not entirely exempted from the operation of these laws; they too may be at least partly subject to gravity (loc. cit.); a hollow organ exerts, by virtue of its cavity, an attraction similar to that of dilating bellows, as well as, by virtue of the living tissue of its walls, a specifically "vital" or selective kind of attraction (p. 325).

As a type of characteristically vital action we may take nutrition, in which occurs a phenomenon
which Galen calls *active motion* (δραστική κίνησις) or, more technically, *alteration* (ἀλλοίωσις). This active type of motion cannot be adequately stated in terms of the passive movements (groupings and re-groupings) of its constituent parts according to certain empirical “laws.” Alteration involves self-movement, a self-determination of the organism or organic part. Galen does not attempt to explain this fundamental characteristic of *alteration* any further; he contents himself with referring his opponents to Aristotle’s work on the “Complete Alteration of Substance” (p. 9).

The most important characteristic of the Physis or Nature is its τέχνη—its artistic creativeness. In other words, the living organism is a creative artist. This feature may be observed typically in its primary functions of *growth* and *nutrition*; these are dependent on the characteristic *faculties* or powers, by virtue of which each part draws to itself what is proper or appropriate to it (τὸ οἰκεῖον) and rejects what is foreign (τὸ ἀλλότριον), thereafter appropriating or assimilating the attracted material; this assimilation is an example of the *alteration* (or qualitative change) already alluded to; thus the food eaten is “altered” into the various tissues of the body, each of these having been provided by “Nature” with its own specific faculties of attraction and repulsion.

Any of the operations of the living part may be looked on in three ways, either (a) as a διναμικός,
faculty, potentiality; (b) as an ἔνεργεια, which is this δύναμις in operation; or (c) as an ἔργον, the product or effect of the ἔνεργεια.¹

¹ What appear to me to be certain resemblances between the Galenical and the modern vitalistic views of Henri Bergson may perhaps be alluded to here. Galen’s vital principle, ἡ τεχνικὴ φύσις (“creative growth”), presents analogies with l’Evolution créatrice: both manifest their activity in producing qualitative change (ἀλλαγής, change ment): in both, the creative change cannot be analysed into a series of static states, but is one and continuous. In Galen, however, it comes to an end with the development of the individual, whereas in Bergson it continues indefinitely as the evolution of life. The three aspects of organic life may be tabulated thus:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>δύναμις</th>
<th>ἔνεργεια</th>
<th>ἔργον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work to be done.</td>
<td>Work being done.</td>
<td>Work done, finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future aspect.</td>
<td>Present aspect.</td>
<td>Past aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A changing which cannot be understood as a sum of static parts; a constant becoming, never stopping — at least till the ἔργον is reached.</td>
<td>Bergson’s “telelogical” aspect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergson’s “philosophical” aspect.</td>
<td>Bergson’s “outlook of physical science.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Galen recognized “creativeness” (τεχνη) in the development of the individual and its parts (ontogeny) and in the maintenance of these, but he failed to appreciate the creative evolution of species (phylogeny), which is, of course, part of the same process. To the teleologist the possibilities (δύναμες) of the Physis are limited, to Bergson they are un-
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Like his master Hippocrates, Galen attached fundamental importance to clinical observation—
to the evidence of the senses as the indispensable groundwork of all medical knowledge. He had
also, however, a forte for rapid generalisation from observations, and his logical proclivities disposed him
limited. Galen and Bergson agree in attaching most practical importance to the middle category—that of Function.

While it must be conceded that Galen, following Aristotle, had never seriously questioned the fixity of species, the following quotation from his work On Habits (chap. ii.) will show that he must have at least had occasional glimmerings of our modern point of view on the matter. Referring to assimilation, he says: "Just as everything we eat or drink becomes altered in quality, so of course also does the altering factor itself become altered. . . . A clear proof of the assimilation of things which are being nourished to that which is nourishing them is the change which occurs in plants and seeds; this often goes so far that what is highly noxious in one soil becomes, when transplanted into another soil, not merely harmless, but actually useful. This has been largely put to the test by those who compose memoirs on farming and on plants, as also by zoological authors who have written on the changes which occur according to the countries in which animals live. Since, therefore, not only is the nourishment altered by the creature nourished, but the latter itself also undergoes some slight alteration, this slight alteration must necessarily become considerable in the course of time, and thus properties resulting from prolonged habit must come to be on a par with natural properties."

Galen fails to see the possibility that the "natural" properties themselves originated in this way, as activities which gradually became habitual—that is to say, that the effects of nurture may become a "second nature," and so eventually nature itself.

The whole passage, however, may be commended to modern biologists—particularly, might one say, to those bacteriologists who have not yet realised how extraordinarily relative is the term "specificity" when applied to the subject-matter of their science.
particularly to deductive reasoning. Examples of an almost Euclidean method of argument may be found in the *Natural Faculties* (e.g. Book III. chap. i.). While this method undoubtedly gave him much help in his search for truth, it also not unfrequently led him astray. This is evidenced by his attempt, already noted, to apply the biological principle of the φύσις in physics. Characteristic examples of attempts to force facts to fit premises will be found in Book II. chap. ix., where our author demonstrates that yellow bile is "virtually" dry, and also, by a process of exclusion, assigns to the spleen the function of clearing away black bile. Strangest of all is his attempt to prove that the same principle of specific attraction by which the ultimate tissues nourish themselves (and the lodestone attracts iron!) accounts for the reception of food into the stomach, of urine into the kidneys, of bile into the gall-bladder, and of semen into the uterus.

These instances are given, however, without prejudice to the system of generalisation and deduction which, in Galen’s hands, often proved exceedingly fruitful. He is said to have tried "to unite professional and scientific medicine with a philosophic link." He objected, however, to such extreme attempts at simplification of medical science as that of the Methodists, to whom diseases were isolated entities, without any relationships in time or space (v. p. xv. *supra*).

He based much of his pathological reasoning upon
the "humoral theory" of Hippocrates, according to which certain diseases were caused by one or more of the four humours (blood, phlegm, black and yellow bile) being in excess—that is, by various dyscrasias. Our modern conception of "hormone" action shows certain resemblances with this theory.

Besides observation and reasoning, Galen took his stand on experiment; he was one of the first of experimental physiologists, as is illustrated in the present book by his researches into the function of the kidneys (p. 59 et seq.). He also conducted a long series of experiments into the physiology of the spinal cord, to determine what parts controlled movement and what sensibility.

As a practitioner he modelled his work largely on the broad and simple lines laid down by Hippocrates. He had also at his disposal all the acquisitions of biological science dating from the time of Aristotle five hundred years earlier, and reinforced by the discoveries in anatomy made by the Alexandrian school. To these he added a large series of researches of his own.

Galen never confined himself to what one might call the academic or strictly orthodox sources of information; he roamed the world over for answers to his queries. For example, we find him on his journeys between Pergamos and Rome twice visiting the island of Lemnos in order to procure some of the terra sigillata, a kind of earth which had a reputation for healing the bites of serpents and
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other wounds. At other times he visited the copper-mines of Cyprus in search for copper, and Palestine for the resin called Balm of Gilead.

By inclination and training Galen was the reverse of a "party-man." In the Natural Faculties (p. 55) he speaks of the bane of sectarian partizanship, "harder to heal than any itch." He pours scorn upon the ignorant "Erasistrateans" and "Asclepiadeans," who attempted to hide their own incompetence under the shield of some great man's name (cf. p. 141).

Of the two chief objects of his censure in the Natural Faculties, Galen deals perhaps less rigorously with Erasistratus than with Asclepiades. Erasistratus did at least recognize the existence of a vital principle in the organism, albeit, with his eye on the structures which the scalpel displayed he tended frequently to forget it. The researches of the anatomical school of Alexandria had been naturally of the greatest service to surgery, but in medicine they sometimes had a tendency to check progress by diverting attention from the whole to the part.

Another novel conception frequently occurring in Galen's writings is that of the Pneuma (i.e. the breath, spiritus). This word is used in two senses, as meaning (1) the inspired air, which was drawn into the left side of the heart and thence carried all over the body by the arteries; this has not a few analogies with oxygen, particularly as its action in the tissues
is attended with the appearance of the so-called "innate heat." (2) A vital principle, conceived as being made up of matter in the most subtle imaginable state (i.e. air). This vital principle became resolved into three kinds: (a) πνεῦμα φυσικόν or spiritus naturalis, carried by the veins, and presiding over the subconscious vegetative life; this "natural spirit" is therefore practically equivalent to the φύσις or "nature" itself. (b) The πνεῦμα ζωτικόν or spiritus vitalis; here particularly is a source of error, since the air already alluded to as being carried by the arteries tends to be confused with this principle of "individuality" or relative autonomy in the circulatory (including, perhaps, the vasomotor) system. (c) The πνεῦμα ψυχικόν or spiritus animalis (anima = ψυχή), carried by longitudinal canals in the nerves; this corresponds to the ψυχή.

This view of a "vital principle" as necessarily consisting of matter in a finely divided, fluid, or "etheric" state is not unknown even in our day. Belief in the fundamental importance of the Pneuma formed the basis of the teaching of another vitalist school in ancient Greece, that of the Pneumatists.

It is unnecessary to detail here the various ways in which Galen's physiological views differ from those of the Moderns, as most of these are noticed in footnotes to the text of the present translation. His ignorance of the circulation of the blood does not lessen the force of his general physiological conclu-
In his opinion, the great bulk of the blood travelled with a to-and-fro motion in the veins, while a little of it, mixed with inspired air, moved in the same way along the arteries; whereas we now know that all the blood goes outward by the arteries and returns by the veins; in either case blood is carried to the tissues by blood-vessels, and Galen’s ideas of tissue-nutrition were wonderfully sound. The ingenious method by which (in ignorance of the pulmonary circulation) he makes blood pass from the right to the left ventricle, may be read in the present work (p. 321). As will be seen, he was conversant with the “anastomoses” between the ultimate branches of arteries and veins, although he imagined that they were not used under “normal” conditions.

Galen was not only a man of great intellectual gifts, but one also of strong moral fibre. In his short treatise “That the best Physician is also a Philosopher” he outlines his professional ideals. It is necessary for the efficient healer to be versed in the three branches of “philosophy,” viz.: (a) logic, the science of how to think; (b) physics, the science of what is—i.e. of “Nature” in the widest sense; (c) ethics, the science of what to do. The amount of toil which he who wishes to be a physician must undergo—firstly, in mastering the work of his predecessors and afterwards in studying disease at first hand—makes it absolutely necessary that he should
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possess perfect self-control, that he should scorn money and the weak pleasures of the senses, and should live laborious days.

Readers of the following pages will notice that Galen uses what we should call distinctly immoderate language towards those who ventured to differ from the views of his master Hippocrates (which were also his own). The employment of such language was one of the few weaknesses of his age which he did not transcend. Possibly also his mother's choleric temper may have predisposed him to it.

The fact, too, that his vivisection experiments (e.g. pp. 59, 273) were carried out apparently without any kind of anaesthetisation being even thought of is abhorrent to the feelings of to-day, but must be excused also on the ground that callousness towards animals was then customary, men having probably never thought much about the subject.

Galen is a master of language, using a highly polished variety of Attic prose with a precision which can be only very imperfectly reproduced in another tongue. Every word he uses has an exact and definite meaning attached to it. Translation is particularly difficult when a word stands for a physiological conception which is not now held; instances are the words anadosis, prosthesis, and prospkysis, indicating certain steps in the process by which nutriment is conveyed from the alimentary canal to the tissues.
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Readers will be surprised to find how many words are used by Galen which they would have thought had been expressly coined to fit modern conceptions; thus our author employs not merely such terms as physiology, phthisis, atrophy, anastomosis, but also haematopoietic, anaesthesia, and even aseptic! It is only fair, however, to remark that these terms, particularly the last, were not used by Galen in quite their modern significance.

Summary. To resume, then: What contribution can Galen bring to the art of healing at the present day? It was not, surely, for nothing that the great Pergamene gave laws to the medical world for over a thousand years!

Let us draw attention once more to:

(1) The high ideal which he set before the profession.

(2) His insistence on immediate contact with nature as the primary condition for arriving at an understanding of disease; on the need for due consideration of previous authorities; on the need also for reflection—for employment of the mind’s eye (ἡ λογική θεωρία) as an aid to the physical eye.

(3) His essentially broad outlook, which often helped him in the comprehension of a phenomenon through his knowledge of an analogous phenomenon in another γένος of nature.
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(4) His keen appreciation of the unity of the organism, and of the inter-dependence of its parts; his realisation that the vital phenomena (physiological and pathological) in a living organism can only be understood when considered in relation to the environment of that organism or part. This is the foundation for the war that Galen waged à outrance on the Methodists, to whom diseases were things without relation to anything. This dispute is, unfortunately, not touched upon in the present volume. What Galen combated was the tendency, familiar enough in our own day, to reduce medicine to the science of finding a label for each patient, and then treating not the patient, but the label. (This tendency, we may remark in parenthesis, is one which is obviously well suited for the standardising purposes of a State medical service, and is therefore one which all who have the weal of the profession at heart must most jealously watch in the difficult days that lie ahead.)

(5) His realisation of the inappropriateness and inadequacy of physical formulae in explaining physiological activities. Galen's disputes with Asclepiades over τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖνα σώματα τὰ ἀπάθη, over the ἀναρμα στοιχεῖα καὶ ληπώδεως ὅγκοι, is but another aspect of his quarrel with the Methodists regarding their pathological "units," whose primary characteristic was just this same ἀπάθεια (impassiveness to environment, "unimpressionability"). We have of course
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our Physiatric or Iatromechanical school at the present day, to whom such processes as absorption from the alimentary canal, the respiratory interchange of gases, and the action of the renal epithelium are susceptible of a purely physical explanation.¹

(6) His quarrel with the Anatomists, which was in essence the same as that with the Atomists, and which arose from his clear realisation that that primary and indispensable desideratum, a view of the whole, could never be obtained by a mere summation of partial views; hence, also, his sense of the dangers which would beset the medical art if it were allowed to fall into the hands of a mere crowd of competing specialists without any organising head to guide them.

¹ In terms of filtration, diffusion, and osmosis.
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SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTERS

BOOK I

CHAPTER I
Distinction between the effects of (a) the organism's psyche or soul (b) its physis or nature. The author proposes to confine himself to a consideration of the latter—the vegetative—aspect of life.

CHAPTER II
Definition of terms. Different kinds of motion. Alteration or qualitative change. Refutation of the Sophists' objection that such change is only apparent, not real. The four fundamental qualities of Hippocrates (later Aristotle). Distinction between faculty, activity (function), and effect (work or product).

CHAPTER III
It is by virtue of the four qualities that each part functions. Some authorities subordinate the dry and the moist principles to the hot and the cold. Aristotle inconsistent here.

CHAPTER IV
We must suppose that there are faculties corresponding in number to the visible effects (or products) with which we are familiar.

CHAPTER V
Genesis, growth, and nutrition. Genesis (embryogeny) subdivided into histogenesis and organogenesis. Growth is a tridimensional expansion of the solid parts formed during genesis. Nutrition.
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Chapter VI

The process of genesis (embryogeny) from insemination onwards. Each of the simple, elementary, homogeneous parts (tissues) is produced by a special blend of the four primary alternative faculties (such secondary alternative faculties being osteopoietic, neuropoietic, etc.). A special function and use also corresponds to each of these special tissues. The bringing of these tissues together into organs and the disposal of these organs is performed by another faculty called diaplastic, moulding, or formative.

Chapter VII

We now pass from genesis to growth. Growth essentially a post-natal process; it involves two factors, expansion and nutrition, explained by analogy of a familiar child's game.

Chapter VIII

Nutrition.

Chapter IX

These three primary faculties (genesis, growth, nutrition) have various others subservient to them.

Chapter X

Nutrition not a simple process. (1) Need of subsidiary organs for the various stages of alteration, e.g., of bread into blood, of that into bone, etc. (2) Need also of organs for excreting the non-utilizable portions of the food, e.g., much vegetable matter is superfluous. (3) Need of organs of a third kind, for distributing the pabulum through the body.

Chapter XI

Nutrition analysed into the stages of application (prosthesis), adhesion (prosphysis), and assimilation. The stages illustrated by certain pathological conditions. Different shades of meaning of the term nutriment.
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Chapter XII
The two chief medico-philosophical schools—Atomist and Vitalist. Hippocrates an adherent of the latter school—his doctrine of an original principle or "nature" in every living thing (doctrine of the unity of the organism).

Chapter XIII
Failure of Asclepiades to understand the functions of kidneys and ureters. His hypothesis of vaporization of imbibed fluids is here refuted. A demonstration of urinary secretion in the living animal; the forethought and artistic skill of Nature vindicated. Refutation also of Asclepiades's disbelief in the special selective action of purgative drugs.

Chapter XIV
While Asclepiades denies in toto the obvious fact of specific attraction, Epicurus grants the fact, although his attempt to explain it by the atomic hypothesis breaks down. Refutation of the Epicurean theory of magnetic attraction. Instances of specific attraction of thorns and animal poisons by medicaments, of moisture by corn, etc.

Chapter XV
It now being granted that the urine is secreted by the kidneys, the rationale of this secretion is enquired into. The kidneys are not mechanical filters, but are by virtue of their nature possessed of a specific faculty of attraction.

Chapter XVI
Erasistratus, again, by his favourite principle of horror vacui could never explain the secretion of urine by the kidneys. While, however, he acknowledged that the kidneys do secrete urine, he makes no attempt to explain this; he ignores, but does not attempt to refute, the Hippocratic doctrine of specific attraction. "Servile" position taken up by Asclepiades and Erasistratus in regard to this function of urinary secretion.
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Chapter XVII

Three other attempts (by adherents of the Erasistratean school and by Lycus of Macedonia) to explain how the kidneys come to separate out urine from the blood. All these ignore the obvious principle of attraction.

BOOK II

Chapter I

In order to explain dispersal of food from alimentary canal via the veins (anadosis) there is no need to invoke with Erasistratus, the horror vacui, since here again the principle of specific attraction is operative; moreover, blood is also driven forward by the compressing action of the stomach and the contractions of the veins. Possibility, however, of Erasistratus's factor playing a certain minor rôle.

Chapter II

The Erasistratean idea that bile becomes separated out from the blood in the liver because, being the thinner fluid, it alone can enter the narrow stomata of the bile-ducts, while the thicker blood can only enter the wider mouths of the hepatic venules.

Chapter III

The morphological factors suggested by Erasistratus are quite inadequate to explain biological happenings. Erasistratus inconsistent with his own statements. The immanence of the physis or nature; her shaping is not merely external like that of a statuary, but involves the entire substance. In genesis (embryogeny) the semen is the active, and the menstrual blood the passive, principle. Attractive, alterative, and formative faculties of the semen. Embryogeny is naturally followed by growth; these two functions distinguished.
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CHAPTER IV

Unjustified claim by Erasistrateans that their founder had associations with the Peripatetic (Aristotelian) school. The characteristic physiological tenets of that school (which were all anticipated by Hippocrates) in no way agree with those of Erasistratus, save that both recognize the purposefulness of Nature; in practice, however, Erasistratus assumed numerous exceptions to this principle. Difficulty of understanding why he rejected the biological principle of attraction in favour of anatomical factors.

CHAPTER V

A further difficulty raised by Erasistratus's statement regarding secretion of bile in the liver.

CHAPTER VI

The same holds with nutrition. Even if we grant that veins may obtain their nutrient blood by virtue of the horror vacui (chap. i.), how could this explain the nutrition of nerves? Erasistratus's hypothesis of minute elementary nerves and vessels within the ordinary visible nerves simply throws the difficulty further back. And is Erasistratus's minute "simple" nerve susceptible of further analysis, as the Atomists would assume? If so, this is opposed to the conception of a constructive and artistic Nature which Erasistratus himself shares with Hippocrates and the writer. And if his minute nerve is really elementary and not further divisible, then it cannot, according to his own showing, contain a cavity; therefore the horror vacui does not apply to it. And how could this principle apply to the restoration to its original bulk of a part which had become thin through disease, where more matter must become attached than runs away? A quotation from Erasistratus shows that he did acknowledge an "attraction," although not exactly in the Hippocratic sense.
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Chapter VII

In the last resort, the ultimate living elements (Erasistratus's simple vessels) must draw in their food by virtue of an inherent attractive faculty like that which the lodestone exerts on iron. Thus the process of anadosis, from beginning to end, can be explained without assuming a horror vacui.

Chapter VIII

Erasistratus's disregard for the humours. In respect to excessive formation of bile, however, prevention is better than cure; accordingly we must consider its pathology. Does blood pre-exist in the food, or does it come into existence in the body? Erasistratus's purely anatomical explanation of dropsy. He entirely avoids the question of the four qualities (e.g. the importance of innate heat) in the generation of the humours, etc. Yet the problem of blood-production is no less important than that of gastric digestion. Proof that bile does not pre-exist in the food. The four fundamental qualities of Hippocrates and Aristotle. How the humours are formed from food taken into the veins: when heat is in proportionate amount, blood results; when in excess, bile; when deficient, phlegm. Various conditions determining cold or warm temperaments. The four primary diseases result each from excess of one of the four qualities. Erasistratus unwillingly acknowledges this when he ascribes the indigestion occurring in fever to impaired function of the stomach. For what causes this functio laesa? Proof that it is the fever (excess of innate heat).

If, then, heat plays so important a part in abnormal functioning, so must it also in normal (i.e. causes of eucrasia involved in those of dyscrasia, of physiology in those of pathology). A like argument explains the genesis of the humours. Addition of warmth to things already warm makes them bitter; thus honey turns to bile in people who are already warm; where warmth deficient, as in old people, it turns to useful blood. This is a proof that bile does not pre-exist, as such, in the food.
The functions of organs also depend on the way in which the four qualities are mixed—e.g. the contracting function of the stomach. Treatment only possible when we know the causes of errors of function. The Erasistratians practically Empiricists in this respect. On an appreciation of the meaning of a dyscrasia follows naturally the Hippocratic principle of treating opposites by opposites (e.g. cooling the overheated stomach, warming it when chilled, etc.). Useless in treatment to know merely the function of each organ; we must know the bodily condition which upsets this function. Blood is warm and moist. Yellow bile is warm and (virtually, though not apparently) dry. Phlegm is cold and moist. The fourth possible combination (cold and dry) is represented by black bile. For the clearing out of this humour from the blood, Nature has provided the spleen—an organ which, according to Erasistratus, fulfils no purpose. Proof of the importance of the spleen is the jaundice, toxaemia, etc., occurring when it is diseased. Erasistratus’s failure to mention the views of leading authorities on this organ shows the hopelessness of his position. The Hippocratic view has now been demonstrated deductively and inductively. The classical view as to the generation of the humours. Normal and pathological forms of yellow and black bile. Part played by the innate heat in their production. Other kinds of bile are merely transition-stages between these extreme types. Abnormal forms removed by liver and spleen respectively. Phlegm, however, does not need a special excretory organ, as it can undergo entire metabolism in the body.

Need for studying the works of the Ancients carefully, in order to reach a proper understanding of this subject.
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BOOK III

Chapter I

A recapitulation of certain points previously demonstrated. Every part of the animal has an attractive and an alternative (assimilative) faculty; it attracts the nutrient juice which is proper to it. Assimilation is preceded by adhesion (prosphyisis) and that again, by application (prosthesis). Application the goal of attraction. It would not, however, be followed by adhesion and assimilation if each part did not also possess a faculty for retaining in position the nutriment which has been applied. A priori necessity for this retentive faculty.

Chapter II

The same faculty to be proved a posteriori. Its corresponding function (i.e. the activation of this faculty or potentiality) well seen in the large hollow organs, notably the uterus and stomach.

Chapter III

Exercise of the retentive faculty particularly well seen in the uterus. Its object is to allow the embryo to attain full development; this being completed, a new faculty—the expulsive—hitherto quiescent, comes into play. Characteristic signs and symptoms of pregnancy. Tight grip of uterus on growing embryo, and accurate closure of os uteri during operation of the retentive faculty. Dilatation of os and expulsive activities of uterus at full term, or when foetus dies. Prolapse from undue exercise of this faculty. Rôle of the midwife. Accessory muscles in parturition.

Chapter IV

Same two faculties seen in stomach. Gurglings or borborygmi show that this organ is weak and is not gripping its contents tightly enough. Undue delay of food in a weak
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stomach proved not to be due to narrowness of pylorus: length of stay depends on whether digestion (another instance of the characteristically vital process of alteration) has taken place or not. Erasistratus wrong in attributing digestion merely to the mechanical action of the stomach walls. When digestion completed, then pylorus opens and allows contents to pass downwards, just as os uteri when development of embryo completed.

Chapter V

If attraction and elimination always proceeded pari passu, the content of these hollow organs (including gall-bladder and urinary bladder) would never vary in amount. A retentive faculty, therefore, also logically needed. Its existence demonstrated. Expulsion determined by qualitative and quantitative changes of contents. “Diarrhoea” of stomach. Vomiting.

Chapter VI

Every organic part has an appetite and aversion for the qualities which are appropriate and foreign to it respectively. Attraction necessarily leads to a certain benefit received. This again necessitates retention.

Chapter VII

Interaction between two bodies; the stronger masters the weaker; a deleterious drug masters the forces of the body, whereas food is mastered by them; this mastery is an alteration, and the amount of alteration varies with the different organs; thus a partial alteration is effected in mouth by saliva, but much greater in stomach, where not only gastric juice, but also bile, pneumonia, innate heat (i.e. oxidation?), and other powerful factors are brought to bear on it; need of considerable alteration in stomach
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as a transition-stage between food and blood; appearance of faeces in intestine another proof of great alteration effected in stomach. Asclepiades's denial of real qualitative change in stomach rebutted. Erasistratus's denial that digestion in any way resembles a boiling process comes from his taking words too literally.

Chapter VIII

Erasistratus denies that the stomach exerts any pull in the act of swallowing. That he is wrong, however, is proved by the anatomical structure of the stomach—its inner coat with longitudinal fibres obviously acts as a vis a frontis (attraction), whilst its outer coat exercises through the contraction of its circular fibres a vis a tergo (propulsion); the latter also comes into play in vomiting. The stomach uses the oesophagus as a kind of hand, to draw in its food with. The functions of the two coats proved also by vivisection. Swallowing cannot be attributed merely to the force of gravity.

Chapter IX

These four faculties which subserve nutrition are thus apparent in many different parts of the body.

Chapter X

Need for elaborating the statements of the ancient physicians. Superiority of Ancients to Moderns. This state of affairs can only be rectified by a really efficient education of youth. The chief requisites of such an education.

Chapter XI

For the sake of the few who really wish truth, the argument will be continued. A third kind of fibre—the oblique—subserves retention; the way in which this fibre is disposed in different coats.
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Chapter XII

The factor which brings the expulsive faculty into action is essentially a condition of the organ or its contents which is the reverse of that which determined attraction. Analogy between abortion and normal parturition. Whatever produces discomfort must be expelled. That discomfort also determines expulsion of contents from gall-bladder is not so evident as in the case of stomach, uterus, urinary bladder, etc., but can be logically demonstrated.

Chapter XIII

Expulsion takes place through the same channel as attraction (e.g., in stomach, gall-bladder, uterus). Similarly the delivery (anadosis) of nutriment to the liver from the food-canal via the mesenteric veins may have its direction reversed. Continuous give-and-take between different parts of the body; superior strength of certain parts is natural, of others acquired. When liver contains abundant food and stomach depleted, latter may draw on former; this occurs when animal can get nothing to eat, and so prevents starvation. Similarly, when one part becomes over-distended, it tends to deposit its excess in some weaker part near it; this passes it on to some still weaker part, which cannot get rid of it; hence deposits of various kinds. Further instances of reversal of the normal direction of anadosis from the food canal through the veins. Such reversal of functions would in any case be expected a priori. In the vomiting of intestinal obstruction, matter may be carried backwards all the way from the intestine to the mouth; not surprising, therefore, that, under certain circumstances, food-material might be driven right back from the skin-surface to the alimentary canal (e.g. in excessive chilling of surface); not much needed to determine this reversal of direction. Action of purgative drugs upon terminals of veins; one part draws from another until whole body participates; similarly in intestinal obstruction, each part passes on the irritating substance to its weaker
neighbour. Reversal of direction of flow occurs not merely on occasion but also constantly (as in arteries, lungs, heart, etc.). The various stages of normal nutrition described. Why the stomach sometimes draws back the nutriment it had passed on to portal veins and liver. A similar ebb and flow in relation to the spleen. Comparison of the parts of the body to a lot of animals at a feast. The valves of the heart are a provision of Nature to prevent this otherwise inevitable regurgitation, though even they are not quite efficient.

**Chapter XIV**

The superficial arteries, when they dilate, draw in air from the atmosphere, and the deeper ones a fine, vaporous blood from the veins and heart. Lighter matter such as air will always be drawn in in preference to heavier; this is why the arteries in the food-canal draw in practically none of the nutrient matter contained in it.

**Chapter XV**

The two kinds of attraction—the mechanical attraction of dilating bellows and the "physical" (vital) attraction by living tissue of nutrient matter which is specifically allied or appropriate to it. The former kind—that resulting from horror vacui—acts primarily on light matter, whereas vital attraction has no essential concern with such mechanical factors. A hollow organ exercises, by virtue of its cavity, the former kind of attraction, and by virtue of the living tissue of its walls, the second kind. Application of this to question of contents of arteries; anastomoses of arteries and veins. Foramina in interventricular septum of heart, allowing some blood to pass from right to left ventricle. Large size of aorta probably due to fact that it not merely carries the pneuma received from the lungs, but also some of the blood which percolates through septum from right ventricle. Thus arteries carry not merely pneuma, but also some light vaporous blood, which certain parts need more
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than the ordinary thick blood of the veins. The organic parts must have their blood-supply sufficiently near to allow them to absorb it; comparison with an irrigation system in a garden. Details of the process of nutrition in the ultimate specific tissues; some are nourished from the blood directly; in others a series of intermediate stages must precede complete assimilation; for example, marrow is an intermediate stage between blood and bone.

From the generalisations arrived at in the present work we can deduce the explanation of all kinds of particular phenomena; an instance is given, showing the co-operation of various factors previously discussed.
That is, "On the Natural Powers," the powers of the Physis or Nature. By that Galen practically means what we should call the physiological or biological powers, the characteristic faculties of the living organism; his Physis is the subconscious vital principle of the animal or plant.
Since feeling and voluntary motion are peculiar to animals, whilst growth and nutrition are common to plants as well, we may look on the former as effects of the soul and the latter as effects of the nature.

And if there be anyone who allows a share in soul to plants as well, and separates the two kinds of soul, naming the kind in question vegetative, and the other sensory, this person is not saying anything else, although his language is somewhat unusual. We, however, for our part, are convinced that the chief merit of language is clearness, and we know that nothing detracts so much from this as do unfamiliar terms; accordingly we employ those terms which the bulk of people are accustomed to use, and we say that animals are governed at once by their soul and by their nature, and plants by their nature alone, and that growth and nutrition are the effects of nature, not of soul.

Like Aristotle, however, he also ascribes quasi-vital properties to inanimate things, cf. Introduction, p. xxvii.

Ergon, here rendered an effect, is literally a work or deed; strictly speaking, it is something done, completed, as distinguished from energia, which is the actual doing, the activity which produces this ergon. cf. p. 13, and Introduction, p. xxx.

Gk. psyche, Lat. anima.  
Gk. physis, Lat. natura.
Καὶ ξητήσομεν κατὰ τόνδε τῶν λόγων, ὑπὸ τίνων γίγνεται δυνάμεων αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα καὶ εἰ δὴ τι ἄλλο φύσεως ἔργον ἐστίν.

'Αλλὰ πρὸτερὸν γε διελέσθαι τε χρῆ καὶ μηνύσαι σαφῶς ἐκαστὸν τῶν ὀνομάτων, οἷς χρησόμεθα κατὰ τόνδε τῶν λόγων, καὶ ἐφ᾽ ὁ τι φέρομεν πράγμα. γενήσεται δὲ τούτ᾽ εὐθὺς ἔργων φυσικῶν διδασκαλία σὺν ταῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐξηγήσεωι.

"Ὅταν οὖν τι σῶμα κατὰ μηδὲν ἐξαλλάττηται τῶν προὔπαρχόντων, ἥσυχάζειν αὐτὸ φαμεν εἰ δ᾽ ἐξίστατό τη, κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνο κινεῖσθαι, καὶ τοίνυν ἐπει πολυειδῶς ἐξίσταται, πολυειδῶς καὶ κινηθήσεται. καὶ γὰρ εἰ λευκὸν ὑπάρχον μελαίνωτο καὶ εἰ μέλαν λευκαίνωτο, κινεῖται κατὰ χρόναν, 3 καὶ εἰ γυλικὸ τέως ὑπάρχον αὖθις || αὐστηρὸν ἢ ἐμπαλιν εξ αὐστηροῦ γυλικὸ γένοιτο, καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἄν κινεῖσθαι λέγοιτο κατὰ τῶν χυμῶν. ἄμφω δὲ ταῦτά τε καὶ τὰ προειρημένα κατὰ τὴν ποιότητα κινεῖσθαι λεχθήσεται καὶ οὐ μόνον γε τὰ κατὰ τὴν χρόνι ἢ τῶν χυμῶν ἐξαλλαττόμενα κινεῖσθαι φαμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θερμότερον ἐκ ψυχροτέρου γενόμενον ἢ ψυχρότερον ἐκ θερμοτέρου κινεῖσθαι καὶ τοῦτο λέγομεν, ὡσπερ γε καὶ εἰ τι ξηρὸν εξ
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II

Thus we shall enquire, in the course of this treatise, from what faculties these effects themselves, as well as any other effects of nature which there may be, take their origin.

First, however, we must distinguish and explain clearly the various terms which we are going to use in this treatise, and to what things we apply them; and this will prove to be not merely an explanation of terms but at the same time a demonstration of the effects of nature.

When, therefore, such and such a body undergoes no change from its existing state, we say that it is at rest; but, if it departs from this in any respect we then say that in this respect it undergoes motion. Accordingly, when it departs in various ways from its pre-existing state, it will be said to undergo various kinds of motion. Thus, if that which is white becomes black, or what is black becomes white, it undergoes motion in respect to colour; or if what was previously sweet now becomes bitter, or, conversely, from being bitter now becomes sweet, it will be said to undergo motion in respect to flavour; to both of these instances, as well as to those previously mentioned, we shall apply the term qualitative motion. And further, it is not only things which are altered in regard to colour and flavour which, we say, undergo motion; when a warm thing becomes cold, and a cold warm, here too we speak of its undergoing motion; similarly also when any-

1 Motion (kinesis) is Aristotle's general term for what we would rather call change. It includes various kinds of change, as well as movement proper. cf. Introduction, p. xxix.
Conveyance," "transport," "transit"; purely mechanical or passive motion, as distinguished from alteration (qualitative change).

2 "Waxing and waning," the latter literally phthisis, a wasting or "decline;" cf. Scotch dwinning, Dutch verdwijnen.

3 Becoming and perishing: Latin, generatio et corruptio.

4 "Ad substantiam productio seu ad formam processus" (Linacre).
thing moist becomes dry, or dry moist. Now, the common term which we apply to all these cases is alteration.

This is one kind of motion. But there is another kind which occurs in bodies which change their position, or as we say, pass from one place to another; the name of this is transference.¹

These two kinds of motion, then, are simple and primary, while compounded from them we have growth and decay,² as when a small thing becomes bigger, or a big thing smaller, each retaining at the same time its particular form. And two other kinds of motion are genesis and destruction,³ genesis being a coming into existence,⁴ and destruction being the opposite.

Now, common to all kinds of motion is change from the pre-existing state, while common to all conditions of rest is retention of the pre-existing state. The Sophists, however, while allowing that bread in turning into blood becomes changed as regards sight, taste, and touch, will not agree that this change occurs in reality. Thus some of them hold that all such phenomena are tricks and illusions of our senses; the senses, they say, are affected now in one way, now in another, whereas the underlying substance does not admit of any of these changes to which the names are given. Others (such as Anaxagorcas)⁵ will have it that the qualities do exist in it, but that they

⁵ "Preformationist" doctrine of Anaxagorcas. To him the apparent alteration in qualities took place when a number of minute pre-existing bodies, all bearing the same quality, came together in sufficient numbers to impress that quality on the senses. The factor which united the minute quality-bearers was Nous. "In the beginning," says Anaxagorcas, "all things existed together—then came Nous and brought them into order."
GALEN

εξ αἰῶνος εἰς αἰῶνα καὶ τὰς φαινομένας ταύτας ἀλλοιώσεις τῇ διακρίσει τε καὶ συγκρίσει γνῶνοντας fairen ὦς 'Αναξαγόρας.

Εἰ δὴ τούτους ἐκτραπομένοις ἐξελέγχοιμι, μείζον ἀν μοι τὸ πάρεργον τοῦ ἔργου γένοιτο. εἰ μὲν γὰρ οὔκ ἦσαν, οὐσιὰ περὶ τῆς καθ' ὅλην τὴν οὕσιαν ἀλλοιώσεως Ἀριστοτέλει τε καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Χρυσόπτω γέγραπται, παρακαλέσαι χρῆ τοῖς ἐκείνοις αὐτούς ὁμιλῆσαι γράμμασιν εἰ δὲ γνωσκόντες ἐπειθ’ ἐκόντες τὰ χείρω πρὸ τῶν βελτίων ἃ ἐροῦνται, μᾶται δὴ ποιοῦ καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα νομισοῦν. οὔτε δὲ καὶ Ἰπποκράτης ὦτως ἐγίγνωσκεν Ἀριστοτέλειοι ἐτι πρότερος ὦν, εἰν ἐτέρως ἡμῖν ἀποδεδεικται. πρῶτος γὰρ οὗτος ἀπάντων ὄν ἦσαν ἅτρον τε καὶ φιλοσόφων ἀποδεικνύειν ἐπεχείρησε τέταρτα εἶναι τὰς πάσας δραστικὰς εἰς ἀλλήλας ποιότητας, ύφ' ὄν γυνεταὶ τε καὶ φθείρεται πάνθ', ὡς γένεσιν τε καὶ φθορὰν ἐπιδεχέται. καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸ κεράνυνθαι δι' ἀλλήλων αὐτῶς ὅλες δι' ὅλων Ἰπποκράτης ἀπάντων πρῶτος ἐγνως καὶ τὰς ἁρχὰς γε τῶν ἀποδειξεων, ὃν ὑστερον Ἀριστοτέλης μετεχείριστο, παρ' ἐκείνῳ πρῶτῳ γεγραμμένας ἑστιν εὐρεῖν.

Εἰ δ’ ὡσπερ τὰς ποιότητας οὕτω καὶ τὰς οὕσιας δι’ ὅλων κεράνυνθαι χρῆ νομίζειν, ὡς ὑστερον ἀπεφήνατο Ζήνων ὁ Κίττιάς, οὐχ ἦγούμαι δεήν ἐτι περὶ τούτου κατὰ τόνδε τὸν λόγον ἐπεξείναι. μόνην γὰρ εἰς τὰ παρόντα δέομαι γνωσκόμεθαι

1 "De ea alteratione quae per totam fit substantiam" (Lincacre).
2 The systematizer of Stoicism and successor of Zeno.
3 Note characteristic impatience with metaphysics. To Galen, as to Hippocrates and Aristotle, it sufficed to look on
are unchangeable and immutable from eternity to eternity, and that these apparent alterations are brought about by separation and combination.

Now, if I were to go out of my way to confute these people, my subsidiary task would be greater than my main one. Thus, if they do not know all that has been written, "On Complete Alteration or Substance" ¹ by Aristotle, and after him by Chrysippus,² I must beg of them to make themselves familiar with these men's writings. If, however, they know these, and yet willingly prefer the worse views to the better, they will doubtless consider my arguments foolish also. I have shown elsewhere that these opinions were shared by Hippocrates, who lived much earlier than Aristotle. In fact, of all those known to us who have been both physicians and philosophers Hippocrates was the first who took in hand to demonstrate that there are, in all, four mutually interacting qualities, and that to the operation of these is due the genesis and destruction of all things that come into and pass out of being. Nay, more; Hippocrates was also the first to recognise that all these qualities undergo an intimate mingling with one another; and at least the beginnings of the proofs to which Aristotle later set his hand are to be found first in the writings of Hippocrates.

As to whether we are to suppose that the substances as well as their qualities undergo this intimate mingling, as Zeno of Citium afterwards declared, I do not think it necessary to go further into this question in the present treatise;³ for immediate purposes we only the qualitative differences apprehended by the senses as fundamental. Zeno of Citium was the founder of the Stoic school; on the further analysis by this school of the qualities into bodies cf. p. 144, note ³.
Galen

thn di' olyhs ths oustias alloiwson, iva mu +

6 nomis~ periexesthai kapei't ev || to swmati dia-

Kaitoi pro ge ths diakrizesws aima faivetai ginomeneo

Kaitoi to g' antilegein autois ounasamy, al\l' epeii ths iatrikhs ulhs h\n

Thus according to Gomperz (Greek Thinkers), the hypo-
thesis of Anaxagoras was that "the bread . . . already con-
tained the countless forms of matter as such which the
human body displays. Their minuteness of size would with-
draw them from our perception. For the defect or 'weak-
ness' of the senses is the narrowness of their receptive area.
need to recognize the complete alteration of substance. In this way, nobody will suppose that bread represents a kind of meeting-place for bone, flesh, nerve, and all the other parts, and that each of these subsequently becomes separated in the body and goes to join its own kind; before any separation takes place, the whole of the bread obviously becomes blood; (at any rate, if a man takes no other food for a prolonged period, he will have blood enclosed in his veins all the same). And clearly this disproves the view of those who consider the elements unchangeable, as also, for that matter, does the oil which is entirely used up in the flame of the lamp, or the faggots which, in a somewhat longer time, turn into fire.

I said, however, that I was not going to enter into an argument with these people, and it was only because the example was drawn from the subject-matter of medicine, and because I need it for the present treatise, that I have mentioned it. We shall then, as I said, renounce our controversy with them, since those who wish may get a good grasp of the views of the ancients from our own personal investigations into these matters.

The discussion which follows we shall devote entirely, as we originally proposed, to an enquiry into the number and character of the faculties of Nature, and what is the effect which each naturally

These elusive particles are rendered visible and tangible by the process of nutrition, which combines them.”

3 Therefore the blood must have come from the bread. The food from the alimentary canal was supposed by Galen to be converted into blood in and by the portal veins. *cf. p. 17.

4 By "elements" is meant all homogeneous, amorphous substances, such as metals, &c., as well as the elementary tissues.
GALEN

ἐκάστη πέφυκεν. ἔργον δὲ δηλονότι καλῶ τὸ
7 γεγονὸς ἥδη καὶ συμπεπληρωμένου ὑπὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτῶν, οἶνον τὸ ἄίμα, τὴν σάρκα, τὸ νεῦρον ἐνέργειαν δὲ τὴν δραστικὴν ὀνομάζω κίνησιν καὶ τὴν ταῦτης αὐτίαν δύναμιν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τὸ σιτίων ἄιμα γίγνεσθαι παθητικὴ μὲν ἢ τοῦ σιτίου, δραστικὴ δὲ τῆς φιλεβδὸς γίγνεται κίνησις, ὡσαύτως δὲ κἂν τῷ μεταφέρειν τὰ κώλα κινεῖ μὲν ὁ μῦς, κινεῖται δὲ τὰ ὀστὰ, τὴν μὲν τῆς φιλεβδὸς καὶ τῶν μυῶν κίνησιν ἐνέργειαν εἰναὶ φημι, τὴν δὲ τῶν σιτίων τε καὶ τῶν ὀστῶν σύμπτωμα τε καὶ πάθημα· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοιοὶ ταῖς, τὰ δὲ φέρεται. τῇ μὲν οὖν ἐνέργειαν ἐγχωρεῖ καλεῖν καὶ ἔργον τῆς φύσεως, οἶνον τὴν πέψιν, τὴν ἀνάδοσιν, τὴν αἰμάτωσιν, ὦ. μὴν τὸ γ' ἔργον ἐξ ἀπαντος ἐνέργειαν· ἢ γὰρ τοις σὰρξ ἔργον μὲν ἐστὶ τῆς φύσεως, οὐ μὴν ἐνέργεια γε. δὴλον οὖν, ὃς θάτερον μὲν τῶν ὀνομάτων διχῶς λέγεται, θάτερον δ' οὖ.

III

Ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ φλέψ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἐκαστον διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν τεταρτῶν ποιάν

1 Work or product. Lat. opus. cf. p. 3. note 2
2 Operation, activation, or functioning. Lat. actio. cf. loc. cit.
3 i.e. a concomitant (secondary) or passive affection. Galen is contrasting active and passive “motion.” cf. p. 6, note 1.
4 As already indicated, there is no exact English equivalent for the Greek term physis, which is a principle immanent
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produces. Now, of course, I mean by an effect \(^1\) that which has already come into existence and has been completed by the activity \(^2\) of these faculties—for example, blood, flesh, or nerve. And activity is the name I give to the active change or motion, and the cause of this I call a faculty. Thus, when food turns into blood, the motion of the food is passive, and that of the vein active. Similarly, when the limbs have their position altered, it is the muscle which produces, and the bones which undergo the motion. In these cases I call the motion of the vein and of the muscle an activity, and that of the food and the bones a symptom or affection,\(^3\) since the first group undergoes alteration and the second group is merely transported. One might, therefore, also speak of the activity as an effect of Nature\(^4\)—for example, digestion, absorption,\(^5\) blood-production; one could not, however, in every case call the effect an activity; thus flesh is an effect of Nature, but it is, of course, not an activity. It is, therefore, clear that one of these terms is used in two senses, but not the other.

III

It appears to me, then, that the vein, as well as each of the other parts, functions in such and such a way according to the manner in which the four quali-

\(^1\) In Greek anadosis. This process includes two stages: (1) transmission of food from alimentary canal to liver (rather more than our "absorption"); (2) further transmission from liver to tissues. Anadosis is lit. a yielding-up, a "delivery;" it may sometimes be rendered "dispersal." "Distribution" (diadosis) is a further stage; cf. p. 163, note 4.
κρᾶσιν ὡδὶ πῶς ἑνεργεῖν δοκεῖ. εἰσὶ δὲ γε μὴν οὐκ ὁλίγοι τινὲς ἄνδρες || οὓς’ ἀδόξοι, φιλόσοφοι τε καὶ ιατροί, τῷ μὲν θερμῷ καὶ τῷ ψυχρῷ τὸ δρᾶν ἀναφέροντες, ὑποβάλλουσι δ’ αὐτοῖς παθητικὰ τὸ ξηρόν τε καὶ τὸ υγρόν. καὶ πρῶτος γ’ Ἀριστοτέλης τὰς τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀπάντων αἰτίας εἰς ταύτας ἀνάγειν πειράται τὰς ἀρχὰς, ἥκολούθησε δ’ ὠστερον αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς στοὰς χωρὸς. καὶ τοι τούτως μὲν, ὡς ἂν καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν στοιχείων τὴν εἰς ἀλληλα μεταβολὴν χύσει τέ τισι καὶ πιλήσειν ἀναφέρουσιν, εὐλογον ἡν ἀρχὰς δραστικὰς ποιήσασθαι τὸ θερμὸν καὶ τὸ ψυχρὸν, Ἀριστοτέλει δ’ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τέταρται ποιότησιν εἰς τὴν τῶν στοιχείων γένεσιν χρωμένω βέλτιον ἥν καὶ τὰς τῶν κατὰ μέρος αἰτίας ἀπάσας εἰς ταύτας ἀνάγειν. τί δὴποτ’ οὐν ἐν μὲν τοῖς περὶ γενέσεως καὶ θυρῶς ταῖς τέταρται χρῆται, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεταφρολογικοῖς καὶ τοῖς προβλήμασι καὶ ἀλλοθεί πολλαχοθεί ταῖς δύο μόναις; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐν τοῖς ξιφοὶς τε καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς μᾶλλον μὲν δρᾶ τὸ θερμὸν καὶ τὸ ψυχρὸν, ἔττου δὲ τὸ ξηρόν καὶ τὸ υγρὸν ἀποφαίνοντο τις, ἵσως ἂν ἔχοι καὶ τὸν Ἰπποκράτην σύμψηφον’ εὶ δ’ ὦσαύτως ἐν || ἀπασιν, οὐκέτ’ οἴμαι συγχωρήσειν τούτο μὴ ὅτι τὸν Ἰπποκράτην ἀλλὰ μὲν αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην μεμνήσθαι γε βουλόμενον ὅν ἐν τοῖς περὶ γενέσεως καὶ θυρῶς οὐχ ἄπλῶς ἀλλὰ μετ’ ἀποδείξεως αὐτὸς ἤμας ἐδίδαξεν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων καὶ τοῖς περὶ κράσεως, εἰς ὅσον ἰατρῷ χρήσιμον, ἐπεσκεψάμεθα.

1 cf. p. 9.
ties are mixed. There are, however, a considerable number of not undistinguished men—philosophers and physicians—who refer action to the Warm and the Cold, and who subordinate to these, as passive, the Dry and the Moist; Aristotle, in fact, was the first who attempted to bring back the causes of the various special activities to these principles, and he was followed later by the Stoic school. These latter, of course, could logically make active principles of the Warm and Cold, since they refer the change of the elements themselves into one another to certain diffusions and condensations. This does not hold of Aristotle, however; seeing that he employed the four qualities to explain the genesis of the elements, he ought properly to have also referred the causes of all the special activities to these. How is it that he uses the four qualities in his book "On Genesis and Destruction," whilst in his "Meteorology," his "Problems," and many other works he uses the two only? Of course, if anyone were to maintain that in the case of animals and plants the Warm and Cold are more active, the Dry and Moist less so, he might perhaps have even Hippocrates on his side; but if he were to say that this happens in all cases, he would, I imagine, lack support, not merely from Hippocrates, but even from Aristotle himself—if, at least, Aristotle chose to remember what he himself taught us in his work "On Genesis and Destruction," not as a matter of simple statement, but with an accompanying demonstration. I have, however, also investigated these questions, in so far as they are of value to a physician, in my work "On Temperaments."

2 Since heat and cold tend to cause diffusion and condensation respectively.
IV

'Ἡ δ' οὖν δύναμις ἢ ἐν ταῖς φλεψίν ἢ αἵματο-
ποιητικῆ προσαγορευμόμενη καὶ πᾶσα δ' ἀλλὴ
dύναμις ἐν τῷ πρὸς τι νενόηται· πρῶτος μὲν
gὰρ τῆς ἐνεργείας αἰτία, ἢδη δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἔργου
catat συμβεβηκός. ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἡ αἰτία πρὸς
ti, τοῦ γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῆς γενομένου μόνου, τῶν δ' ἀλλων οὐδενός, εὐδηλον, ὅτι καὶ ἡ δύναμις ἐν τῷ
πρὸς τι. καὶ μέχρι γ' ἀν ἀγνοομεν τὴν οὐσίαν
tῆς ἐνεργούσης αἰτίας, δύναμιν αὐτὴν ὄνομάζομεν,
eιναὶ τίνα λέγοντες ἐν ταῖς φλεψίν αἵματοποιη-
τικῆ, ὅσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ πεπτικῆ κἂν τῇ
kardia σφυμικῆν καὶ καθ' ἐκαστον τὸν ἀλλων
ιδίαν τινὰ τῆς || κατὰ τὸ μόριον ἐνεργείας. εἴπερ
οὖν μεθόδοι μέλλομεν ἐξευρήσειν, ὅποιαι τε καὶ
ὀποιαὶ τινὲς αἱ δυνάμεις εἰσίν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων
αὐτῶν ἀρκετέον· ἐκαστὸν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τινὸς
ἐνεργείας γίγνεται καὶ τούτων ἐκάστης προηγεῖται
tis aitia.

V

'Εργα τούνν τῆς φύσεως ἐτε μὲν κυουμένου τε
καὶ διαπλαττομένου τοῦ ξύρου τὰ σύμπαντ' ἐστὶ
toû σῶματος μόρια, γεννηθέντος δὲ κοινὸν ἔφ'
ἀπασιν ἔργου ἦ εἰς τὸ τέλειον ἐκάστω μέγεθος
ἀγωνή καὶ μετὰ ταῦθ' ἡ μέχρι τοῦ δυνατοῦ
diamoný.

'Ενεργεῖαι δ' ἐπὶ τρισὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἔργοις
trefis ἐξ ἀνάγκης, ἔφ' ἐκάστῳ μία, γένεσις τε καὶ
IV

The so-called blood-making\(^1\) faculty in the veins, then, as well as all the other faculties, fall within the category of relative concepts; primarily because the faculty is the cause of the activity, but also, accidentally, because it is the cause of the effect. But, if the cause is relative to something—for it is the cause of what results from it, and of nothing else—it is obvious that the faculty also falls into the category of the relative; and so long as we are ignorant of the true essence of the cause which is operating, we call it a faculty. Thus we say that there exists in the veins a blood-making faculty, as also a digestive\(^2\) faculty in the stomach, a pulsatile\(^3\) faculty in the heart, and in each of the other parts a special faculty corresponding to the function or activity of that part. If, therefore, we are to investigate methodically the number and kinds of faculties, we must begin with the effects; for each of these effects comes from a certain activity, and each of these again is preceded by a cause.

V

The effects of Nature, then, while the animal is still being formed in the womb, are all the different parts of its body; and after it has been born, an effect in which all parts share is the progress of each to its full size, and thereafter its maintenance of itself as long as possible.

The activities corresponding to the three effects mentioned are necessarily three—one to each—

\(^1\) Lit. haematopoietic. cf. p. 11, note 3. \(^2\) Lit. peptic. \(^3\) Lit. sphygmic.
αὐξησις καὶ θρέψις. ἄλλῃ ή μὲν γένεσις συχ ἀπλῇ τε ἐνέργεια τῆς φύσεως, ἄλλῃ εἰς ἀλλοιο-
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1 Genesis corresponds to the intrauterine life, or what we may call embryogeny. Alteration here means histogenesis or tissue-production; shaping or moulding (in Greek diaplasia) means the ordering of these tissues into organs (organogenesis).

18
namely, Genesis, Growth, and Nutrition. Genesis, however, is not a simple activity of Nature, but is compounded of alteration and of shaping.\(^1\) That is to say, in order that bone, nerve, veins, and all other [tissues] may come into existence, the underlying substance from which the animal springs must be altered; and in order that the substance so altered may acquire its appropriate shape and position, its cavities, outgrowths, attachments, and so forth, it has to undergo a shaping or formative process.\(^2\) One would be justified in calling this substance which undergoes alteration the material of the animal, just as wood is the material of a ship, and wax of an image.

_Growth_ is an increase and expansion in length, breadth, and thickness of the solid parts of the animal (those which have been subjected to the moulding or shaping process). _Nutrition_ is an addition to these, without expansion.

VI

Let us speak then, in the first place, of Genesis, which, as we have said, results from alteration together with shaping.

The seed having been cast into the womb or into the earth (for there is no difference),\(^3\) then, after a certain definite period, a great number of parts become constituted in the substance which is being generated; these differ as regards moisture, dryness, coldness and warmth,\(^4\) and in all the other qualities

\(^2\) cf. p. 25, note 4.

\(^3\) Note inadequate analogy of semen with fertilised seeds of plants (i.e. of gamete with zygote). Strictly speaking, of course, semen corresponds to pollen. cf. p. 130, note 2.

\(^4\) i.e. the four primary qualities; cf. chap. iii. supra.
Various secondary or derivative differences in the tissues. Note pre-eminence of sense of touch.

De Anima, ii. et seq.

Lit. *homoeomorpha* = of similar parts throughout, “the same all through.” He refers to the elementary tissues, conceived as not being susceptible of further analysis.
which naturally derive therefrom.¹ These derivative qualities, you are acquainted with, if you have given any sort of scientific consideration to the question of genesis and destruction. For, first and foremost after the qualities mentioned come the other so-called tangible distinctions, and after them those which appeal to taste, smell, and sight. Now, tangible distinctions are hardness and softness, viscosity, friability, lightness, heaviness, density, rarity, smoothness, roughness, thickness and thinness; all of these have been duly mentioned by Aristotle.² And of course you know those which appeal to taste, smell, and sight. Therefore, if you wish to know which alterative faculties are primary and elementary, they are moisture, dryness, coldness, and warmth, and if you wish to know which ones arise from the combination of these, they will be found to be in each animal of a number corresponding to its sensible elements. The name sensible elements is given to all the homogeneous³ parts of the body, and these are to be detected not by any system, but by personal observation of dissections.⁴

Now Nature constructs bone, cartilage, nerve, membrane, ligament, vein, and so forth, at the first stage of the animal's genesis,⁵ employing at this task a faculty which is, in general terms, generative and alterative, and, in more detail, warming, chilling, drying, or moistening; or such as spring from the

¹ That is, by the bodily eye, and not by the mind's eye. The observer is here called an autopites or "eye-witness." Our medical term autopsy thus means literally a personal inspection of internal parts, ordinarily hidden.

² i.e. "alteration" is the earlier of the two stages which constitute embryogeny or "genesis." cf. p. 18, note 1.
The terms Galen actually uses are: ostopoietic, neuropoietic, chondropoietic.
blending of these, for example, the bone-producing, nerve-producing, and cartilage-producing faculties\(^1\) (since for the sake of clearness these names must be used as well).

Now the peculiar\(^2\) flesh of the liver is of this kind as well, also that of the spleen, that of the kidneys, that of the lungs, and that of the heart; so also the proper substance of the brain, stomach, gullet, intestines, and uterus is a sensile element, of similar parts all through, simple, and uncompounded. That is to say, if you remove from each of the organs mentioned its arteries, veins, and nerves,\(^3\) the substance remaining in each organ is, from the point of view of the senses, simple and elementary. As regards those organs consisting of two dissimilar coats,\(^4\) of which each is simple, of these organs the coats are the elements—for example, the coats of the stomach, oesophagus, intestines, and arteries; each of these two coats has an alterative faculty peculiar to it, which has engendered it from the menstrual blood of the mother. Thus the special alterative faculties in each animal are of the same number as the elementary parts\(^5\); and further, the activities must necessarily correspond each to one of the special parts, just as each part has its special use—for example, those ducts which extend from the kidneys into the bladder, and which are called ureters; for these are not arteries, since they do not pulsate nor do they consist of two coats; and they

\(^2\) As we should say, parenchyma (a term used by Erasistratus).

\(^3\) These were all the elementary tissues that Aristotle, for example, had recognized; other tissues (e.g. flesh or muscle) he believed to be complexes of these.

\(^4\) Or tunics.

\(^5\) i.e. tissues.
Galen

γάρ οὐτ' ἀρτηρίαι εἰσίν, ὅτι μήτε σφύζουσι μήτ' ἐκ δυνῶν χιτῶνων συνεστήκασιν, οὔτε φλέβες, ὅτι μήθ' αἵμα περιέχουσι μήτ' ἔοικεν αὐτῶν ὁ χιτών κατά τι τῶ τῆς φλεβᾶς· ἀλλὰ καὶ νεῦρων ἐπὶ πλέον ἀφεστήκασιν ἢ τῶν εἰρημένων.

Τι ποτ' οὖν εἰσιν; ἔρωτά τις, ὡσπερ ἀναγκαίον ὅν ἀπαν μόριον ἢ ἀρτηρίαν ἢ φλέβα ἢ νεῦρον ὑπάρχειν ἢ ἐκ τούτων πεπλέχθαι καὶ μὴ τούτ' αὐτὸ τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον, ὡς ἰδιὸς ἐκάστῳ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ὀργάνων ἔστιν ἢ οὐσία. καὶ γὰρ καὶ αἱ κύστεις ἐκάτεροι ἢ τε τὸ οὕρον ὑποδεχομένη καὶ ἢ τὴν ξαυθὴν χολήν οὐ μόνον τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλλήλων διαφέρουσι καὶ οἱ εἰς τὸ ήπαρ ἀποφυόμενοι || πόροι, καθάπερ στόμαχοι τινες ἀπὸ τῆς χοληδόχου κύστεως, οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἀρτηρίαις οὔτε φλεψίν οὔτε νεῦροις ἐοίκασιν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἐπὶ πλέον ἐν ἄλλοις τε τισὶ καὶ τοῖς περὶ τῆς Ιπποκράτους ἀνατομῆς εἰρήται.

Αἱ δὲ κατὰ μέρος ἀπασαι δυνάμεις τῆς φύσεως αἱ ἀλλοιωτικαὶ αὐτὴν μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν χιτῶνων τῆς κολλίας καὶ τῶν ἐντέρων καὶ τῶν υστερῶν ἀπετέλεσαν, οἳ αἱ πρὶς ἐστὶν δὲ σύνθεσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐμφυομένων πλοκῆς καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ ἐντέρων ἐκφυσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς ἐνδον κοιλότητος ἰδέαν καὶ τάλλῳ ὅσα τοιαῦτα δύναμις τις ἐτέρα διέπλασεν, ἡ διαπλαστικὴν ὄνομαζομεν, ἡν ὡς καὶ τεχνικὴν εἶναι λέγομεν, μᾶλλον δ' ἀριστην καὶ ἀκραν τέχνην καὶ πάντα τινὸς ἕνεκα ποιοῦσαν, ὡς μηδὲν ἄργον εἶναι μηδὲ περιπτῶν μηδ' ἀλωσ.

---

1 As, for example, Aristotle had held; cf. p. 23, note 3. Galen added many new tissues to those described by Aristotle.
are not veins, since they neither contain blood, nor do their coats in any way resemble those of veins; from nerves they differ still more than from the structures mentioned.

“What, then, are they?” someone asks—as though every part must necessarily be either an artery, a vein, a nerve, or a complex of these, and as though the truth were not what I am now stating, namely, that every one of the various organs has its own particular substance. For in fact the two bladders—that which receives the urine, and that which receives the yellow bile—not only differ from all other organs, but also from one another. Further, the ducts which spring out like kinds of conduits from the gall-bladder and which pass into the liver have no resemblance either to arteries, veins or nerves. But these parts have been treated at a greater length in my work “On the Anatomy of Hippocrates,” as well as elsewhere.

As for the actual substance of the coats of the stomach, intestine,—and uterus, each of these has been rendered what it is by a special alterative faculty of Nature; while the bringing of these together, the combination therewith of the structures which are inserted into them, the outgrowth into the intestine, the shape of the inner cavities, and the like, have all been determined by a faculty which we call the shaping or formative faculty; this faculty we also state to be artistic—nay, the best and highest art—doing everything for some purpose, so that

2 Lit. *synthesis*.

3 By this is meant the *duodenum*, considered as an outgrowth or prolongation of the stomach towards the intestines.

οὕτως ἔχουν, ὡς δύνασθαι βέλτιον ἐτέρως ἔχειν. ἀλλὰ τούτο μὲν ἐν τοῖς περὶ χρείας μορίων ἀποδείξομεν. ||

VII

16 Ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν αὐξητικῆς ἡδῆς μεταβάντες δύναμιν αὐτὸ τοῦθ’ ύπομνήσωμεν πρῶτον, ὡς ὑπάρχει μὲν καὶ αὐτῇ τοῖς κυνομένοις ὁσπερ καὶ ἡ θρεπτική: ἀλλ’ οἶον ὑπηρέτιδες τινὲς εἰσὶ τηνικάντα τῶν προειρημέων δυνάμεων, οὐκ ἐν αὐταῖς ἔχουσαι τὸ πᾶν κύρος. ἐπειδὰν δὲ τὸ τέλειον ἀπολάβῃ μέγεθος τὸ ζῶον, ἐν τῷ μετὰ τὴν ἀποκύψιν χρόνω παντὶ μέχρι τῆς ἀκμῆς ἢ μὲν αὐξητικὴ τηνικάντα κρατεῖ. Βοηθοὶ δ’ αὐτῆς καὶ οἶον ὑπηρέτιδες ἢ τ’ ἀλλοιωτική δύναμις ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ θρεπτική. τί οὖν τὸ ἴδιον ἐστὶ τῆς αὐξητικῆς δυνάμεως; εἰς πᾶν μέρος ἔκτειναι τὰ πεφυκότα. καλεῖται δ’ οὕτω τὰ στερεὰ μόρια τοῦ σώματος, ἀρτηριαὶ καὶ φλέβες καὶ νεῦρα καὶ ὡστὰ καὶ χόνδροι καὶ ύμενες καὶ σύνδεσμοι καὶ οἱ χυτῶν ἄπαντες, οὕς στοιχείωδεις τε καὶ όμοιο-μερεῖς καὶ ἀπλοῦς ἀλλόγιον ἐμπροσθεῖν ἐκαλοῦμεν. ὅτω δὲ τρόπῳ τὴν εἰς πᾶν μέρος ἐκτασιν ἵσχυσιν, ἐγὼ φράσω παράδειγμα τι πρότερον εἰπὼν ἐνεκα τοῦ σαφοῦς. ||

17 Τὰς κύστεις τῶν ύδων λαβόντες οἱ παιδεῖς πληροῦσί τε πνεύματος καὶ τρίβουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς τέφρας πλησίον τοῦ πυρός, ὡς ἀλεάνεσθαι μὲν, βλάπτεσθαι δὲ μηδέν: καὶ πολλὴ γ’ αὐτῇ ἡ

1 Lit. the auxetic or incremental faculty.
there is nothing ineffective or superfluous, or capable of being better disposed. This, however, I shall demonstrate in my work "On the Use of Parts.

VII

Passing now to the faculty of Growth¹ let us first mention that this, too, is present in the foetus in utero as is also the nutritive faculty, but that at that stage these two faculties are, as it were, handmaids to those already mentioned,² and do not possess in themselves supreme authority. When, however, the animal³ has attained its complete size, then, during the whole period following its birth and until the acme is reached, the faculty of growth is predominant, while the alternative and nutritive faculties are accessory—in fact, act as its handmaids. What, then, is the property of this faculty of growth? To extend in every direction that which has already come into existence—that is to say, the solid parts of the body, the arteries, veins, nerves, bones, cartilages, membranes, ligaments, and the various coats which we have just called elementary, homogeneous, and simple. And I shall state in what way they gain this extension in every direction, first giving an illustration for the sake of clearness.

Children take the bladders of pigs, fill them with air, and then rub them on ashes near the fire, so as to warm, but not to injure them. This is a common

² i.e. to the alternative and shaping faculties (histogenetic and organogenetic).
³ If the reading is correct we can only suppose that Galen meant the embryo.
παιδιὰ περί τε τὴν Ἰωνίαν καὶ ἐν ἄλλωι ἐθνεσιν οὐκ ὁλίγοις ἐστίν. ἐπιλέγοντι δὲ δὴ καὶ τιν’ ἐπὶ τρίβοντες ἐν μέτρῳ τέ τινι καὶ μέλει καὶ ρυθμῷ καὶ ἐστὶ πάντα τὰ ρήματα ταῦτα παρακέλευσις τῇ κύστει πρὸς τὴν αὐξήσιν. ἐπειδὰν ὁ ἰκανὸς αὐτὸς διατετάσθαι δοκῇ, πάλιν ἐμφυσώσι τε καὶ ἐπιδιατένουσι καὶ ἀνθίς τρίβουσι καὶ τούτῳ πλεονάκις ποιοῦσιν, ἀχρὶς ἂν αὐτοῖς ἡ κύστις ἰκανὸς ἔχειν δοκῇ τῆς αὐξήσεως. ἀλλ’ ἐν τούτοις γε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν παιδῶν ἐναργῶς, ὅσον εἰς μέγεθος ἐπιδίδωσιν ἢ ἐντὸς εὐρυχωρία τῆς κύστεως, τοσοῦτον ἀναγκαῖον εἰς λεπτότητα καθαρεῖσθαι τὸ σῶμα καὶ εἰ γε τὴν λεπτότητα ταῦτην ἀνατρέφειν οὐδὲ τ’ ἤσαν οἱ παιδεῖς, ὀμοίως ἂν τῇ φύσει τὴν κύστιν ἐκ μικρᾶς μεγάλην ἀπειργάζοντο. νυνὶ δὲ τούτ’ αὐτοῖς ἐνδεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐδὲ καθ’ ἕνα τρόπον εἰς μίμησιν ἐνδεχόμενον ἀρθῆναι μὴ ὅτι τοῖς παισιν ἀλλ’ οὗδ’ ἀλλὰ τινί· μονὴς γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἰδιών ἐστιν.

"Ωστὶ ήδη σοι δῆλον, ὡς ἀναγκαία τοῖς αὐξανομένοις ἡ θρέψις. εἰ γὰρ διατεύνοιτο μὲν, ἀνατρέφοιτο δὲ μὴ, φαντάσιαν ψευδῆ μᾶλλον, οὐκ αὐξήσιν ἀληθῆ τὰ τοιαῦτα σῶματα κτίσεται. καίτοι καὶ τὸ διατείνεσθαι πάντῃ μόνοις τοῖς ὑπὸ φύσεως αὐξανομένοις ὑπάρχει. τὰ γὰρ υφ’ ἤμοι διατεινόμενα σῶματα κατὰ μίαν τινὰ διάστασιν τούτο πάσχονται μειοῦται ταῖς λοιπαῖς, οὐδ’ ἐστιν εὑρεῖν οὐδέν, ὁ συνεχὲς ἔτι μένον καὶ ἀδιάσπαστον εἰς τὰς τρεῖς διαστάσεις ἐπεκτείνας δυνάμεθα. μόνης οὖν τῆς φύσεως τὸ πάντῃ διαστάναι συνεχές ἐαυτῷ μένον ἔτι καὶ τὴν ἄρχαιαν ἀπασαν ἰδέαν φυλάττον τὸ σῶμα.
game in the district of Ionia, and among not a few other nations. As they rub, they sing songs, to a certain measure, time, and rhythm, and all their words are an exhortation to the bladder to increase in size. When it appears to them fairly well distended, they again blow air into it and expand it further; then they rub it again. This they do several times, until the bladder seems to them to have become large enough. Now, clearly, in these doings of the children, the more the interior cavity of the bladder increases in size, the thinner, necessarily, does its substance become. But, if the children were able to bring nourishment to this thin part, then they would make the bladder big in the same way that Nature does. As it is, however, they cannot do what Nature does, for to imitate this is beyond the power not only of children, but of any one soever; it is a property of Nature alone.

It will now, therefore, be clear to you that nutrition is a necessity for growing things. For if such bodies were distended, but not at the same time nourished, they would take on a false appearance of growth, not a true growth. And further, to be distended in all directions belongs only to bodies whose growth is directed by Nature; for those which are distended by us undergo this distension in one direction but grow less in the others; it is impossible to find a body which will remain entire and not be torn through whilst we stretch it in the three dimensions. Thus Nature alone has the power to expand a body in all directions so that it remains unruptured and preserves completely its previous form.
Καὶ τοὺτ’ ἐστιν ἡ αὐξησις ἀνευ τῆς ἐπιρρεόυσης
tε καὶ προσπλαττομένης τροφῆς μὴ δυναμένη
γενέσθαι.

VIII

Καὶ τοῖνυν ὁ λόγος ἦκειν ἐοικεν ὁ περὶ τῆς
θρέψεως, διὶ δὴ λοιπὸς ἐστὶ καὶ τρίτος ὅν ἐξ
ἀρχῆς προνθέμεθα. τοῦ γὰρ ἐπιρρέοντος ἐν εἴδει
tροφῆς παντὶ μορίῳ τοῦ τρεφομένου σώματος
προσπλαττομένου θρέψις μὲν ἡ ἐνέργεια, θερπτικὴ
dὲ δύναμις ἡ αἰτία. ἀλλοίωσις μὲν δὴ κάνταυθα
τὸ γένος τῆς ἐνεργείας, ἀλλ’ οὐχ οἴσαπερ ἢ ἐν τῇ
γενέσθαι. ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ὃν πρῶτον ὑστερον
ἐγένετο, κατὰ δὲ τὴν θρέψιν τῷ ἡδὴ γεγονότι
συνεξομοιοῦται τὸ ἐπιρρέον καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ εὐλόγως
ἐκεῖνη μὲν τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν γένεσιν, ταύτην δὲ
ἐξομοίωσιν ὑώμασαν.

IX

Επειδὴ δὲ περὶ τῶν τριῶν δυνάμεων τῆς φύσεως
αὐτάρκως εἰρηται καὶ φαίνεται μηδεμάς ἄλλης
προσδείχθαι τὸ ζῶον, ἔχου γε καὶ ὅπως αὐξηθῇ
καὶ ὅπως τελειώθη καὶ ὅπως ἔως πλεῖστον διαφυ-
λαχθῇ, δόξειε μὲν ἀν ἰσως ἰκανῶς ἔχειν ὁ λόγος
οὕτως ἡδὴ καὶ πάσας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰς τῆς φύσεως
dυνάμεις. ἀλλ’ εἰ τις πάλιν ἐννοῆσειν, ὡς οὐ-
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Such then is growth, and it cannot occur without the nutriment which flows to the part and is worked up into it.

VIII

We have, then, it seems, arrived at the subject of Nutrition, which is the third and remaining consideration which we proposed at the outset. For, when the matter which flows to each part of the body in the form of nutriment is being worked up into it, this activity is nutrition, and its cause is the nutritive faculty. Of course, the kind of activity here involved is also an alteration, but not an alteration like that occurring at the stage of genesis.¹ For in the latter case something comes into existence which did not exist previously, while in nutrition the inflowing material becomes assimilated to that which has already come into existence. Therefore, the former kind of alteration has with reason been termed genesis, and the latter, assimilation.

IX

Now, since the three faculties of Nature have been exhaustively dealt with, and the animal would appear not to need any others (being possessed of the means for growing, for attaining completion, and for maintaining itself as long a time as possible), this treatise might seem to be already complete, and to constitute an exposition of all the faculties of Nature. If, however, one considers that it has not

¹ i.e. not the pre-natal development of tissue already described. cf. chap. vi.
δενὸς οὐδέπω τῶν τοῦ ζῶου μορίων ἐφήσατο,
κοιλίας λέγω καὶ ἐντέρων καὶ ἡπατος καὶ τῶν
ὀμάων, οὐδ’ ἐξηγήσατο τᾶς ἐν αὐτοῖς δυνάμεις,
αὐθις δόξειν ἃν οἶον προσομιὸν τι μόνον εἰρήσθαι
τῆς χρησίμου διδασκαλίας. || τὸ γὰρ σύμπαν ὡδ’
ἐχει. γένεσις καὶ αὐξησις καὶ θρέψις τὰ πρῶτα
καὶ οἶον κεφάλαια τῶν ἔργων ἐστὶ τῆς φύσεως·
ὅστε καὶ αἱ τούτων ἐργαστικαὶ δυνάμεις αἱ
πρῶται τρέις εἰσὶ καὶ κυριῶταται δέονται δ’ εἰς
ὑπηρεσίαν, ὡς ἢδη δέδεικται, καὶ ἄλληλων καὶ
ἄλλων. τίνων μὲν οὖν ἡ γεννητικὴ τε καὶ αὐξη-
τικὴ δέονται, εἰρήται, τίνων δ’ ἡ θρεπτικὴ, νῦν
εἰρήσεται.

X

Δοκῶ γὰρ μοι δείξειν τὰ περὶ τὴν τῆς τροφῆς
οἰκονομίαν ὄργανα τε καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτῶν
dιὰ ταύτην γεγονότα. ἔπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ ἐνέργεια
tαύτης τῆς δυνάμεως ἐξομοίωσις ἐστὶν, ὀμοιοῦ-
σθαι δὲ καὶ μεταβάλλειν εἰς ἄλληλα πάσι τοῖς
οὕσιν ἄδυνατον, εἰ μὴ τινὰ ἔχοι κοινωνίαν ἢδη
cαὶ συγγένειαν ἐν ταῖς ποιότησι, διὰ τοῦτο
πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐκ πάντων ἐδεσμάτων πᾶν ζῶον
τρέφεσθαι πέφυκεν, ἐπειτα δ’ οὐδ’ ἐξ ὧν οἶον τ’
estin ou'd' eke touton paraχρήμα, καὶ dià tauto

1 Administration, lit. "economy."
2 The activation or functioning of this faculty, the faculty
yet touched upon any of the parts of the animal (I mean the stomach, intestines, liver, and the like), and that it has not dealt with the faculties resident in these, it will seem as though merely a kind of introduction had been given to the practical parts of our teaching. For the whole matter is as follows: Genesis, growth, and nutrition are the first, and, so to say, the principal effects of Nature; similarly also the faculties which produce these effects—the first faculties—are three in number, and are the most dominating of all. But as has already been shown, these need the service both of each other, and of yet different faculties. Now, these which the faculties of generation and growth require have been stated. I shall now say what ones the nutritive faculty requires.

X

For I believe that I shall prove that the organs which have to do with the disposal of the nutrient, as also their faculties, exist for the sake of this nutritive faculty. For since the action of this faculty is assimilation, and it is impossible for anything to be assimilated by, and to change into anything else unless they already possess a certain community and affinity in their qualities, therefore, in the first place, any animal cannot naturally derive nourishment from any kind of food, and secondly, even in the case of those from which it can do so, it cannot do this at once. Therefore, by reason of

tēn anángkēn pλειόνων ὄργανων ἀλλοιωτικῶν τῆς
troφῆς ἐκαστον || τῶν ἔων χρήζει. ἦν μὲν γὰρ
tὸ ἅπανθὸν ἐρυθρὸν γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν ἅπανθὸν,
ἀπλῆς καὶ μιᾶς δεῖται τῆς ἄλλοιωσεως: ἦν δὲ τὸ
λευκὸν μέλαν καὶ τὸ μέλαν λευκόν, ἀπασῶν τῶν
μεταξύ. καὶ τοῖνυν καὶ τὸ μαλακώτατον ὅυκ ἄν
ἀθρόως σκληρότατον καὶ τὸ σκληρότατον ὅυκ ἄν
ἀθρόως μαλακώτατον γένοιτο, ὡσπερ οὔδὲ τὸ
dυσωδέστατον εὐωδέστατον οὔτ' ἐμπαλίω τὸ εὐω-
dέστατον δυσωδέστατον ἐξαιφνης γένοιτ' ἂν.

Πῶς οὖν εξ αἵματος οὕστων ἂν ποτὲ γένοιτο μὴ
παχυνθέντος γε πρότερον ἐπὶ πλείοντον αὐτοῦ καὶ
λευκανθέντος ἢ πῶς εξ ἄρτου τὸ αἷμα μὴ κατά
βραχὺ μὲν ἀποθεμένου τῆν λευκότητα, κατὰ
βραχὺ δὲ λαμβάνοντος τὴν ἐρυθρότητα; σὰρκα
μὲν γὰρ εξ αἵματος γενέσθαι ράστον· εἰ γὰρ εἰς
tοσοῦτον αὐτὸ παχύνειν ἡ φύσις, ὡς σύστασιν
tινα σχεῖν καὶ μηκέτ' εἰναι ρυτόν, ἡ πρώτη καὶ
νεωπαγής οὕτως ἂν εἴη σάρξ· οὕστων δ' ἵνα γένη-
tαι, πολλοῦ μὲν δεῖται χρόνου, πολλῆς δ' ἐργασίας
cαὶ μεταβολῆς τῷ αἵματι. ὧτι δὲ καὶ τῷ ἄρτῳ
καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον θρίδα|κίνη καὶ τεύτλῳ καὶ τοῖς
ὁμοίοις παμπόλλης δεῖται τῆς ἄλλοιωσεως εἰς
αἵματος γένεσιν, οὔδὲ τούτ' ἄδηλον.

"Ἐν μὲν δὴ τούτ' αἵτιον τὸν πολλὰ γενέσθαι τὰ
περὶ τὴν τῆς τροφῆς ἄλλοιωσιν ὄργανα. δεύτερον
δ' ἢ τῶν περιπτωμάτων φύσις. ὡς γὰρ ὑπὸ
βοτανῶν οὐδ' ὅλως δυνάμεθα τρέφεσθαι, καίτοι
τῶν βοσκήματων τρεφομένων, οὔτως ὑπὸ μαθανί-

1 Lit. "‘necessity’"; more restrictive, however, than our "law of Nature." cf. p. 314, note 1.
2 His point is that no great change, in colours or in anything else, can take place at one step.
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this law, every animal needs several organs for altering the nutriment. For in order that the yellow may become red, and the red yellow, one simple process of alteration is required, but in order that the white may become black, and the black white, all the intermediate stages are needed. So also, a thing which is very soft cannot all at once become very hard, nor vice versa; nor, similarly can anything which has a very bad smell suddenly become quite fragrant, nor again, can the converse happen.

How, then, could blood ever turn into bone, without having first become, as far as possible, thickened and white? And how could bread turn into blood without having gradually parted with its whiteness and gradually acquired redness? Thus it is quite easy for blood to become flesh; for, if Nature thicken it to such an extent that it acquires a certain consistency and ceases to be fluid, it thus becomes original newly-formed flesh; but in order that blood may turn into bone, much time is needed and much elaboration and transformation of the blood. Further, it is quite clear that bread, and, more particularly lettuce, beet, and the like, require a great deal of alteration in order to become blood.

This, then, is one reason why there are so many organs concerned in the alteration of food. A second reason is the nature of the superfluitics. For, as we are unable to draw any nourishment from grass, although this is possible for cattle, similarly we can derive nourishment from radishes, albeit not

3 Not quite our "waste products," since these are considered as being partly synthetic, whereas the Greek peritlo-mata were simply superfluous substances which could not be used and were thrown aside.
δος τρεφόμεθα μέν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν κρεών. τούτων μὲν γὰρ ὅλιγον δεῖν ὅλων ἢ φύσις ἡμῶν κρατεῖ καὶ μεταβάλλει καὶ ἄλλοιοι καὶ χρηστὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν αἶμα συνίστησιν· ἐν δὲ τῇ ῥαφανίδι τὸ μὲν οἰκεῖον τε καὶ μεταβληθῆναι δυνάμενον, μόνις καὶ τούτο καὶ σὺν πολλῇ τῇ κατεργασίᾳ, πανταπασιν ἠλάχιστον· ὁλη δ' ὅλιγον δεῖν ἐστὶ περιττωματική καὶ διεξερχεται τὰ τῆς πέψεως ὀργανα, βραχέος ἐξ αὐτῆς εἰς τὰς φλέβας ἀναληφθέντος αἵματος καὶ οὐδὲ τούτον τελέως χρηστοῦν. δευτέρας οὖν αὐθίς ἐδέησε διακρίσεως τῇ φύσει τῶν ἐν ταῖς φλεψὶ περιττωμάτων. καὶ χρεία καὶ τούτους ὅδὸν τε τινων ἐπέρων ἐπὶ τὰς ἐκτρίσεις αὐτὰ παραγοντῶν, ὅς μὴ λυμαίνοιτο τοίς χρηστοῖς, ὕποδοχὼν τε τινων οἶον δεξαμενῶν, ἐν αἷς ὅταν εἰς ἰκανὸν πλῆθος ἀφίκηται, τηνικαῦτ’ ἐκκριθήσεται.

Δεύτερον δὴ σοι καὶ τούτο τὸ γένος τῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι μορίων ἐξεύρηται τοῖς περιττώμασι τῆς τροφῆς ἀνακείμενον. ἄλλο δὲ τρίτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ πάντη φέρεσθαι, καθάπερ τινὲς ὁδὸι πολλαὶ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ὅλου κατατεμιμέναι.

Μία μὲν γὰρ εἰσόδος ἡ διὰ τοῦ στόματος ἀπασὶ τοῖς συίδοις, οὐχ ἐν δὲ τὸ τρεφόμενον ἄλλα πάμπολλα τε καὶ πάμπολυ διεστώτα. μὴ τοῖνυν θαύμαζε τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὄργανων, ὡσα θρέψεως ἐνεκεν ἡ φύσις ἐδημούργησε. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι-

---

1 Note “our natures,” cf. p. 12, note 4; p. 47, note 1.
2 The term οἰκεῖος, here rendered appropriate, is explained on p. 33. cf. also footnote on same page. Linacre often translated it convenient, and it may usually be rendered proper, peculiar, own special, or own particular in English. Sometimes it is almost equal to akin, cognate, related: cf.
to the same extent as from meat; for almost the whole of the latter is mastered by our natures; it is transformed and altered and constituted useful blood; but, in the radish, what is appropriate and capable of being altered (and that only with difficulty, and with much labour) is the very smallest part; almost the whole of it is surplus matter, and passes through the digestive organs, only a very little being taken up into the veins as blood—nor is this itself entirely utilisable blood. Nature, therefore, had need of a second process of separation for the superfluities in the veins. Moreover, these superfluities need, on the one hand, certain fresh routes to conduct them to the outlets, so that they may not spoil the useful substances, and they also need certain reservoirs, as it were, in which they are collected till they reach a sufficient quantity, and are then discharged.

Thus, then, you have discovered bodily parts of a second kind, consecrated in this case to the [removal of the] superfluities of the food. There is, however, also a third kind, for carrying the pabulum in every direction; these are like a number of roads intersecting the whole body.

Thus there is one entrance—that through the mouth—for all the various articles of food. What receives nourishment, however, is not one single part, but a great many parts, and these widely separated; do not be surprised, therefore, at the abundance of organs which Nature has created for the purpose of nutrition. For those of them which have to do with p. 319, note 2. With Galen's oikeios and ἀλλότριος we may compare the German terms eigen and fremd used by Aberhalden in connection with his theory of defensive ferments in the blood-serum.
οὕντα προπαρασκευάζει τήν ἐπιτήδειον ἑκάστῳ μορίῳ τροφήν, τὰ δὲ διακρίνει τὰ περιπτώματα, τὰ δὲ παραπέμπει, τὰ δ’ ὑποδέχεται, τὰ δ’ ἐκκρίνει, τὰ δ’ ὅδοι τῆς πάντη φορᾶς εἰς τῶν χρηστῶν χυμῶν, ὡστ’ εἶπεν βούλει τὰς δυνάμεις τῆς φύσεως ἀπάσας ἐκμαθαίνει, ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου τούτων ἀν εἴη σοι τῶν ὅργανων ἐπισκεπτέουν.

24 Ἀρχὴ δ’ αὐτῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὅσα || τοῦ τέλους ἔγγυς ἔργα τε τῆς φύσεως ἐστὶ καὶ μόρια καὶ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν.

XI

Αὐτοῦ δὲ δὴ πάλιν ἀναμνηστέαν ἡμῖν τοῦ τέλους, οὕτε ἔνεκα τοσαῦτα τε καὶ τοιαῦτα τῇ φύσει δεδημιούργηται μόρια. τὸ μὲν οὖν ὅνομα τοῦ πράγματος, ὡσπερ καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται, θρέψει: ὁ δὲ κατὰ τόνομα λόγος ὁμοίωσις τοῦ τρέφοντος τῷ τρεφομένῳ. ἢν δ’ αὕτη γένηται, προσβάλλοντα χρῆ πρόσφυσιν, ἢν δ’ ἐκεῖνη, πρόσθεσιν. ἐπειδὰν γὰρ ἐκπέσῃ τῶν ἀργεῖων ὁ μέλλων θρέψεων ὦτιῶν τῶν τοῦ ζῶον μορίων χυμῶς, εἰς ἀπαν αὐτὸ διαστείρτω πρῶτων, ἑπειτὰ προστίθεται κἀπεῖτα προσφύγεται καὶ τελέως ὁμοιοῦται.

1 Transit, cf. p. 6, note 1.
2 i.e. of the living organism, cf. p. 2, note 1.
3 i.e. with nutrition.
4 We might perhaps say, more shortly, “assimilation of food to feeder,” or, “of food to fed”; Linacre renders, “nutrimenti cum nutrito assimilatio.”
alteration prepare the nutriment suitable for each part; others separate out the superfluities; some pass these along, others store them up, others excrete them; some, again, are paths for the transit in all directions of the utilisible juices. So, if you wish to gain a thorough acquaintance with all the faculties of Nature, you will have to consider each one of these organs.

Now in giving an account of these we must begin with those effects of Nature, together with their corresponding parts and faculties, which are closely connected with the purpose to be achieved.

XI

Let us once more, then, recall the actual purpose for which Nature has constructed all these parts. Its name, as previously stated, is nutrition, and the definition corresponding to the name is: an assimilation of that which nourishes to that which receives nourishment. And in order that this may come about, we must assume a preliminary process of adhesion, and for that, again, one of presentation. For whenever the juice which is destined to nourish any of the parts of the animal is emitted from the vessels, it is in the first place dispersed all through this part, next it is presented, and next it adheres, and becomes completely assimilated.

5 Lit. prosphysis, i.e. attachment, implantation.
6 Lit. prosthesis, "apposition." One is almost tempted to retain the terms prosthesis and prosphysis in translation, as they obviously correspond much more closely to Galen's physiological conceptions than any English or semi-English words can.
Δηλούσι δ' αἱ καλούμεναι λεύκαι τὴν διαφορὰν ὁμοιώσεως τε καὶ προσφύσεως, ὡσπερ τὸ γένος ἐκεῖνο τῶν ὑδέρων, ὃ τινες ὑομάξουσιν ἀνὰ σάρκα, διορίζει σαφῶς πρόσθεσιν προσφύσεως. οὐ γὰρ ἐνδείᾳ δὴπον τῆς ἐπιρροέωσης ὑγρότητος, ὡς ἐνιαὶ τῶν ἀτροφιῶν τε καὶ φθίσεως, ἢ τοῦ τοιούτου γένεσις ὑδέρου || συντελεῖται. φαίνεται γὰρ ἰκανῶς ἢ τε σάρξ ὑγρὰ καὶ διάβροχος ἐκαστὸν τε τῶν στερεῶν τοῦ σώματος μορίων ὥσαντος διακείμενον. ἄλλα πρόσθεσις μὲν τις γίγνεται τῆς ἐπιρροέωσης τροφῆς, ἀτε δ' ὑδατω- δεστέρας οὐσίας ἐτί καὶ μὴ πάνω τι κεχυμομένης μηδὲ τὸ γλύσχρον ἐκεῖνο καὶ κολλώδες, ὃ δὴ τῆς ἐμφύτου θερμασίας οἰκονομία προσγίγνεται, κεκτημένης ἡ πρόσφυσις ἄδυνατός ἐστιν ἐπι- τελεῖσθαι πλήθει λεπτῆς ὑγρότητος ἀπέπεμπτον διαρρεόσης τε καὶ ῥαδίως ὀλισθαῖνοσῆς ἀπὸ τῶν στερεῶν τοῦ σώματος μορίων τῆς τροφῆς. ἐν δὲ ταῖς λεύκαις πρόσφυσις μὲν τις γίγνεται τῆς τροφῆς, οὐ μὴν ἐξομοίωσις γε. καὶ δῆλον ἐν τῶδε τὸ μικρὸ πρόσθεν ρηθὲν ὡς ὀρθῶς ἐλέγετο τὸ δεῖν πρόσθεσιν μὲν πρῶτον, ἐφεξῆς δὲ πρόσ- φυσιν, ἐπεὶτ' ἐξομοίωσιν γενέσθαι τὸ μέλλοντι τρέφεσθαι.

Κυρίως μὲν οὖν τὸ τρέφον ἢδη τροφῆ, τὸ δ' οἷον μὲν τροφῆ, οὐπώ δὲ τρέφον, ὀποῖον ἐστὶ τὸ προσφυόμενον ἢ προστιθέμενον, τροφῆ μὲν οὐ

1 Lit. phthisis. cf. p. 6, note 2. Now means tuberculosis only.
2 More literally, “chymified.” In anasarca the subcutaneous tissue is soft, and pits on pressure. In the “white” disease referred to here (by which is probably meant nodular leprosy) the same tissues are indurated and “brawny.” The
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The so-called white [leprosy] shows the difference between assimilation and adhesion, in the same way that the kind of dropsy which some people call anasarca clearly distinguishes presentation from adhesion. For, of course, the genesis of such a dropsy does not come about as do some of the conditions of atrophy and wasting, from an insufficient supply of moisture; the flesh is obviously moist enough,—in fact it is thoroughly saturated,—and each of the solid parts of the body is in a similar condition. While, however, the nutriment conveyed to the part does undergo presentation, it is still too watery, and is not properly transformed into a juice, nor has it acquired that viscous and agglutinative quality which results from the operation of innate heat; therefore, adhesion cannot come about, since, owing to this abundance of thin, crude liquid, the pabulum runs off and easily slips away from the solid parts of the body. In white [leprosy], again, there is adhesion of the nutriment but no real assimilation. From this it is clear that what I have just said is correct, namely, that in that part which is to be nourished there must first occur presentation, next adhesion, and finally assimilation proper.

Strictly speaking, then, nutriment is that which is actually nourishing, while the quasi-nutriment which is not yet nourishing (e.g. matter which is undergoing adhesion or presentation) is not, strictly speaking, nutriment, but is so called only by an equivocation. principle of certain diseases being best explained as cases of arrest at various stages of the metabolic path is recognized in modern pathology, although of course the instances given by Galen are too crude to stand.

1 The effects of oxidation attributed to the heat which accompanies it? cf. p. 141, note 1; p. 254, note 1.
κυρίως, ὃμωνύμως δὲ τροφή· τὸ δ’ ἐν ταῖς φλεψίν ἔτι περιεχόμενον || καὶ τούτου μᾶλλον ἔτι τὸ κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα τῷ μέλλειν ποτὲ θρέψειν, εἰ καλῶς κατεργασθεῖη, κέκληται τροφή. κατὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων ἐκαστον τροφήν ὄνομάζομεν οὔτε τῷ τρέφειν ἦδη τὸ ξέσον οὔτε τῷ τοιοῦτον ὑπάρχειν οἶον τὸ τρέφον, ἀλλὰ τῷ δύνασθαι τε καὶ μέλλειν τρέφειν, εἰ καλῶς κατεργασθεῖη.

Τούτο γὰρ ἦν καὶ τὸ πρὸς Ἱπποκράτους λεγόμενον. "Τροφῇ δὲ τὸ τρέφον, τροφῇ καὶ τὸ οἶον τροφῇ καὶ τὸ μέλλον." τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὁμοιοῦν ενὸν ἦδη τροφῇ ἄνομασθαι, τὸ δ’ οἶον μὲν ἐκεῖνο προστιθέμενον ἢ προσφυόμενον οἶον τροφῆν· τὸ δ’ ἀλλο πάν, ὅσον ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ καὶ ταῖς φλεψί περιέχεται, μέλλον.

XII

"Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἀναγκαῖον ὁμοίωσιν τινὶ εἶναι τοῦ τρέφοντος τῷ τρεφομένῳ τῆν θρέψιν, ἀντικρυς δῆλον. οὐ μὴν ὑπάρχουσάν γε ταύτην τῆν ὁμοιωσίν, ἀλλὰ φαινομένην μόνον εἶναι φασιν οἱ μῆτε τεχνικὴν οἰόμενοι τῆν φύσιν εἶναι μῆτε προνοητικὴν τοῦ ξέσου μηθ’ ὅλωσ τινὰς οἰκεῖας ἐξεὶν δυνάμεις, αἰς χρωμενή τὰ μὲν ἀλλοιοὶ, τὰ δ’ ἐλκεῖ, || τὰ δ’ ἐκκρίνει.

Καὶ αυτὴ δύο γεγόνασιν αἱρέσεις κατὰ γένος ἐν ἱατρικῇ τε καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ τῶν ἀποφημαμένων
Also, that which is still contained in the veins, and still more, that which is in the stomach, from the fact that it is destined to nourish if properly elaborated, has been called "nutriment." Similarly we call the various kinds of food "nutriment," not because they are already nourishing the animal, nor because they exist in the same state as the material which actually is nourishing it, but because they are able and destined to nourish it if they be properly elaborated.

This was also what Hippocrates said, viz., "Nutriment is what is engaged in nourishing, as also is quasi-nutriment, and what is destined to be nutriment." For to that which is already being assimilated he gave the name of nutriment; to the similar material which is being presented or becoming adherent, the name of quasi-nutriment; and to everything else—that is, contained in the stomach and veins—the name of destined nutriment.

XII

It is quite clear, therefore, that nutrition must necessarily be a process of assimilation of that which is nourishing to that which is being nourished. Some, however, say that this assimilation does not occur in reality, but is merely apparent; these are the people who think that Nature is not artistic, that she does not show forethought for the animal's welfare, and that she has absolutely no native powers whereby she alters some substances, attracts others, and discharges others.

Now, speaking generally, there have arisen the following two sects in medicine and philosophy
Here follows a contrast between the Vitalists and the Epicurean Atomists. cf. p. 153 et seq.

A unity or continuum, an individuum.
among those who have made any definite pronouncement regarding Nature. I speak, of course, of such of them as know what they are talking about, and who realize the logical sequence of their hypotheses, and stand by them; as for those who cannot understand even this, but who simply talk any nonsense that comes to their tongues, and who do not remain definitely attached either to one sect or the other—such people are not even worth mentioning.

What, then, are these sects, and what are the logical consequences of their hypotheses? The one class supposes that all substance which is subject to genesis and destruction is at once continuous and susceptible of alteration. The other school assumes substance to be unchangeable, unalterable, and subdivided into fine particles, which are separated from one another by empty spaces.

All people, therefore, who can appreciate the logical sequence of an hypothesis hold that, according to the second teaching, there does not exist any substance or faculty peculiar either to Nature or to Soul, but that these result from the way in which the primary corpuscles, which are unaffected by change, come together. According to the first-mentioned teaching, on the other hand, Nature is not posterior to the corpuscles, but is a long way prior to them and older than they; and therefore in their view it is Nature which puts together the bodies both of plants and animals; and this she does by virtue of certain faculties which she possesses—these being, on the one hand, attractive and assimilative of what is appropriate, and, on the other, expulsive or

3 Lit. to the physis or the psyche; that is, a denial of the autonomy of physiology and psychology. 4 Lit. somata.
Ἀλλοτρίων, καὶ τεχνικῶς ἀπαντα διαπλάττει τε 
γεννώσα καὶ προνοεῖται τῶν γεννωμένων ἔτεραις 
αὐθίς τοις δυνάμεσι, στερκτική μὲν τινὶ καὶ 
προνοητική τῶν ἐγγόνων, κοινωνικῇ δὲ καὶ φιλικῇ 
τῶν όμογένων. κατὰ δ’ αὐ τοῖς ἐτέρως οὔτε 
τούτων οὔδὲν ὑπάρχει ταῖς φύσεσιν οὔτ’ ἐννοιά 
τίς ἔστι τῇ ψυχῇ σύμφυτος ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ ἀκο-
λουθίας οὐ μάχης, οὐ διαρέσεως οὐ συνθέσεως, 
οὐ δικαίων οὐκ ἀδίκων, οὐ καλῶν οὐκ αἰσχρῶν, 
ἀλλ’ ἐξ αἰσθήσεως τε καὶ δι’ αἰσθήσεως ἀπαντα 
τὰ τοιαῦθ’ ἡμῖν ἐγγίγνεσθαι φασί καὶ φαντασίαις 
τοῖς καὶ μνήμαις οἰκαίζεσθαι τὰ ξώα,

"Ενιοὶ || δ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ρήτως ἀπεφήναντο μηδε-
μίαν εἶναι τής ψυχῆς δύναμιν, ἡ λογιζόμεθα, ἀλλ’ 
ὕπο τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀγεσθαι παθῶν ἡμὰς καθάπερ 
βοσκήματα πρὸς μηδὲν ἀνανεῦσαι μηδ’ ἀντειπεῖν 
δυναμένους. καθ’ οὕς δηλονότι καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ 
φρόνησις καὶ σωφροσύνη καὶ ἐγκράτεια λήρος 
ἐστὶ μακρὸς καὶ φιλούμενοι οὔτ’ ἀλλήλους οὔτε 
τὰ ἐγγόνα καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς οὔδὲν ἡμῶν μέλει. κατα-
φρονοῦσι δὲ καὶ τῶν οὐεράτων καὶ τῶν οἰωνών 
καὶ τῶν συμβόλων καὶ πάσης ἀστρολογίας, ὕπερ 
ὁν ἡμεῖς μὲν ἴδα δι’ ἐτέρων γραμμάτων ἐπὶ πλέον 
ἐσκεφάλεμθα περὶ τῶν Ἀσκληπίαδος τοῦ ἰατροῦ 
σκοπούμενοι δογμάτων. ἐνεστὶ δὲ τοῖς βουλο-
μένοις κάκεινοις μὲν ὁμηλῆσαι τοῖς λόγοις καὶ νῦν 
δ’ ἡδὴ σκοπεῖν, ὡσπερ τινῶν δυοίν ὁδῶν ἡμῖν 
προκειμένων, ὀποτέραν βέλτιον ἐστὶ τρέπεσθαι. 
Ἰπποκράτης μὲν γὰρ τὴν προτέραν ρήθεισαν 
ἐτράπετο, καθ’ ἦν ἦνωται μὲν ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἀλλοι-
ούται καὶ σύμπνουν ὅλον ἐστὶ καὶ σύρρουν τὸ
what is foreign. Further, she skilfully moulds everything during the stage of genesis; and she also provides for the creatures after birth, employing here other faculties again, namely, one of affection and forethought for offspring, and one of sociability and friendship for kindred. According to the other school, none of these things exist in the natures of living things, nor is there in the soul any original innate idea, whether of agreement or difference, of separation or synthesis, of justice or injustice, of the beautiful or ugly; all such things, they say, arise in us from sensation and through sensation, and animals are steered by certain images and memories.

Some of these people have even expressly declared that the soul possesses no reasoning faculty, but that we are led like cattle by the impression of our senses, and are unable to refuse or dissent from anything. In their view, obviously, courage, wisdom, temperance, and self-control are all mere nonsense, we do not love either each other or our offspring, nor do the gods care anything for us. This school also despises dreams, birds, omens, and the whole of astrology, subjects with which we have dealt at greater length in another work, in which we discuss the views of Asclepiades the physician. Those who wish to do so may familiarize themselves with these arguments, and they may also consider at this point which of the two roads lying before us is the better one to take. Hippocrates took the first-mentioned. According to this teaching, substance is one and is subject to alteration; there is a consensus in the move-

1 For "natures" in the plural, involving the idea of a separate nature immanent in each individual, cf. p. 36, note 1.
2 A lost work.
3 For Asclepiades v. p. 40, note 5.
σώμα καὶ ἡ φύσις ἀπαντά τεχνικῶς καὶ δικαίως πράττει δυνάμεις ἐξουσία, καθ’ ὑπὸ ἐκαστον τῶν μορίων ἐλκεί μὲν || ἐφ’ ἐαυτὸ τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐαυτῷ ὕμνῳν, ἐλξαν δὲ προσφύει τε παντι μέρει τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τελέως ἐξομοιοὶ, τὸ δὲ μὴ κρατηθὲν ἐν τούτῳ μηδὲ τὴν παντελή δυνηθέν ἀλλοιώσιν τε καὶ ὁμοίότητα τοῦ τρεφομένου καταδέξασθαι δι’ ἑτέρας αὐτὶνος ἐκκριτικῆς δυνάμεως ἀποτρίβεται.

XIII

Μαθεῖν δ’ ἐνεστὶν οὐ μόνον ἐξ ὅν οἱ τάναντία τιθέμενοι διαφέρουσι τοῖς ἐναργῶς φαινομένοις, εἰς ὅσον ὀρθότητος τε καὶ ἀληθείας ἤκει τὰ Ἰπποκράτους δόγματα, ἄλλα καὶ ἀυτῶν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐν τῇ φυσικῇ θεωρίᾳ ξητομένων τῶν τ’ ἄλλων ἀπάντων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς γενεῖς ἐνεργεῶν. ὅσοι γὰρ οὐδεμίαν οὐδενὶ μορίῳ νομίζουσιν ὑπάρχειν ἐλεκτικῆν τῆς οἰκείας ποιότητος δύναμιν, ἀναγκαίονται πολλάκις ἐναντία λέγειν τοῖς ἐναργῶς φαινομένοις, ὥσπερ καὶ Ὅσκληπιάδης ὁ ἰατρὸς ἐπὶ τῶν νεφρῶν ἐποίησεν, οὗς οὐ μόνον Ἰπποκράτης ἢ Διοκλής ἢ Ἐρασίστρατος ἢ


2 i.e. “appropriated”; very nearly “assimilated.”
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ments of air and fluid throughout the whole body;¹ Nature acts throughout in an artistic and equitable manner, having certain faculties, by virtue of which each part of the body draws to itself the juice which is proper to it, and, having done so, attaches it to every portion of itself, and completely assimilates it; while such part of the juice as has not been mastered,² and is not capable of undergoing complete alteration and being assimilated to the part which is being nourished, is got rid of by yet another (an expulsive) faculty.

XIII

Now the extent of exactitude and truth in the doctrines of Hippocrates may be gauged, not merely from the way in which his opponents are at variance with obvious facts, but also from the various subjects of natural research themselves—the functions of animals, and the rest. For those people who do not believe that there exists in any part of the animal a faculty for attracting its own special quality³ are compelled repeatedly to deny obvious facts.⁴ For instance, Asclepiades, the physician,⁵ did this in the case of the kidneys. That these are organs for secreting [separating out] the urine, was the belief not only of Hippocrates, Diocles,

³ "Attractricem convenientis qualitatis vim" (Linacre). Ἐσείπαρτε π. 36, note 2. ⁴ Lit. "obvious phenomena." ⁵ Asclepiades of Bithynia, who flourished in the first half of the first century b.c., was an adherent of the atomistic philosophy of Democritus, and is the typical representative of the Mechanistic school in Graeco-Roman medicine; he disbelieved in any principle of individuality ("nature") in the organism, and his methods of treatment, in accordance with his pathology, were mechano-therapeutical. cf. p. 64, note 3.
Πραξαγόρας ἢ τὶς ἄλλος ἰατρὸς ἀριστος ὀργανα
diakritiκά τῶν οὐρων πεπιστεύκασιν ὑπάρχειν,
31 ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ μάγειροι σχεδὸν ἀπαντεῖς ἵσασιν,
οσμέραι θεώμενοι τήν τε θέσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν
ἀφ’ ἐκατέρου πόρον εἰς τὴν κύστιν ἐμβάλλοντα,
τὸν οὐρητήρα καλούμενον, ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς κατα-
σκευῆς ἀναλογιζόμενοι τῆν τε χρείαν αὐτῶν καὶ
tὴν δύναμιν. καὶ πρὸ γε τῶν μαγείρων ἀπαντεῖς
ἀνθρωποι καὶ δυσομοῦντες πολλάκις καὶ παντά-
πασιν ἰσχυροῦντες, ὅταν ἀλγωσι μὲν τὰ κατὰ
tὰς ψόας, ψαμμώδη δ’ ἐξουρῶσιν, νεφρικοὺς
ὑνομάζουσι σφᾶς αὐτούς.

Ἄσκληπιάδην δ’ οἶμαι μηδὲ λίθον ὑφηθέντα
ποτε θεάσασθαι πρὸς τῶν οὕτω πασχόντων μηδ’
ὡς προηγήσατο κατὰ τὴν μεταξὺ τῶν νεφρῶν
καὶ τῆς κύστεως χώραν ὄδυνη τις ὧδεια διερχο-
μένου τοῦ λίθου τὸν οὐρητήρα μηδ’ ὃς ὑφηθέντος
αὐτοῦ τὰ τε τῆς ὀδύνης καὶ τὰ τῆς ἰσχυρίας
ἐπαύσατο παραχρῆμα. τῶς οὖν εἰς τὴν κύστιν
tὰ λόγῳ παραγεῖ τὸ οὐρον, ἂξιοι ἀκούσαι καὶ
θαυμάσαι τάνδρος τὴν σοφίαν, οὐ καταλιπτὼν
οὕτως εὐρείας ὀδοὺς ἐναργῶς φαινομένας ἀφανείς
32 καὶ στενὰς καὶ παντάπασιν ἀνασυστήτους || ύπέ-
θετο. βούλεται γὰρ εἰς ἄτμους ἀναλομένου τὸ
πινόμενον υγρὸν εἰς τὴν κύστιν διαδίδοσθαι
κάπετ’ ἐξ ἐκείνων αὖθις ἀλλήλοις συνιόντων
οὕτως ἀπολαμβάνειν αὐτὸ τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἱδέαν καὶ
γίγνεσθαι πάλιν υγρὸν ἐξ ἄτμων ἄτεχνος ὡς περὶ
σπογγιᾶς τινος ἢ ἐρίου τῆς κύστεως διανοοῦ-
μενος, ἀλλ’ οὐ σώματος ἀκριβῶς πυκνοῦ καὶ
στεγανοῦ δύο χιτῶνας ἰσχυροτάτους κεκτημένου,
Erasistratus, Praxagoras, and all other physicians of eminence, but practically every butcher is aware of this, from the fact that he daily observes both the position of the kidneys and the duct (termed the ureter) which runs from each kidney into the bladder, and from this arrangement he infers their characteristic use and faculty. But, even leaving the butchers aside, all people who suffer either from frequent dysuria or from retention of urine call themselves "nephritics," when they feel pain in the loins and pass sandy matter in their water.

I do not suppose that Asclepiades ever saw a stone which had been passed by one of these sufferers, or observed that this was preceded by a sharp pain in the region between kidneys and bladder as the stone traversed the ureter, or that, when the stone was passed, both the pain and the retention at once ceased. It is worth while, then, learning how his theory accounts for the presence of urine in the bladder, and one is forced to marvel at the ingenuity of a man who puts aside these broad, clearly visible routes, and postulates others which are narrow, invisible—indeed, entirely imperceptible. His view, in fact, is that the fluid which we drink passes into the bladder by being resolved into vapours, and that, when these have been again condensed, it thus regains its previous form, and turns from vapour into fluid. He simply looks upon the bladder as a sponge or a piece of wool, and not as the perfectly compact and impervious body that it is, with two very

---

1 Diocles of Carystus was the chief representative of the Dogmatic or Hippocratic school in the first half of the fourth century B.C. Praxagoras was his disciple, and followed him in the leadership of the school. For Erasistratus, cf. p. 95 et seq.

2 Sufferers from kidney-trouble.

3 The ureters.
Unless otherwise stated, “peritoneum” stands for parietal peritoneum alone.
strong coats. For if we say that the vapours pass through these coats, why should they not pass through the peritoneum and the diaphragm, thus filling the whole abdominal cavity and thorax with water? "But," says he, "of course the peritoneal coat is more impervious than the bladder, and this is why it keeps out the vapours, while the bladder admits them." Yet if he had ever practised anatomy, he might have known that the outer coat of the bladder springs from the peritoneum and is essentially the same as it, and that the inner coat, which is peculiar to the bladder, is more than twice as thick as the former.

Perhaps, however, it is not the thickness or thinness of the coats, but the situation of the bladder, which is the reason for the vapours being carried into it? On the contrary, even if it were probable for every other reason that the vapours accumulate there, yet the situation of the bladder would be enough in itself to prevent this. For the bladder is situated below, whereas vapours have a natural tendency to rise upwards; thus they would fill all the region of the thorax and lungs long before they came to the bladder.

But why do I mention the situation of the bladder, peritoneum, and thorax? For surely, when the vapours have passed through the coats of the stomach and intestines, it is in the space between these and the peritoneum that they will collect and become liquefied (just as in dropsical subjects it is in this region that most of the water gathers). Otherwise the vapours must necessarily pass straight forward

2 In the peritoneal cavity.
3 Contrast, however, anasarca, p. 41.
Γέλων, ἡ πάντως αὐτοῦς χρὴ φέρεσθαι πρόσω διὰ πάντων τῶν ὀπωσδέν ὀμιλοῦντων καὶ μηδέ-
ποθ’ ἱστασθαί. ἀλλ’ εἶ καὶ τούτῳ τις ὑπόθουτο,
διεκπεσόντες ἂν οὕτως οὐ τὸ περιτόναιον μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐπιγάστριον, εἰς τὸ περίχον σκε-
δασθείειν ἢ πάντως ἂν ὑπὸ τῷ δέρματι συν-
αθροισθείειν.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς ταύτ’ ἀντιλέγειν οἱ νῦν
Ἀσκληπιαίδειοι πειρῶνται, καίτοι πρὸς ἀπάντων ἂεὶ τῶν παρατυχθανόντων αὐτοῖς, ὅταν περὶ
tούτων ἐρίξοι, καταγελώμενοι. οὕτως ἄρα
dυσαπότριπτον τι κακόν ἔστιν ἢ περὶ τὰς αἱρέσεις
φιλοτιμία καὶ δυσέκνηστον ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα καὶ
ψώρας ἀπάσης δυσιατότερον.

Τῶν γονίν καθ’ ἡμᾶς τις σοφιστῶν τά τ’ ἄλλα
καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἐριστικοὺς λόγους ἰκανῶς συγκε-
κροτημένος καὶ δεινὸς εἰπεῖν, εἴπερ τις ἄλλος,
ἀφίκομενος ἐμοὶ ποθ’ ὑπὲρ τούτων εἰς λόγους,
tοσοῦτον ἀπέδει τοῦ δυσωπεῖσθαι πρὸς τινος
tῶν εἰρημένων, ὥστε καὶ θαυμάζειν ἐφασκεν
ἐμοῦ τὰ σαφῶς φαινόμενα λόγους ληρώδεσιν
ἀνατρέπειν ἐπιχειροῦντος. ἔναργὼς γὰρ ὁσιμέρα
θεωρεῖσθαι τὰς κύστεις ἀπάσας, εἰ τις αὐτὰς
ἐμπλήσειν ύδατος ἢ ἄρος, εἴτα δήσας τὸν
τράχηλον πιέζοι πανταχόθεν, οὐδαμόθεν μεθηώ-
σας οὐδέν, ἀλλ’ ἀκριβῶς ἀπαί ἔντος ἐαυτῶν
στεγοῦσας. καίτοι ἢ εἴπερ ἢςάν τινες ἢ τῶν
μεφρῶν εἰς αὐτὰς ἠκοντες αἰσθητοῖ καὶ μεγάλου
πόρου, πάντως ἂν, ἔφη, δι’ ἐκεῖνων, ὡσπερ εἰσήγει
τὸ ὑγρὸν εἰς αὐτὰς, οὕτω καὶ ὕλιβόντων
ἐξεκρίνετο. ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτ’ εἰπὼν ἐξαίφυης
through everything which in any way comes in contact with them, and will never come to a standstill. But, if this be assumed, then they will traverse not merely the peritoneum but also the epigastrium, and will become dispersed into the surrounding air; otherwise they will certainly collect under the skin.

Even these considerations, however, our present-day Asclepiadeans attempt to answer, despite the fact that they always get soundly laughed at by all who happen to be present at their disputations on these subjects—so difficult an evil to get rid of is this sectarian partizanship, so excessively resistant to all cleansing processes, harder to heal than any itch!

Thus, one of our Sophists who is a thoroughly hardened disputer and as skilful a master of language as there ever was, once got into a discussion with me on this subject; so far from being put out of countenance by any of the above-mentioned considerations, he even expressed his surprise that I should try to overturn obvious facts by ridiculous arguments! "For," said he, "one may clearly observe any day in the case of any bladder, that, if one fills it with water or air and then ties up its neck and squeezes it all round, it does not let anything out at any point, but accurately retains all its contents. And surely," said he, "if there were any large and perceptible channels coming into it from the kidneys the liquid would run out through these when the bladder was squeezed, in the same way that it entered?" ¹ Having abruptly made these and

¹ Regurgitation, however, is prevented by the fact that the ureter runs for nearly one inch obliquely through the bladder wall before opening into its cavity, and thus an efficient value is produced.
On the τέχνη (artistic or creative skill) shown by the living organism (φύσις) v. pp. 25, 45, 47; Introduction, p. xxix.

2 Direct denial of Aristotle’s dictum that “Nature does nothing in vain.” We are reminded of the view of certain
similar remarks in precise and clear tones, he concluded by jumping up and departing—leaving me as though I were quite incapable of finding any plausible answer!

The fact is that those who are enslaved to their sects are not merely devoid of all sound knowledge, but they will not even stop to learn! Instead of listening, as they ought, to the reason why liquid can enter the bladder through the ureters, but is unable to go back again the same way, —instead of admiring Nature's artistic skill —they refuse to learn; they even go so far as to scoff, and maintain that the kidneys, as well as many other things, have been made by Nature for no purpose! And some of them who had allowed themselves to be shown the ureters coming from the kidneys and becoming implanted in the bladder, even had the audacity to say that these also existed for no purpose; and others said that they were spermatic ducts, and that this was why they were inserted into the neck of the bladder and not into its cavity. When, therefore, we had demonstrated to them the real spermatic ducts entering the neck of the bladder lower down than the ureters, we supposed that, if we had not done so before, we would now at least draw them away from their false assumptions, and convert them forthwith to the opposite view. But even this they presumed to dispute, and said that it was not to be wondered at that the semen should remain longer in these latter ducts, these being more constricted, and that it should flow quickly down the ducts which came from the kidneys, seeing that these were modern laboratory physicians and surgeons that the colon is a "useless" organ. cf. Erasistratus, p. 143.

The vasa deferentia.
οὐν ἡμαγκάσθημεν αὐτοῖς τοῦ λοιποῦ δεικνύειν εἰσρέον τῇ κύστει διὰ τῶν οὐρητήρων τὸ ούρον ἐναργῶς ἐπὶ ξόντος ἐτί τοῦ ξόου, μόνος ἂν οὖτω ποτὲ τὴν φλαιράιαν αὐτῶν ἐπισχήσειν ἐπιτίζουτε.

Ὁ δὲ τρόπος τῆς δείξεώς ἐστὶ τοιόσοδε. διελείπων χρή τὸ πρὸ τῶν οὐρητήρων περετόναυοι, εἶτα βρόχοις αὐτοὺς ἐκλαβείν κάπειτ' ἐπιδήσαντας ἔσαι τὸ ξόου· οὐ γὰρ ἂν οὐρήσειν ἔτι· μετὰ δὲ παῦται λύειν μὲν τοὺς ἐξωθεὶς δεσμοὺς, δεικνύοι δὲ κενῆν μὲν τὴν κύστιν, μεστοὺς δ' ἰκανῶς καὶ διαστημένους τοὺς οὐρητήρας καὶ κινδυνεύοντας ῥαγήναι κάπειτα τοὺς βρόχους αὐτῶν ἀφελόντας ἐναργῶς ὀρᾶν ἢδη πληρομένην οὖρον τὴν κύστιν.

37 Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦτο || φανέντι, πρὶν οὐρήσαι τὸ ξόου, βρόχον αὐτοῦ περιβαλείν χρὴ τῷ αἰδοίῳ κάπειτα θλίβειν πανταχόθεν τὴν κύστιν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν οὐδὲν ἐτί διὰ τῶν οὐρητήρων ἐπανέλθοι πρὸς τοὺς νεφροὺς. κἂν τοῦτο δῆλον γίγνεται τὸ μὴ μόνον ἐπὶ τεθνεώτος ἄλλα καὶ περίοντος ἐτί τοῦ ξόου καλύεσθαι μεταλαμβάνειν αὕθις ἐκ τῆς κύστεως τοὺς οὐρητήρας τὸ ούρον. ἐπὶ τοῦτοις ὀφθείσιν ἐπιτρέπειν ἢδη τὸ ξόου οὐρεῖν λύωντας αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐπὶ τῷ αἰδοίῳ βρόχον, εἶτ' αὕθις ἐπιβαλεῖν μὲν θατέρῳ τῶν οὐρητήρων, ἔσαι δὲ τὸν ἔτερον εὶς τὴν κύστιν συρρεῖν καὶ τινα διαλιπόντας χρόνου ἐπιδεικνύειν ἢδη, πῶς ὁ μὲν ἔτερος αὐτῶν ὁ δεδεμένος μεστὸς καὶ διαστημένος κατὰ τὰ πρὸς τῶν νεφρῶν μέρη φαίνεται, ὁ δ' ἔτερος ὁ λευμένος αὐτὸς μὲν χαλαρὸς ἐστιν, πεπλήρωσ' ὁ οὐροῦ τὴν κύστιν. εἶτ' αὕθις διαστεῖν πρῶτον μὲν τὸν πλήρη καὶ δείξαι, πῶς ἐξακοντίζεται τὸ 58
well dilated. We were, therefore, further compelled to show them in a still living animal, the urine plainly running out through the ureters into the bladder; even thus we hardly hoped to check their nonsensical talk.

Now the method of demonstration is as follows. One has to divide the peritoneum in front of the ureters, then secure these with ligatures, and next, having bandaged up the animal, let him go (for he will not continue to urinate). After this one loosens the external bandages and shows the bladder empty and the ureters quite full and distended—in fact almost on the point of rupturing; on removing the ligature from them, one then plainly sees the bladder becoming filled with urine.

When this has been made quite clear, then, before the animal urinates, one has to tie a ligature round his penis and then to squeeze the bladder all over; still nothing goes back through the ureters to the kidneys. Here, then, it becomes obvious that not only in a dead animal, but in one which is still living, the ureters are prevented from receiving back the urine from the bladder. These observations having been made, one now loosens the ligature from the animal’s penis and allows him to urinate, then again ligatures one of the ureters and leaves the other to discharge into the bladder. Allowing, then, some time to elapse, one now demonstrates that the ureter which was ligatured is obviously full and distended on the side next to the kidneys, while the other one—that from which the ligature had been taken—is itself flaccid, but has filled the bladder with urine. Then, again, one must divide the full ureter, and demonstrate how
oùron εξ αυτοῦ, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς φλεβοτομίαις τὸ αἷμα, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐτερον άθικς διατεμεών καπεῖτ' ἑπιδήσαι τὸ ξώον ἐξωθέν, ἀμ- 
φοτέρων διηρημένων, || εἴθ' ὅταν ίκανῶς ἔχειν 
δοκῇ, λύσαι τὸν δεισμόν. εὑρεθῇσται γὰρ ἢ μὲν 
κύστις κενῆ, πληρές δ' οὖρον τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν 
ἐντέρων τε καὶ τοῦ περιτοναιοῦ χωρίον ἀπαν, ὥς 
ἄν εἰ καὶ ὑδερικὸν ἢν τὸ ξώον. ταῦτ' οὖν εἰ 
τις αὐτὸς καθ' έαυτὸν βουληθεῖν βασανίζειν ἐπὶ 
ξώον, μεγάλως μοι δοκεῖ καταγνώσεσθαι τὴς 
Ἀσκληπιαίδου προπετείας. εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ τῇ 
αιτίαν μάθοι, δ' ἤν οὐδὲν ἐκ τῆς κύστεως εἰς 
τοὺς οὐρητήρας ἀντεκρεῖ, πεισθῆναι ἀν μοι δοκεῖ 
καὶ διὰ τούτῳ τὴν εἰς τὰ ξώα πρόνοιαν τε καὶ 
τέχνην τῆς φύσεως.

Ιπποκράτης μὲν οὖν ὃν ἵσμεν ἰατρῶν τε καὶ 
φιλοσόφων πρῶτος ἀπάντων, ὡς ἄν καὶ πρῶτος 
ἐπιγνοὺς τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἔργα, θαυμάζει τε καὶ 
διὰ παντὸς αὐτὴν ὑμνεὶ δικαίως ὅνομάζων καὶ 
μόνην ἔξαρκείν εἰς ἀπαντα τοῖς ξώοις φησίν, 
αὐτὴν εἶ αὐτῆς ἀδιδάκτως πράττονταν ἀπαντα 
τὰ δεόντα: τοιαῦτην δ' οὖσαν αὐτὴν εὐθέως 
καὶ δυνάμεις ὑπέλαβεν ἔχειν ἐλκτικὴν μὲν τῶν 
οἰκείων, ἀποκριτικὴν δὲ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων καὶ 
39 τρέφειν τε καὶ αὐξεῖν αὐτῆς τὰ ξώα καὶ κρίνειν 
τὰ νοσήματα· καὶ διὰ τούτων ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν 
ἡμῶν σύμπνοιαν τε μίαν εἶναι φησί καὶ σύρροιαν 
καὶ πάντα συμπαθεά: κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀσκληπιιάδην

1 "De l’habilité et de la prévoyance de la nature à l’égard des animaux" (Daremberg). cf. p. 56, note 1.
2 cf. p. 36, note 2.
the urine spurts out of it, like blood in the operation of venesection; and after this one cuts through the other also, and both being thus divided, one bandages up the animal externally. Then when enough time seems to have elapsed, one takes off the bandages; the bladder will now be found empty, and the whole region between the intestines and the peritoneum full of urine, as if the animal were suffering from dropsy. Now, if anyone will but test this for himself on an animal, I think he will strongly condemn the rashness of Asclepiades, and if he also learns the reason why nothing regurgitates from the bladder into the ureters, I think he will be persuaded by this also of the forethought and art shown by Nature in relation to animals.\textsuperscript{1}

Now Hippocrates, who was the first known to us of all those who have been both physicians and philosophers inasmuch as he was the first to recognize what Nature effects, expresses his admiration of her, and is constantly singing her praises and calling her "just." Alone, he says, she suffices for the animal in every respect, performing of her own accord and without any teaching all that is required. Being such, she has, as he supposes, certain \textit{faculties}, one attractive of what is appropriate,\textsuperscript{2} and another eliminative of what is foreign, and she nourishes the animal, makes it grow, and expels its diseases by crisis.\textsuperscript{3} Therefore he says that there is in our bodies a concordance in the movements of air and fluid, and that everything is in sympathy. According to Asclepiades, however, nothing is

\textsuperscript{3} The morbid material passed successively through the stages of "crudity," "coction" \textit{(pepsis)}, and "elimination" \textit{(crisis)}. For "critical days" \textit{cf.} p. 74, note 1.
oudein oudein sympasthes esti fusai, diaphorimeneis te kal katasthebraosmevenis eis anaruma stoicheia kai
leprodeis ogykous aptasis tis ouysis. eis anagnikes
ou an alla te muryia tois enargos faunomeneis
enantios apfehynato kai tis fusews hympose
thi te toin oikeion epistastikein dunamin kai
tiin toin allotriwn apokritikhin. eti mev oin
thi exaimatosews te kai anadosews eixeure tina
phyravan adoleschian eis de thn twn periptomoton
katharison oudein olwos euryon eitein ouk okynse
omose xwrisai tois faunomeneois, eti mev thi
thi twn ourown diakrisews aposterhseis mev twn te
vefron kai twn ourhtrwv tihn evgeriavan, adeilon
de tinas pourn eis tihn kustin upothevelenos touto
gar 7in depladhe megas kai seumon apisthiasata
tois faunomeneis pisteusai tois adeilous.

'Et p | de this xanthishicholhis eti medzion autow
kai neanikoteron esti to tolimma: genvnasthain
gar autin eis tois choleidochous argheios, ou
diakrinesthai legei.

Pous oin tois iktetikois amfou symtipitei,
ta mev diachorimata medon olwos eis autow
exounta choli, anaiplewv de autous xuyvnomenon
olou to somega; lhyrei halin entauv anaagkazetai
tois eti toun ourown eirhmenois paraplenos.
Lhyrei de oudein hytton kai peribh this melainhs choles
kai to ou splhonden outhe ti tov 'Ippokratos
eirhtai symieis antilegein t' epitcheiron ois ouk
oudein empliketos tivn kai manikof stomahtai.

1 This was the process by which nutriment was taken up
from the alimentary canal; "absorption," "dispersal"; cf.
62
naturally in sympathy with anything else, all substance being divided and broken up into inharmonious elements and absurd “molecules.” Necessarily, then, besides making countless other statements in opposition to plain fact, he was ignorant of Nature’s faculties, both that attracting what is appropriate, and that expelling what is foreign. Thus he invented some wretched nonsense to explain blood-production and anadosis,¹ and, being utterly unable to find anything to say regarding the clearing-out² of superfluities, he did not hesitate to join issue with obvious facts, and, in this matter of urinary secretion, to deprive both the kidneys and the ureters of their activity, by assuming that there were certain invisible channels opening into the bladder. It was, of course, a grand and impressive thing to do, to mistrust the obvious, and to pin one’s faith in things which could not be seen!

Also, in the matter of the yellow bile, he makes an even grander and more spirited venture; for he says this is actually generated in the bile-ducts, not merely separated out.

How comes it, then, that in cases of jaundice two things happen at the same time—that the dejections contain absolutely no bile, and that the whole body becomes full of it? He is forced here again to talk nonsense, just as he did in regard to the urine. He also talks no less nonsense about the black bile and the spleen, not understanding what was said by Hippocrates; and he attempts in stupid—I might say insane—language, to contradict what he knows nothing about.

p. 13, note 5. The subject is dealt with more fully in chap. xvi.

¹ Lit. catharsis.
Τι δὴ τὸ κέρδος ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων δογμάτων ἐστι τὰς θεραπείας ἐκτίσσατο; μήτε νεφριτικὸν τι νόσημα δύνασθαι θεραπεύσαι μήτ' ἵκτερικὸν μήτε μελαγχολικὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ πάσιν ἀνθρώποις οὐχ Ἰπποκράτει μόνον ὁμολογουμένου τοῦ καθαύρει τῶν φαρμάκων ἐνια μὲν τὴν ἕξαυθήν χολήν, ἐνια δὲ τὴν μέλαιναν, ἀλλὰ δὲ τίνα φλέγμα καὶ τίνα τὸ λεπτὸν καὶ ύδατῶδες περίττωμα, μηδὲ περὶ τούτων συγχωρεῖν, ἀλλ' ὕπ' αὐτῶν τῶν φαρμάκων γίγνεσθαι λέγειν τοιούτον ἐκαστὸν τῶν κενουμένων, ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τῶν χολη||δόχων πόρων τὴν χολήν· καὶ μηδὲν διαφέρειν κατὰ τὸν θαυμαστὸν Ἀσκληπιάδην ἢ ύδραγωγὸν διδόναι τοῖς ύδεριῶσιν ἢ χολαγωγὸν φάρμακον· ἀπαντα γὰρ ὁμοίως κενοῦν καὶ συντήκειν τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ σύντηγμα τοιόνδε τι φαίνεσθαι ποιεῖν, μὴ πρότερον ύπάρχον τοιοῦτον.

'Αρ' οὖν οὐ μαίνεσθαι νομιστέον αὐτῶν ἢ παντάπασιν ἀπειρον εἶναι τῶν ἔργων τῆς τέχνης; τὶς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν, ὡς, εἰ μὲν φλέγματος ἀγωγὸν δοθείη φάρμακον τοῖς ἵκτεριῶσιν, οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ τέτταρας κυαθοὺς καθαρθείειν οὐτῷ δ' οὐδὲ εἰ τῶν ύδραγωγῶν τι' χολαγωγῷ δὲ φαρμάκῳ πλεῖστον μὲν ἐκκενοῦται χολῆς, αὐτίκα δὲ καθαρὸς τοῖς οὖτῳ καθαρθείσιν ὁ χρῶς γίγνεται. πολλοὺς γοῦν ἡμεῖς μετὰ τὸ θεραπεύσαι τὴν ἐν τῷ ἦπατι διάθεσιν ἀπαξ καθήραντες ἀπηλλάξαμεν τοῦ παθήματος. οὐ μὴν οὖδ' εἰ φλέγματος ἀγωγῷ καθαύροις φαρμάκῳ, πλέον αὐ̸ τὶ διαπράξαι.
And what profit did he derive from these opinions from the point of view of treatment? He neither was able to cure a kidney ailment, nor jaundice, nor a disease of black bile, nor would he agree with the view held not merely by Hippocrates but by all men regarding drugs—that some of them purge away yellow bile, and others black, some again phlegm, and others the thin and watery superfluity; he held that all the substances evacuated were produced by the drugs themselves, just as yellow bile is produced by the biliary passages! It matters nothing, according to this extraordinary man, whether we give a hydragogue or a cholagogue in a case of dropsy, for these all equally purge and dissolve the body, and produce a solution having such and such an appearance, which did not exist as such before!

Must we not, therefore, suppose he was either mad, or entirely unacquainted with practical medicine? For who does not know that if a drug for attracting phlegm be given in a case of jaundice it will not even evacuate four cyathi of phlegm? Similarly also if one of the hydragogues be given. A cholagogue, on the other hand, clears away a great quantity of bile, and the skin of patients so treated at once becomes clear. I myself have, in many cases, after treating the liver condition, then removed the disease by means of a single purgation; whereas, if one had employed a drug for removing phlegm one would have done no good.

drugs were given; they are the products of dissolved tissue. Asclepiades did not believe that diseases were due to a materia perccans, but to disturbances in the movements of the molecules (γκοι) which constitute the body; thus, in opposition to the humorists such as Galen, he had no use for drugs. cf. p. 49, note 5. 4 About 4 oz., or one-third of a pint.
GALEN

Καὶ ταῦτ’ οὖχ Ἰπποκράτης μὲν οὖτως οἴδε γεγονόμενα, τοῖς δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπειρίας μόνης ὀρμω-42 μένοις ἐτέρως ἐγνωσταί, ἀλλὰ κακεὶς ὦσαίτως καὶ πᾶσιν ιατροῖς, οἷς μέλει τῶν ἔργων τῆς τέχ-νης, οὔτω δοκεῖ πλὴν Ἀσκληπιάδου. προδοσίαν γὰρ εἶναι νενόμικε τῶν στοιχείων ὃν ὑπέθετο τὴν ἄλθή περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὁμολογίαν. εἰ γὰρ ὅλως εὑρεθείη τι φάρμακον ἐλκτικὸν τοῦτο τινος τοῦ χυμοῦ μόνον, κίνδυνος κρατεῖν δηλαδὴ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν σωμάτων εἶναι τινα δύναμιν ἐπισταστικὴν τῆς οἰκείας ποιότητος. διὰ τούτου κνῆκόν μὲν καὶ κόκκον τῶν κνίδιοι καὶ ἱπποφαίες οὐχ ἐλκεῖν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἀλλὰ ποιεῖν τὸ φλέγμα φησίν· ἀνθὸς δὲ χαλκόν καὶ λεπίδα καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν κεκαυμένον χαλκὸν καὶ χαμάδρυν καὶ χαμαλέσοντα εἰς ὑδωρ ἀναλύειν τὸ σῶμα καὶ τοὺς ὑδρικοὺς ὑπὸ τούτων οὐ καθαιρομένους οὐν- νασθαι ἀλλὰ κενομένους συναξόντων δηλαδὴ τὸ πάθος. εἰ γὰρ οὐ κενοὶ τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν ὑδατῶδες υγρὸν ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ γεννᾶ, τῷ νοσήματι προστιμωρεῖται. καὶ μὲν γε καὶ ἡ σκαμμωνία πρὸς τῷ μὴ κενοῦν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τῶν ἱκτερικῶν τῆς χολῆς ἐτί καὶ τὸ χρηστὸν αἷμα χολῆν ἐργαζομένη || καὶ συντήκουσα τὸ σῶμα καὶ τηλικαύτα κακὰ δρῶσα καὶ τὸ πάθος ἐπαινοῦσα κατὰ γε τῶν Ἀσκληπιάδου λόγου.

"Ομως ἔναργῳς ὀρᾶται πόλλοις ὄφελοῦσα. ναὶ, φησίν, ὄνυναι μὲν, ἀλλ’ αὐτῷ μόνῳ τῷ

---

1 The Empiricists. cf. Introduction, p. xiii.
2 His ὄγκοι or molecules.
3 He does not say “organized” or “living” body; inanimate things were also thought to possess “natures”; cf. p. 2, note 1.
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Nor is Hippocrates the only one who knows this to be so, whilst those who take experience alone as their starting-point\(^1\) know otherwise; they, as well as all physicians who are engaged in the practice of medicine, are of this opinion. Asclepiades, however, is an exception; he would hold it a betrayal of his assumed "elements"\(^2\) to confess the truth about such matters. For if a single drug were to be discovered which attracted such and such a humour only, there would obviously be danger of the opinion gaining ground that there is in every body\(^3\) a faculty which attracts its own particular quality. He therefore says that safflower,\(^4\) the Cnidian berry,\(^5\) and \textit{Hippophaes},\(^6\) do not draw phlegm from the body, but actually make it. Moreover, he holds that the flower and scales of bronze, and burnt bronze itself, and germander,\(^7\) and wild mastich\(^8\) dissolve the body into water, and that dropsical patients derive benefit from these substances, not because they are purged by them, but because they are rid of substances which actually help to increase the disease; for, if the medicine does not evacuate\(^9\) the dropsical fluid contained in the body, but generates it, it aggravates the condition further. Moreover, scamyony, according to the Asclepiadean argument, not only fails to evacuate\(^9\) the bile from the bodies of jaundiced subjects, but actually turns the useful blood into bile, and dissolves the body; in fact it does all manner of evil and increases the disease.

And yet this drug may be clearly seen to do good to numbers of people! "Yes," says he, "they derive

\(^4\) \textit{Carthamus tinctorius}. \quad \(^5\) \textit{Daphne Gnidium}.  
\(^6\) \textit{Euphorbia acanthothamnos}. \quad \(^7\) \textit{Teucrium chamaedrys}.  
\(^8\) \textit{Atractylis gummifera}. \quad \(^9\) On use of \textit{kevdp} cf. p. 98, note 1.
λόγῳ τῆς κενώσεως. καὶ μὴν εἰ φλέγματος ἀγωγοῦν αὐτοῖς δοῖς φάρμακον, οὐκ ὑνίσχουται. καὶ τούθ' οὗτος ἐναργεῖς ἐστὶν, ὡστε καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ μόνης τῆς ἐμπειρίας ὅρμῳμενοι γιγνώσκουσιν αὐτό. καίτοι τούτοις γε τοῖς ἄνδράσιν αὐτὸ δὴ τούτ' ἐστι φιλοσόφημα, τὸ μηδενὶ λόγῳ πιστεύειν ἄλλα μόνοις τοῖς ἐναργῶς φαινομένοις. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν σωφρονοῦσιν Ἄσκληπιτίδης δὲ παρατάσθε ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν ἡμᾶς ἀπιστεῖν κελεύων, ἐνθά τὸ φαινόμενον ἀνατρέπει σαφῶς αὐτοῦ τὰς ὑποθέσεις. καίτοι μακρῷ γ' ἴνα ἀμεινὸν οὖχ ὁμόσε χωρεῖν τοῖς φαινομένοις ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι ἀναθέσθαι τὸ πᾶν.

"Ἀρ' οὖν τάτα μόνον ἐναργῶς μάχεται τοῖς Ἄσκληπιτίδου δόγμασιν ἢ καὶ τὸ θέρους μὲν πλείονα κενόσθαι τὴν ἐαυτῆν χολήν ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν φαρμάκων, χειμῶνος δὲ τὸ φλέγμα, καὶ νεανίσκω μὲν πλείονα τὴν χολήν, πρεσβύτη ὅτι τὸ φλέγμα; φαίνεται || γὰρ ἐκαστον ἐξειν τὴν οὐσαν, οὐκ αὐτὸ γεννᾶν τὴν οὖκ οὖσαν. εἰ γοῦν ἐθελήσαις νεανίσκῳ τινὶ τῶν ἰσχύων καὶ θερμῶν ὥρα θέρους μὴτ' ἀργῶς βεβιωκότι μὴτ' εν πλησιμοῦ φλέγματος ἀγωγόν δοῦναι φάρμακον, ὀλιγιστὸν μὲν καὶ μετὰ βίαις πολλῆς ἐκκενώσεις τοῦ χυμοῦ, βλάψεις δ' ἐσχάτως τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐμπαλίν δ' εἰ χολαγγοῦν δοῖς, καὶ πάμπολυ κενώσεις καὶ βλάψεις οὐδέν.

"Ἀρ' ἀπιστοῦμεν ἔτι τῷ μὴ οὖχ ἐκαστον τῶν φαρμάκων ἐπάγγεσθαι τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐαυτῷ χυμόν;

1 Empiricist physicians.
benefit certainly, but merely in proportion to the evacuation." . . . But if you give these cases a drug which draws off phlegm they will not be benefited. This is so obvious that even those who make experience alone their starting-point \(^1\) are aware of it; and these people make it a cardinal point of their teaching to trust to no arguments, but only to what can be clearly seen. In this, then, they show good sense; whereas Asclepiades goes far astray in bidding us distrust our senses where obvious facts plainly overturn his hypotheses. Much better would it have been for him not to assail obvious facts, but rather to devote himself entirely to these.

Is it, then, these facts only which are plainly irreconcilable with the views of Asclepiades? Is not also the fact that in summer yellow bile is evacuated in greater quantity by the same drugs, and in winter phlegm, and that in a young man more bile is evacuated, and in an old man more phlegm? Obviously each drug attracts something which already exists, and does not generate something previously non-existent. Thus if you give in the summer season a drug which attracts phlegm to a young man of a lean and warm habit, who has lived neither idly nor too luxuriously, you will with great difficulty evacuate a very small quantity of this humour, and you will do the man the utmost harm. On the other hand, if you give him a cholagogue, you will produce an abundant evacuation and not injure him at all.

Do we still, then, disbelieve that each drug attracts that humour which is proper to it? \(^2\) Possibly the

\(^2\) Note that drugs also have "natures"; cf. p. 66, note 3, and pp. 83-84.
GALEN

ίσως φήσουσιν οἱ ἀπ’ Ἀσκληπιάδου, μᾶλλον δ’ οὐκ ἱσώς, ἀλλὰ πάντως ἀπιστεὶν ἐροῦσιν, ἵνα μὴ προδώσι τὰ φίλτατα.

XIV

Πάλιν οὖν καὶ ἤμεῖς ἐφ’ ἐτέραν μεταβῶμεν ἀδολεσχίαν: οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπουσιν οἱ σοφισταὶ τῶν ἀξίων τι ζητημάτων προχειρίζεσθαι καίτοι παμπόλλων ὑπαρχόντων, ἀλλὰ καταρτίβειν ἀναγκάζουσι τὸν χρόνον εἰς τὴν τῶν σοφισμάτων, διὸ προβάλλουσι, λύσιν.

Τής οὖν ἡ ἀδολεσχία; ἡ ἐνδοξὸς αὐτὴ καὶ πολυθρόλητος λίθος ἡ τῶν σίδηρον || ἐπιστωμένη, τάχα γὰρ ἄν αὐτὴ ποτὲ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἐπιστάσαιτο πιστεῦειν εἶναι τινὰς ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν σωμάτων ἐλεκτικάς τῶν οἰκείων ποιοτήτων δυνάμεις.

Ἐπίκουρος μὲν οὖν καίτοι παραπλησίοις Ἀσκληπιάδη στοιχείοις πρὸς τὴν φυσιολογίαν χρώμενος ὁμος ὁμολογεῖ, πρὸς μὲν τῆς ἢρακλείας λίθου τῶν σίδηρον ἐλκεσθαι, πρὸς δὲ τῶν ἡλέκτρων τὰ κυρίβια καὶ πειράται γε καὶ τὴν αἵτιαν ἀποδιδόναι τοῦ φαινομένου. τὰς γὰρ ἀπορρεοῦσας ἀτόμους ἀπὸ τῆς λίθου ταῖς ἀπορρεούσαις ἀπὸ τοῦ σίδηρον τοῖς σχήμασιν οἰκείας εἶναι φησιν, ὡστε περιπλέκεσθαι ῥαδίως. προσκρουόσας οὖν αὐτὰς τοῖς συγκρίμασιν ἐκατέρως τῆς τε λίθου καὶ τοῦ σιδήρου κάπειτ’ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἀποταλλομένας οὕτως ἀλλήλαις τε περιπλέκεσθαι καὶ

1 Pun here. 2 Lit. physiology, i.e. nature-lore, almost our “Natural Philosophy”; cf. Introduction, p. xxvi.
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adherents of Asclepiades will assent to this—or rather, they will—not possibly, but certainly—declare that they disbelieve it, lest they should betray their darling prejudices.

XIV

Let us pass on, then, again to another piece of nonsense; for the sophists do not allow one to engage in enquiries that are of any worth, albeit there are many such; they compel one to spend one's time in dissipating the fallacious arguments which they bring forward.

What, then, is this piece of nonsense? It has to do with the famous and far-renowned stone which draws iron [the lodestone]. It might be thought that this would draw their minds to a belief that there are in all bodies certain faculties by which they attract their own proper qualities.

Now Epicurus, despite the fact that he employs in his Physics elements similar to those of Asclepiades, yet allows that iron is attracted by the lodestone, and chaff by amber. He even tries to give the cause of the phenomenon. His view is that the atoms which flow from the stone are related in shape to those flowing from the iron, and so they become easily interlocked with one another; thus it is that, after colliding with each of the two compact masses (the stone and the iron) they then rebound into the middle and so become entangled with each other,

3 The ultimate particle of Epicurus was the ἀτόμος or atom (lit. "non-divisible"), of Asclepiades, the ὕγκος or molecule. Asclepiades took his atomic theory from Epicurus, and he again from Democritus; cf. p. 49, note 5.

4 Lit. Herculean stone.
Galen

συνεπιστάσθαι τὸν σίδηρον. τὸ μὲν οὖν τῶν ὑποθέσεων εἰς τὴν αἰτιολογίαν ἀπίθανον ἀντικρὺς δήλου, ὅμως δὲ οὖν ὀμολογεῖ τὴν ὀλκήν. καὶ οὔτω γε καὶ κατὰ τὰ σώματα τῶν ξώνων φησὶ γίγνεσθαι τὰς τ' ἀναδόσεις καὶ τὰς διακρίσεις τῶν περιττωμάτων καὶ τὰς τῶν καθαρότων φαρμάκων ἐνεργεῖαι.

'Ασκληπιιάδης δὴ τὸ τῆς εἰρημένης αἰτίας ἀπίθανον || ὑπιδόμενος καὶ μηδεμίαν ἀλλήν ἐφ' οἷς ὑπέθετο στοιχείοις ἐξευρίσκοις πιθανὴν ἐπὶ τὸ μηδ' ὅλως ἐλκεσθαι λέγειν ὑπὸ μηδείς μηδὲν ἀναισχυντήσας ἑτράπετο, δέον, εἰ μὴ οἳ 'Επίκουρος εἴπεν ἡρέσκετο μήτ' ἄλλα βελτίων λέγειν εἰχεν, ἀποστήραι τῶν ὑποθέσεων καὶ τὴν τε φύσιν εἰπεῖν τεχνικὴν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν ὄντων ἐνομένην τε πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀεὶ καὶ ἀλλοιομένην ὑπὸ τῶν ἑαυτῆς μορίων εἰς ἄλληλα δρόντων τε καὶ πασχόντων. εἰ γὰρ ταῦθ' ὑπέθετο, χαλεπὸν οὖν ἦν τὴν τεχνικὴν ἐκείνην φύσιν ὀμολογήσαι δύναμεν εἰχεν ἑπισταστικὴν μὲν τῶν οἰκείων, ἀποκριτικὴν δὲ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων. οὐ γὰρ δι' ἄλλο τί γ' ἂν αὐτὴ τὸ τεχνικὴ τ' εἶναι καὶ τοῦ ξώνου διασωστικὴ καὶ τῶν νοσημάτων κριτικὴ παρὰ τὸ προσίσεσθαι μὲν καὶ φυλάττει τὸ οἰκεῖον, ἀποκρίνειν δὲ τὸ ἀλλότριον.

'Αλλ' 'Ασκληπιιάδης κάνταυθα τὸ μὲν ἀκόλουθον ταῖς ἀρχαῖς αἰς ὑπεθέθη συνεῖδεν, οὐ μὴν τὴν γε πρὸς τὸ φαινόμενον ἐναργῶς ἡδέσθη μάχην, ἀλλ' ὀμόσε || χωρεῖ καὶ περὶ τούτου πᾶσιν οὐκ ἰατροῖς μόνον ἄλλ' ἡδη καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις

---

1 Lit. aetiology. 2 Anadosis; cf. p. 62, note 1.
and draw the iron after them. So far, then, as his hypotheses regarding causation go, he is perfectly unconvincing; nevertheless, he does grant that there is an attraction. Further, he says that it is on similar principles that there occur in the bodies of animals the dispersal of nutriment and the discharge of waste matters, as also the actions of cathartic drugs.

Asclepiades, however, who viewed with suspicion the incredible character of the cause mentioned, and who saw no other credible cause on the basis of his supposed elements, shamelessly had recourse to the statement that nothing is in any way attracted by anything else. Now, if he was dissatisfied with what Epicurus said, and had nothing better to say himself, he ought to have refrained from making hypotheses, and should have said that Nature is a constructive artist and that the substance of things is always tending towards unity and also towards alteration because its own parts act upon and are acted upon by one another. For, if he had assumed this, it would not have been difficult to allow that this constructive nature has powers which attract appropriate and expel alien matter. For in no other way could she be constructive, preservative of the animal, and eliminative of its diseases, unless it be allowed that she conserves what is appropriate and discharges what is foreign.

But in this matter, too, Asclepiades realized the logical sequence of the principles he had assumed; he showed no scruples, however, in opposing plain fact; he joins issue in this matter also, not merely with all physicians, but with everyone else, and

8 cf. p. 45. 4 The vis conservatrix et medicatrix Naturae.
The crisis or resolution in fevers was observed to take place with a certain regularity; hence arose the doctrine of "critical days."
maintains that there is no such thing as a crisis, or critical day, and that Nature does absolutely nothing for the preservation of the animal. For his constant aim is to follow out logical consequences and to upset obvious fact, in this respect being opposed to Epicurus; for the latter always stated the observed fact, although he gives an ineffective explanation of it. For, that these small corpuscles belonging to the lodestone rebound, and become entangled with other similar particles of the iron, and that then, by means of this entanglement (which cannot be seen anywhere) such a heavy substance as iron is attracted—I fail to understand how anybody could believe this. Even if we admit this, the same principle will not explain the fact that, when the iron has another piece brought in contact with it, this becomes attached to it.

For what are we to say? That, forsooth, some of the particles that flow from the lodestone collide with the iron and then rebound back, and that it is by these that the iron becomes suspended? that others penetrate into it, and rapidly pass through it by way of its empty channels? that these then collide with the second piece of iron and are not able to penetrate it although they penetrated the first piece? and that they then course back to the first piece, and produce entanglements like the former ones?

The hypothesis here becomes clearly refuted by its absurdity. As a matter of fact, I have seen five writing-stylets of iron attached to one another in a line, only the first one being in contact with the

2 These were hypothetical spaces or channels between the atoms; cf. Introduction, p. xiv.
δ' εἰς τὰλλα τῆς δυνάμεως διαδοθείσας· καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὥς, εἰ μὲν τῷ κάτω τοῦ γραφείου πέρατι προσάγοις ἐτερον, ἔχεται τε καὶ συνάπτεται καὶ κρέμαται τὸ προσενεχέν· εἰ δ' ἀλλοι τινὶ μέρει τῶν πλαγίων προσθεῖσι, οὐ συνάπτεται. πάντη γὰρ ὁμοίως ἡ τῆς λίθου διαδίδοται δύναμις, εἰ μόνον ἄψαυτο κατὰ τι τοῦ πρώτου γραφείου. καὶ μέντοι κὰκ τοῦτον πάλιν εἰς τὸ δεύτερον ὄλον ἡ δύναμις ἀμα νοῆματι διαρρέει κὰξ ἐκείνου πάλιν εἰς τὸ τρίτον ὄλον. εἰ δὴ νοῆσαις σμικράν τινα λίθον ἡρακλείαν ἐν αἰκῷ τινὶ κρεμαμένην, εἶτ' ἐν κύκλῳ ψαύνοντα πάμπολλα σιδήρια κἀκείνων πάλιν ἐτερα κἀκείνων ἀλλα καὶ τοῦτ' ἄχρι πλείονος, ἀπαντά | δὴπο τίμπλασθαι δεῖ τὰ σιδήρια τῶν ἀπορρεόντων τῆς λίθου σωμάτων. καὶ κινδυνεύει διαφορηθῆναι τὸ σμικρὸν ἐκείνο λιθιδιον εἰς τὰς ἀπορροας διαλυθεὶν. καίτοι, κἂν εἰ µηδὲν παρακέοιτ' αὐτῷ σιδήριον, εἰς τὸν ἄερα σκεδάνυται, µάλιστ' εἰ καὶ θερµὸς υπάρχωι.

Ναὶ, φησί, σµικρὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ χρή πάνω νοεῖν, ὡστε τῶν ἐµφεροµένων τῷ ἀερὶ ψηγµάτων τούτων δὴ τῶν σµικροτάτων ἐκείνων ἐναι µυριοστὸν εἶναι µέρος. εἰτ' ἐξ οὔτω σµικρῶν τολµάτε λέγειν κρεµάνυνθαι βάρη τηλικάυτα σιδήρου; εἰ γὰρ ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν µυριοστὸν ἔστι µέρος τῶν ἐν τῷ αέρι φεροµένων ψηγµάτων, τηλίκου χρή νοῆσαι τὸ πέρας αὐτῶν τὸ ἀγκιστροειδὲς, ὃ περιπλέκεται πρὸς ἄλληλα; πάντως γὰρ δήπο τοῦτο σµικροτάτων ἐστὶν ὄλου τοῦ ψηγµατος.

1 He means the specific drawing power or faculty of the lodestone. 2 cf. our modern "radium-emanations."
lodestone, and the power\(^1\) being transmitted through it to the others. Moreover, it cannot be said that if you bring a second stylet into contact with the lower end of the first, it becomes held, attached, and suspended, whereas, if you apply it to any other part of the side it does not become attached. For the power of the lodestone is distributed in all directions; it merely needs to be in contact with the first stylet at any point; from this stylet again the power flows, as quick as a thought, all through the second, and from that again to the third. Now, if you imagine a small lodestone hanging in a house, and in contact with it all round a large number of pieces of iron, from them again others, from these others, and so on,—all these pieces of iron must surely become filled with the corpuscles which emanate from the stone; therefore, this first little stone is likely to become dissipated by disintegrating into these emanations.\(^2\) Further, even if there be no iron in contact with it, it still disperses into the air, particularly if this be also warm.

"Yes," says Epicurus, "but these corpuscles must be looked on as exceedingly small, so that some of them are a ten-thousandth part of the size of the very smallest particles carried in the air." Then do you venture to say that so great a weight of iron can be suspended by such small bodies? If each of them is a ten-thousandth part as large as the dust particles which are borne in the atmosphere, how big must we suppose the hook-like extremities by which they interlock with each other\(^3\) to be? For of course this is quite the smallest portion of the whole particle.

\(^3\) cf. Ehrlich's hypothesis of "receptors" in explanation of the "affinities" of animal cells.
Εἴτε μικρὸν μικρῷ, κινούμενον κινούμενῳ περιπλακέων οὐκ εἰσθαν ἀποπάλλεται. καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἄλλ’ ἀττα πάντως αὐτοῖς, τὰ μὲν ἀνωθεν, τὰ δὲ κάτωθεν, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐμπροσθεν, τὰ δ’ ὀπίσθεν, τὰ δ’ ἐκ τῶν δεξιῶν, τὰ δ’ ἐκ τῶν ἀριστερῶν || ἐκρηγνύμενα σείει τε καὶ βράττει καὶ μένειν οὐκ έά. καὶ μέντοι καὶ πολλὰ χρὴ νοεῖν εξ ἀνάγκης έκαστον ἐκείνων τῶν σμικρῶν σωμάτων ἐξεῖν ἀγκιστρώδη πέρατα. δ’ ἐνδ’ μὲν γὰρ ἀλλήλοις συνάπτεται, δ’ ἐτέρου δ’ ἐνδ’ τού μὲν ὑπερκειμένου τῇ λίθῳ, τοῦ δ’ ὑποκειμένου τῷ σιδήρῳ. εἰ γὰρ ἀνω μὲν ἐξαφθείη τῆς λίθου, κάτω δὲ τῷ σιδήρῳ μὴ συμπλακεῖν, πλέουν οὐδέν. ὥστε τοῦ μὲν ὑπερκειμένου τῷ ἀνω μέρος ἐκκρέμασθαι χρὴ τῆς λίθου, τοῦ δ’ ὑποκειμένου τῷ κάτω πέρατι συνήφθαι τὸν σίδηρον. ἐπεὶ δὲ κἀκεῖνον πλαγίων ἀλλήλοις περιπλέκεται, πάντως ποιεῖ σκαντάθα έχει τὰ ἀγκιστρά. καὶ μέμνησο μοι πρὸ πάντων, ὅπως άντα σμικρὰ τὰς τοιαύτας καὶ τοσαύτας ἀποφύσεις έχει. καὶ τούτου μᾶλλον έτι, πῶς, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον σιδήριον συναφθῆ τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ τῷ δεύτερῳ τὸ τρίτον κακείω τὸ τέταρτον, ἀμα μὲν διεξέρχεσθαι χρῆ τοὺς πόρους ταύτη τὰ σμικρὰ καὶ ληρώδη ψήγματα, ἀμα δ’ ἀποπάλλεσθαι τοῦ μετ’ αὐτό || τεταγμένου, καίτοι κατὰ πᾶν ὁμοίων τῆς φύσεων ὑπάρχοντος.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη πάλιν ὑπόθεσις ἀτολμός, ἄλλ’, εἰ χρή τὰληθὲς εἰπεῖν, μακρῷ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν ἀναίσχυντοτέρα, πέντε σιδηρίων ὁμοίων ἀλλή- 78
Then, again, when a small body becomes entangled with another small body, or when a body in motion becomes entangled with another also in motion, they do not rebound at once. For, further, there will of course be others which break in upon them from above, from below, from front and rear, from right and left, and which shake and agitate them and never let them rest. Moreover, we must perforce suppose that each of these small bodies has a large number of these hook-like extremities. For by one it attaches itself to its neighbours, by another—the topmost one—to the lodestone, and by the bottom one to the iron. For if it were attached to the stone above and not interlocked with the iron below, this would be of no use.\(^1\) Thus, the upper part of the superior extremity must hang from the lodestone, and the iron must be attached to the lower end of the inferior extremity; and, since they interlock with each other by their sides as well, they must, of course, have hooks there too. Keep in mind also, above everything, what small bodies these are which possess all these different kinds of outgrowths. Still more, remember how, in order that the second piece of iron may become attached to the first, the third to the second, and to that the fourth, these absurd little particles must both penetrate the passages in the first piece of iron and at the same time rebound from the piece coming next in the series, although this second piece is naturally in every way similar to the first.

Such an hypothesis, once again, is certainly not lacking in audacity; in fact, to tell the truth, it is far more shameless than the previous ones; according

\(^1\) i.e. from the point of view of the theory.
λος ἐφεξῆς τεταγμένων διὰ τοῦ πρῶτου διαδυ-μενα ῥάδιες τῆς λίθου τὰ μόρια κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἀποπάλλεσθαι καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτον κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐτοίμως διεξέρχεσθαι. καὶ μὴν ἐκατέρως ἀτοπον. ἐι μὲν γὰρ ἀποπάλλεται, πῶς εἰς τὸ τρίτον ὥκεως διεξέρχεται; εἰ δ' οὐκ ἀποπάλλεται, πῶς κρεμάνωται τὸ δεύτερον ἐκ τοῦ πρῶτου; τὴν γὰρ ἀπόταλος αὐτὸς ὑπέθετο δημιουργὸν τῆς ὀλκῆς.

'Αλλ', ὅπερ ἐφην, εἰς ἀδολεσχίαν ἀναγκαίον ἐμπίπτειν, ἐπειδὰν τὶς τοιούτως ἀνδράσι διαλέγη-ται. σύντομον οὖν τινα καὶ κεφαλαιώδῃ λόγου εἰπὼν ἀπαλλάττεσθαι βούλομαι. τοῖς Ἀσκλη-πιάδου γραμμασιν εἴ τις ἐπιμελῶς ὀμιλήσειε, τὴν τε πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀκολουθίαν τῶν τοιούτων δομιμάτων ἀκριβῶς ἄν ἐκμάθω καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰ φαινόμενα μάχην. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἐπίκουρος τὰ

52 φαινόμενα φυλάττειν βουλόμενος ἁσχημονεῖ || φι-λοτιμούμενος ἐπιδεικνύειν αὐτὰ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ὁμο-λογοῦσα· ὁ δ' Ἀσκληπιάδης τὸ μὲν ἀκολουθοῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς φυλάττει, τοῦ φαινομένου δ' οὐδὲν αὐτῷ μέλει. ὡστὶς οὖν βουλεῖ οὕτως ἀποτίσαν ἐξελέγχειν τῶν ὑποθέσεων, εἰ μὲν πρὸς Ἀσκλη-πιάδην ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ γίγνοιτο, τῆς πρὸς τὸ φαινόμενον ὑπομιμησκέτω μάχης· εἰ δὲ πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον, τῆς πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς διαφωνίας. αἱ δ' ἄλλαι σχεδον αἱρέσεις αἱ τῶν ὁμοίων ἀρχῶν ἐχόμεναι τελέως ἀπέσβησαν, αὐτῶς δ' ἐτι μόναι διαρκόοιοι οὐκ ἄγεννοι. καίτοι τὰ μὲν Ἀσ-κληπιάδου Μηνόδωτος ὁ ἐμπειρικὸς ἀφύκτως ἐξελεγχεῖ, τὴν τε πρὸς τὰ φαινόμενα μάχην ὑπο-μιμησικών αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἀλληλα. τὰ δ' 80
to it, when five similar pieces of iron are arranged in a line, the particles of the lodestone which easily traverse the first piece of iron rebound from the second, and do not pass readily through it in the same way. Indeed, it is nonsense, whichever alternative is adopted. For, if they do rebound, how then do they pass through into the third piece? And if they do not rebound, how does the second piece become suspended to the first? For Epicurus himself looked on the rebound as the active agent in attraction.

But, as I have said, one is driven to talk nonsense whenever one gets into discussion with such men. Having, therefore, given a concise and summary statement of the matter, I wish to be done with it. For if one diligently familiarizes oneself with the writings of Asclepiades, one will see clearly their logical dependence on his first principles, but also their disagreement with observed facts. Thus, Epicurus, in his desire to adhere to the facts, cuts an awkward figure by aspiring to show that these agree with his principles, whereas Asclepiades safeguards the sequence of principles, but pays no attention to the obvious fact. Whoever, therefore, wishes to expose the absurdity of their hypotheses, must, if the argument be in answer to Asclepiades, keep in mind his disagreement with observed fact; or if in answer to Epicurus, his discordance with his principles. Almost all the other sects depending on similar principles are now entirely extinct, while these alone maintain a respectable existence still. Yet the tenets of Asclepiades have been unanswerably confuted by Menodotus the Empiricist, who draws his attention to their opposition to phenomena and to each other;
'Επικούρου πάλιν ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης ἐχόμενος ἀεὶ τῆς ἀκολουθίας, ἡς ἐκεῖνος οὖ πάνυ τι φαίνεται φροντίζων.

'Αλλ' οἱ νῦν ἀνθρωποὶ, πρὶν καὶ ταύτας ἐκμαθεῖν τὰς αἱρέσεις καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς βελτίων κατείτα χρόνω πολλῷ κρίναί τε καὶ βασανίσαι τὸ καθ' ἐκάστην αὐτῶν ἀληθεῖς τε καὶ ψεύδος, οἱ μὲν ιατροὶ ἑαυτοὺς, οἱ δὲ φιλοσόφοις ὑπομάζοντι μηδὲν εἰδότες. || οὐδὲν οὐν θαυμαστῶν ἐπίσης τοῖς ἀληθεῖς ταῦτα τετιμήσατα. ὦτο γὰρ ἐκαστός πρώτῳ περιτύχῃ διδασκάλῳ, τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο, μὴ περιμενας μηδὲν ἐτί παρ' ἄλλου μαθεῖν. ἐνίοι δ' αὐτῶν, εἰ καὶ πλείοσιν ἐντύχοιε, ἀλλ' οὕτω γ' εἰςιν ἀσύνετοι τε καὶ βραδεῖς τὴν διάνοιαν, ὡστε καὶ γεγορακότες οὕτω συνιὰν ἀκολουθιαν λόγον. πάλαι δὲ τοὺς τοιούτους ἐπὶ τὰς βαναύσους ἀπέλυνον τέχνας. ἀλλὰ ταύτα μὲν ἔστε ὃ τι τελευτήσει θεὸς οἴδειν.

'Ημεῖς δ' ἐπειδὴ, καὶ τοιοι φεύγοντες ἀντιλέγειν τοῖς ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εὐθὺς ἐσφαλμένοις, ὅμως ἤγαγκάσθημεν ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς ἀκολουθίας εἰπεῖν τινα καὶ διαλεχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτούς, ἐτί καὶ τούτο προσθήσομεν τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ὥς οὐ μόνον τὰ καθαίροντα φάρμακα πέφυκεν ἐπιστάσθαι τὰς οἰκείας ποιότητας ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τοὺς σκόλοπας ἀνάγοντα καὶ τὰς τῶν βελῶν ἀκίδας εἰς πολὺ βάθος σαρκὸς ἐμπεπαρμένας εἰνότε. καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὡσα τοὺς ίοὺς τῶν θηρίων ἢ τοὺς ἐμπεφαρμαγμένους τοῖς βέλεσιν ἀνέλκει, καὶ ταύτα τὴν αὐτήν ταῖς ἤρακλείαις δύναμιν. ἐγὼγ' οὖν οἴδα πιὸ καταπεπαρμένον ἐν πολὶ νεανίσκου σκόλοπα τοῖς.
and, again, those of Epicurus have been confuted by Asclepiades, who adhered always to logical sequence, about which Epicurus evidently cares little.

Now people of the present day do not begin by getting a clear comprehension of these sects, as well as of the better ones, thereafter devoting a long time to judging and testing the true and false in each of them; despite their ignorance, they style themselves, some "physicians" and others "philosophers." No wonder, then, that they honour the false equally with the true. For everyone becomes like the first teacher that he comes across, without waiting to learn anything from anybody else. And there are some of them, who, even if they meet with more than one teacher, are yet so unintelligent and slow-witted that even by the time they have reached old age they are still incapable of understanding the steps of an argument. . . . In the old days such people used to be set to menial tasks. . . . What will be the end of it God knows!

Now, we usually refrain from arguing with people whose principles are wrong from the outset. Still, having been compelled by the natural course of events to enter into some kind of a discussion with them, we must add this further to what was said—that it is not only cathartic drugs which naturally attract their special qualities,¹ but also those which remove thorns and the points of arrows such as sometimes become deeply embedded in the flesh. Those drugs also which draw out animal poisons or poisons applied to arrows all show the same faculty as does the lodestone. Thus, I myself have seen a thorn which was embedded in a young man's foot fail to

¹ cf. p. 69, note 2.
μὲν δακτύλοις ἐλκουσίν ἢμιὼν βιαίως οὖκ ἀκολουθοῦσαντα, φαρμάκον δὲ ἐπιτεθέντος ἀλώπως τε καὶ διὰ ταχεῶν ἀνελθόντα. καίτοι καὶ πρὸς τούτο τινες ἀντιλέγοντε σφάκοντες, ὅταν ἦ φλεγμονή λυθη τοῦ μέρους, αὐτόματον ἐξεῖναι τὸν σκόλοπα πρὸς οὐδενὸς ἀνελκόμενον. ἀλλ' οὗτοι γε πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνοεῖν έσίκασιν, ὡς ἄλλα μὲν ἐστὶ φλεγμονῆς, ἄλλα δὲ τῶν οὔτω καταπεπαρμένων ἐλκτικὰ φάρμακα· καίτοι γ' εύπερ ἀφλεγμάντων γενομένων ἐξερίστο τὰ παρὰ φύσιν, ὁσα φλεγμονῆς ἐστὶ λυτικὰ, ταύτ' εὔθως ἄν ἦν κἀκεῖνων ἐλκτικά.

Δεύτερον δ', δ καὶ μᾶλλον ἂν τις θαυμάσειεν, ὡς οὐ μόνον ἄλλα μὲν τοὺς σκόλοπας, ἄλλα δὲ τοὺς ἐξάγει φάρμακα, ἄλλα καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν τοὺς ἐλκοῦτων τὰ μὲν τὸν τῆς ἐχίδνης, τὰ δὲ τὸν τῆς τρυγόνος, τὰ δ' ἂλλου τινὸς ἐπιστάται καὶ σαφῶς ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν τοὺς φαρμάκους ἐπικειμένους αὐτούς. ἐνταῦθ' οὖν Ἑπίκουρον μὲν ἐπαινεῖν χρή τῆς πρὸς τὸ φαινόμενον αἴδοις, μέμφεσθαι δὲ τὸν λόγον τῆς αἰτίας. ὅν γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐλκοῦτε τοὺς δακτύλοις οὐκ ἀνηγάγομεν σκόλοπα, τοῦτον ὑπὸ τῶν σμικρῶν ἐκείνων ἀνέλκεσθαι ψηγμάτων, πῶς οὐ παντάπασιν ἄτοπον εἶναι χρή νομίζειν;

*Ἀρ' οὖν ἡδη πεπείσμεθα τῶν οὖν τῶν ἐκάστω δύναμίν τιν' ὑπάρχειν, ἵ τῇ τὴν οἰκείαν ἐλκεῖ ποιότητα, τὸ μὲν μᾶλλον, τὸ δ' ἦττον;

*Ἡ καὶ τὸ τῶν πυρῶν ἔτι παράδειγμα προ-

---

1 That is to say, the two properties should go together in all cases—which they do not.  
2 Trygon pastinaca.
come out when we exerted forcible traction with our fingers, and yet come away painlessly and rapidly on the application of a medicament. Yet even to this some people will object, asserting that when the inflammation is dispersed from the part the thorn comes away of itself, without being pulled out by anything. But these people seem, in the first place, to be unaware that there are certain drugs for drawing out inflammation and different ones for drawing out embedded substances; and surely if it was on the cessation of an inflammation that the abnormal matters were expelled, then all drugs which disperse inflammations ought, ipso facto, to possess the power of extracting these substances as well.¹

And secondly, these people seem to be unaware of a still more surprising fact, namely, that not merely do certain medicaments draw out thorns and others poisons, but that of the latter there are some which attract the poison of the viper, others that of the sting-ray,² and others that of some other animal; we can, in fact, plainly observe these poisons deposited on the medicaments. Here, then, we must praise Epicurus for the respect he shows towards obvious facts, but find fault with his views as to causation. For how can it be otherwise than extremely foolish to suppose that a thorn which we failed to remove by digital traction could be drawn out by these minute particles?

Have we now, therefore, convinced ourselves that everything which exists³ possesses a faculty by which it attracts its proper quality, and that some things do this more, and some less?

Or shall we also furnish our argument with the

¹ cf. p. 66, note 3.
χειρισόμεθα τῷ λόγῳ; φανήσονται γὰρ οἷμαι καὶ τῶν γεωργῶν αὐτῶν ἀμαθέστεροι περὶ τὴν φύσιν ὁι μηδὲν ὁλως ὑπὸ μηδενὸς ἐλκεσθαι συγχωροῦντες: ὡς ἔγωγε πρῶτον μὲν ἀκούσας τὸ γεγονόμενον ἑθαύμασα καὶ αὐτὸς ἡβουλήθην αὐτόπτης αὐτοῦ καταστήμην. μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ, ὡς καὶ τὰ τῆς πείρας ὁμολόγει, τὴν αἰτίαν σκοποῦμενος ἐν παμπόλλω χρόνῳ κατὰ πάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις οὕδεμιαν ἄλλην εὑρεῖν οἶδος τῇ ὑπὸ ἄχρι τοῦ πιθανοῦ προϊόνταν ἄλλα καταγελάστους τε καὶ σαφῶς ἐξελεγχομένας τὰς ἄλλας ἀπάσεις πλὴν τῆς τὴν ὅλην προσβεβοῦσης.

’Εστὶ δὲ τὸ γεγονόμενον τοιὸῦτε. κατακομβι-ζόντες οἱ παρ’ ἠμῶν γεωργοὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἄγρων πυροὺς εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐν ἀμάξας τις, ὅταν ὑφελέσθαι βουληθῶσιν, ὡστε μὴ φοραθῆναι, κεράμῳ ἀττα πληρώσαντες ύδατος μέσοισ αὐτῶς ἐνιστάσιν. ἐλκοντες οὖν ἐκεῖνοι διὰ τοῦ κεραμίου τὸ ύγρόν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὅγκον μὲν καὶ βάρος προσκτώνται, κατάδηλοι δ’ οὐ πάνι γίγνονται τοῖς ὀρῶσιν, εἰ μὴ τις προπεπυσμένος ἤδη περιεργό-τερον ἐπισκοποῖτο. καὶ τοῖς εἰ βουληθείς ἐν ἥλιῳ καταθέναι πάνιν θερμῷ ταύτων ἀγγεῖον, ἐλάχιστον παντελῶς εὑρήσεις τὸ δαπανῶμενον ἐφ’ ἐκάστης ἡμέρας. οὕτως ἄρα καὶ τῆς ἡλιακῆς θερμασίας τῆς σφοδρᾶς ὕσχυροτέραν οἱ πυροὶ δύναμιν ἔχουσιν ἐλκείν εἰς ἑαυτοῦ τὴν πλησίον-ζουσαν ὑγρότητα. λόρος οὐν ἐνταῦθα μακρὸς ὑ πρὸς τὸ λεπτομερές φορὰ τοῦ περιέχοντος ἡμᾶς ἀέρος καὶ μάλιστ’ ὅταν ἱκανῶς ἡ θερμῶς,

1 The way that corn can attract moisture.
illustration afforded by corn? For those who refuse to admit that anything is attracted by anything else, will, I imagine, be here proved more ignorant regarding Nature than the very peasants. When, for my own part, I first learned of what happens, I was surprised, and felt anxious to see it with my own eyes. Afterwards, when experience also had confirmed its truth, I sought long among the various sects for an explanation, and, with the exception of that which gave the first place to attraction, I could find none which even approached plausibility, all the others being ridiculous and obviously quite untenable.

What happens, then, is the following. When our peasants are bringing corn from the country into the city in wagons, and wish to filch some away without being detected, they fill earthen jars with water and stand them among the corn; the corn then draws the moisture into itself through the jar and acquires additional bulk and weight, but the fact is never detected by the onlookers unless someone who knew about the trick before makes a more careful inspection. Yet, if you care to set down the same vessel in the very hot sun, you will find the daily loss to be very little indeed. Thus corn has a greater power than extreme solar heat of drawing to itself the moisture in its neighbourhood. Thus the theory that the water is carried towards the rarefied part of the air surrounding us (particularly when that is distinctly warm) is utter nonsense; for although it is

2 Specific attraction of the "proper" quality; cf. p. 85, note 3.
3 Theory of evaporation insufficient to account for it. cf. p. 104, note 1.
πολὺ μὲν ὑπάρχοντος ἢ κατὰ τοὺς πυροὺς λεπτομερεστέρος, δεχομένου δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ δέκατον μέρος τῆς εἰς ἐκείνους μεταλαμβανομένης ὑγρότητος.

XV

'Επεὶ δὲ ἰκανῶς ἡδολεσχήσαμεν σὺχ ἐκόντες, ἀλλ’, ὡς ἡ παροιμία φησί, μανυμένοις ἀναγκασθέντες συμμανίναι, πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν οὐρών ἐπανέλθωμεν διάκρισιν, ἐν ἡ τῶν μὲν Ἀσκληπιάδου λήρων ἐπιλαθόμεθα, μετὰ δὲ τῶν πεπευσμένων διηθεῖσαι τὰ οὐρα διὰ τῶν νεφρῶν, τὸς τρόπος τῆς ἐνέργειας ἐστίν, ἐπισκεψόμεθα πάντως γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς νεφρούς φέρεται τὰ οὐρα τοῦτο βέλτιον εἶναι νομίζοντα, καθάπερ ἡμεῖς, ὅποταν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἀπίστωμεν ἢ, εἰ τούτῳ ἀδύνατον, ἐτερόν τι χρῆ τῆς φορᾶς αὐτῶν ἐξευρεῖν αὐτοῖο. τὸ δὲ τούτῳ ἐστὶν; εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοὺς νεφροὺς δόσομεν τινα δύναμιν ἐλκτικὴν τῆς τοιαύτης ποιότητος, ὡς Ἰπποκράτης ἐνόμιζεν, οὐδὲν ἐτερόν ἐξευρήσομεν. ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἦτοι τούτους ἐλκέων αὐτὸ προσήκειν ἢ τὰς φλέβας πέμπειν, εἴπερ γε μὴ ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ φέρεται, παντὶ που δήλουν. ἀλλ’ εἰ μὲν αἱ φλέβες περιστελλόμεναι προσθοίειν, οὐκ ἐκεῖνο μόνον, ἀλλὰ σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ πάν αἷμα τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν ἐαυτοῖς εἰς τοὺς νεφροὺς ἐκθλίψομεν εἰ δὲ τούτῳ ἀδύνατον, ὡς δεῖξομεν, λείπεται τοὺς νεφροὺς ἐλκεῖν.
ON THE NATURAL FACULTIES, I. xiv.-xv

much more rarefied there than it is amongst the corn, yet it does not take up a tenth part of the moisture which the corn does.

XV

Since, then, we have talked sufficient nonsense—not willingly, but because we were forced, as the proverb says, "to behave madly among madmen"—let us return again to the subject of urinary secretion. Here let us forget the absurdities of Asclepiades, and, in company with those who are persuaded that the urine does pass through the kidneys, let us consider what is the character of this function. For, most assuredly, either the urine is conveyed by its own motion to the kidneys, considering this the better course (as do we when we go off to market!1), or, if this be impossible, then some other reason for its conveyance must be found. What, then, is this? If we are not going to grant the kidneys a faculty for attracting this particular quality,2 as Hippocrates held, we shall discover no other reason. For, surely everyone sees that either the kidneys must attract the urine, or the veins must propel it—if, that is, it does not move of itself. But if the veins did exert a propulsive action when they contract, they would squeeze out into the kidneys not merely the urine, but along with it the whole of the blood which they contain.3 And if this is impossible, as we shall show, the remaining explanation is that the kidneys do exert traction.

1 Playful suggestion of free-will in the urine.
2 Specific attraction. cf. p. 87, note 2.
3 i.e. there would be no selective action.
Πώς οὖν ἄδυνατον τούτο; τῶν νεφρῶν ἡ θέσις ἀντιβαίνει. οὖ γὰρ δὴ οὕτω γ' ὑπόκειναι τῇ κοιλᾷ φλεβί || καθάπερ τοῖς ἐξ ἐγκεφάλου περιττώμασιν ἐν τῇ ρινῇ καὶ κατὰ τὴν υπέρφαγον οἶ τοῖς ἢθμοῖς ὤμοιοι πῶροι, ἀλλ' ἐκατέρωθεν αὐτῇ παράκειναι. καὶ μὴν, εὔπερ ὅμοιος τοῖς ἢθμοῖς ὅσον ἁν ἡ λεπτότερον καὶ τελέως ὄρρωδες, τούτῳ μὲν ἐτοίμως διαπέμπουσι, τὸ δὲ παχύτερον ἀποστέγουσιν, ἀπαν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ λέγειν χρῆ τὸ αἴμα τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν τῇ κοιλᾷ φλεβί, καθάπερ εἰς τοὺς τρυγοὺς ὁ πᾶς οἷος ἐμβάλλεται. καὶ μὲν γε καὶ τὸ τοῦ γάλακτος τοῦ τυρομένου παράδειγμα σαφῶς ἄν, δ' ἴθωλαι λέγειν, ἐνδείξαντες. καὶ γὰρ καὶ τούτῳ πάν ἐμβληθὲν εἰς τοὺς ταλάρους οὐ πάν διηθεῖται, ἄλλ' ὅσον μὲν ἁν ἡ λεπτότερον τῆς εὐρύτητος τῶν πλοκάμων, εἰς τὸ κάταντες φέρεται καὶ τούτῳ μὲν ὅρρος ἐπονομάζεται: τὸ λοιπὸν δὲ τὸ παχὺ τὸ μέλλον ἑσεθαι τυρός, ὡς ἁν οὐ παραδεχομένων αὐτὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ταλάρους πόρων, οὐ διεκπέπτει κάτω. καὶ τούτω, εὔπερ οὕτω μέλλει διηθεῖσθαι τῶν νεφρῶν οὐ τοῦ αἰματος ὅρρος, ἀπαν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἑκείν χρῆ τὸ αἴμα καὶ μὴ τὸ μὲν ναί, τὸ δ' οὐ. ||

59 Πῶς οὖν ἔχει τὸ φαινόμενον ἐκ τῆς ἀνατομῆς; Τὸ μὲν ἔτερον μέρος τῆς κοίλης ἀνώ πρὸς τὴν καρδίαν ἀναφέρεται, τὸ λοιπὸν δ' ἐπιβαίνει τῇ ράχει καθ' ὅλης αὐτῆς ἐκτεινόμενον ἀχρὶ τῶν σκελῶν, ὡστε τὸ μὲν ἔτερον οὐδ' ἐγγὺς ἀφικνεῖται

1 Nasal mucus was supposed to be the non-utilizable part of the nutriment conveyed to the brain. cf. p. 214, note 3.
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And how is propulsion by the veins impossible? The situation of the kidneys is against it. They do not occupy a position beneath the hollow vein [vena cava] as does the sieve-like [ethmoid] passage in the nose and palate in relation to the surplus matter from the brain;¹ they are situated on both sides of it. Besides, if the kidneys are like sieves, and readily let the thinner serous [whey-like] portion through, and keep out the thicker portion, then the whole of the blood contained in the vena cava must go to them, just as the whole of the wine is thrown into the filters. Further, the example of milk being made into cheese will show clearly what I mean. For this, too, although it is all thrown into the wicker strainers, does not all percolate through; such part of it as is too fine in proportion to the width of the meshes passes downwards, and this is called whey [serum]; the remaining thick portion which is destined to become cheese cannot get down, since the pores of the strainers will not admit it. Thus it is that, if the blood-serum has similarly to percolate through the kidneys, the whole of the blood must come to them, and not merely one part of it.

What, then, is the appearance as found on dissection?

One division of the vena cava is carried upwards ² to the heart, and the other mounts upon the spine and extends along its whole length as far as the legs; thus one division does not even come near the

¹ He means from its origin in the liver (i.e. in the three hepatic veins). His idea was that the upper division took nutriment to heart, lungs, head, etc., and the lower division to lower part of body. On the relation of right auricle to vena cava and right ventricle, cf. p. 321, notes 4 and 5.
tōn nefrōn, tō lambda dē plēsioiμεν, ou μην eis autoús ge katafūsetai. ἔχρην δ', εὔτερ ἐμελλεν ὡς δ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καθαρθήσεσθαι τὸ αἷμα, πάν ἐμπίπτειν eis autoús κἀπειτα κἀτω μὲν φέρεσθαι τὸ λεπτόν, ὑσχεσθαι δ' ἀνω τὸ παχύ. νυν δ' οὐχ οὔτως ἔχει πλάγιοι γὰρ ἐκατέρωθεν τῆς κοίλης φλεβὸς οἱ νεφροὶ κεῖται. οὐκοῦν ὡς ἡμοὶ διηθοῦσι, πεμπούσης μὲν ἐκεῖνης, αὐτὸ δ' οὕδεμιαν εἰσφερόμενοι δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἐλκουσὶ δηλοντότι τοῦτο γὰρ ἐτὶ λείπεται.

Πῶς οὖν ἐλκουσιν; εἰ μὲν, ὡς Ἑπίκουρος οὔτε τὰς ὀλκάς ἀπάσας γίγνεσθαι κατὰ τὰς τῶν αὐτομῶν ἀποτάλασεις τε καὶ περιπλοκάς, ἀμεινον ἢν οὔτως εἰπεῖν αὐτοὺς μηδ' ἐλκεῖν ὅλως· πολὺ γὰρ ἂν οὔτω γε τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἱρακλείας λίθου μικρῷ πρόσθεν εἰρημένων ὁ λόγος ἐξεταζόμενος εὑρεθεὶν γειούστερος: ἀλλ' ὡς Ἰπποκράτης ἠβουλετο. λεχθήσεται δὲ σαφέστερον ἐπὶ προήκουτι τῷ λόγῳ. νυνὶ γὰρ οὐ τούτῳ πρόκειται διδάσκειν, ἀλλ' ὡς οὗτ' ἄλλο τι δυνατὸν εἰπεῖν αὐτοῖν εἴναι τῆς τῶν οὐρων διακρίσεως πλὴν τῆς ὀλκῆς τῶν νεφρῶν οὖθ' οὔτω γίγνεσθαι τὴν ὀλκήν, ὡς οἱ μηδεμίαν οἰκείαν διδόντες τῇ φύσει δύναμιν οὐνταί γίγνεσθαι.

Τούτων γὰρ ὁμολογηθέντος, ὡς ἐστίν ὅλως τις ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ φύσεως διωκουμένοις δύναμις ἐλεκτικῆ, ληρώδης νομίζοιτ' ἄν ὁ περὶ ἀναδόσεως τροφῆς ἀλλ' τι λέγειν ἐπιχειρῶν.

---

1 We arrive at our belief by excluding other possibilities.
2 i.e. the mechanistic physicists. cf. pp. 45-47.
3 cf. p. 85, note 3.
kidneys, while the other approaches them but is certainly not inserted into them. Now, if the blood were destined to be purified by them as if they were sieves, the whole of it would have to fall into them, the thin part being thereafter conveyed downwards, and the thick part retained above. But, as a matter of fact, this is not so. For the kidneys lie on either side of the vena cava. They therefore do not act like sieves, filtering fluid sent to them by the vena cava, and themselves contributing no force. They obviously exert traction; for this is the only remaining alternative.

How, then, do they exert this traction? If, as Epicurus thinks, all attraction takes place by virtue of the *rebounds* and *entanglements* of atoms, it would be certainly better to maintain that the kidneys have no attractive action at all; for his theory, when examined, would be found as it stands to be much more ridiculous even than the theory of the lodestone, mentioned a little while ago. Attraction occurs in the way that Hippocrates laid down; this will be stated more clearly as the discussion proceeds; for the present our task is not to demonstrate this, but to point out that no other cause of the secretion of urine can be given except that of attraction by the kidneys,¹ and that this attraction does not take place in the way imagined by people who do not allow Nature a faculty of her own.²

For if it be granted that there is any attractive faculty at all in those things which are governed by Nature,³ a person who attempted to say anything else about the absorption of nutriment⁴ would be considered a fool.

¹ The subject of anadosis is taken up in the next chapter. cf. also p. 62, note 1.
"'Ερασίστρατος δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐτέρας μὲν τις δόξας εὐήθεσιν ἀντεἴπει διὰ μακρῶν, ὑπερέβη δὲ τελέως τῇν Ἰπποκράτους, οὐδ' ἀχρί τοῦ μνημονεύσαι μόνον αὐτῆς, ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ καταπόσεως ἐποίησεν, ἄξιόδεσας. ἐν ἐκείνοις μὲν γὰρ ἀχρὶ τοσοῦτον φαίνεται μνημονεύων, ὡς τούνομ' εἰπείν τῆς ὅλκης μόνον ὢδὲ πως γράφειν.

"'Ολεὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς κοιλίας συνεμία φαίνεται εἶναι". περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναδόσεως τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος οὐδ' ἀχρὶ συλλαβῆς μᾶς ἐμνήμονευσε τῆς Ἰπποκρατείου δόξης. καίτοι γ' ἐπήρκεσέν ἂν ἡμῖν, εἰ καὶ τούτ' ἔγραψε μόνον, ὡς Ἰπποκράτης εἰπὼν "Σάρκες ὀλκαὶ καὶ ἐκ κοιλίας καὶ ἐξωθεῖν" ψεύδεται. οὕτε γὰρ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας οὔτ' ἐξωθεῖν ἐλκεῖν δύνανται. εἰ δὲ καὶ ὅτι μήτρας αὐτιώμενος ἄρρωστον αὐχένα κακῶς εἰπεν "Ὁ γὰρ δύναται αὐτής ὁ στόμαχος εἰρύσαι τὴν γονήν," ἢ εἰ καὶ τι τοιοῦτον ἄλλο γράφειν ὁ 'Ερασίστρατος ἥξιώσε, τὸτ' ἂν καὶ ἡμεῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπολογούμενοι εἴπομεν.

1 Ω γενναῖε, μὴ ρητορικῶς ἡμῶν κατάτρεχε χωρίς ἀποδείξεως, ἀλλ' εἰπε τινα κατηγορίαν του δόγματος, ἣν ἡ πεισθώμεν σοι ὅσ καλῶς ἐξέλεγχοντι τὸν παλαιὸν λόγον ἡ μεταπείσωμεν

1 On Erasistratus v. Introd. p. xii. His view that the stomach exerts no holke, or attraction, is dealt with more fully in Book III., chap. viii.
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Now, while Erasistratus for some reason replied at great length to certain other foolish doctrines, he entirely passed over the view held by Hippocrates, not even thinking it worth while to mention it, as he did in his work "On Deglutition"; in that work, as may be seen, he did go so far as at least to make mention of the word attraction, writing something as follows:

"Now, the stomach does not appear to exercise any attraction." But when he is dealing with anadosis he does not mention the Hippocratic view even to the extent of a single syllable. Yet we should have been satisfied if he had even merely written this: "Hippocrates lies in saying 'The flesh attracts both from the stomach and from without,' for it cannot attract either from the stomach or from without." Or if he had thought it worth while to state that Hippocrates was wrong in criticizing the weakness of the neck of the uterus, "seeing that the orifice of the uterus has no power of attracting semen," or if he [Erasistratus] had thought proper to write any other similar opinion, then we in our turn would have defended ourselves in the following terms:

"My good sir, do not run us down in this rhetorical fashion without some proof; state some definite objection to our view, in order that either you may convince us by a brilliant refutation of the ancient doctrine, or that, on the other hand, we may convert you from your ignorance." Yet why do I

---

1 Erasistratus
2 i.e. the tissues.
3 cf. p. 291.
ώς ἀγνοοῦντα. καίτοι τί λέγω ῥητορικῶς; μὴ γάρ, ἐπειδὴ τινὲς τῶν ῥητόρων, ἂ μάλιστ' ἀδυνατοῦσι διαλύεσθαι, τάῦτα διαγελάσαντες οὐδ' ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἀντιλέγειν, ἡδὲ ποὺ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡγώμεθ' εἶναι τὸ ῥητορικῶς· τὸ γάρ διὰ λόγου πιθανοῦ ἑστι τὸ || ῥητορικῶς, τὸ δ' ἀνεῖ λόγου βαρμολοχικόν, οὐ ῥητορικόν. οὐκον οὔτε ῥητορικῶς οὔτε διαλεκτικῶς ἀντεἶπεν ὁ Ἑρασίστρατος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς καταπόσεως λόγῳ. τὶ γάρ φησιν; "‗Ολκῇ μὲν οὖν τῆς κοιλίας οὐδεμιά φαίνεται εἶναι." πάλιν οὖν αὐτῷ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀντιμαρτυρῶν ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ἀντιπαραβαλλέσθω· περιστολὴ μὲν οὖν τοῦ στομάχου οὐδεμιά φαίνεται εἶναι. καὶ πῶς οὐ φαίνεται; τάχ' ἀν ἵσως εἶποι τις τῶν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· τὸ γάρ ἀεὶ τῶν ἀνωθεν αὐτοῦ μερῶν συστελλομένων διαστέλλεσθαι τὰ κάτω πῶς οὐκ ἐστὶ τῆς περιστολῆς ἐνδεικτικῶν; αὕθης οὖν ἡμεῖς, καὶ πῶς οὐ φαίνεται, φήσομεν, ἡ τῆς κοιλίας ὀλκή; τὸ γάρ ἀεὶ τῶν κάτωθεν μερῶν τοῦ στομάχου διαστελλομένων συστέλλεσθαι τὰ ἀνω πῶς οὖκ ἐστὶ τῆς ὀλκῆς ἐνδεικτικῶν; εἰ δὲ σωφρονήσεις ποτε καὶ γνοίη τὸ φαινόμενον τοῦτο μηδὲν μᾶλλον τῆς ἐτέρας τῶν δοξῶν ὑπάρχειν ἐνδεικτικῶν ἀλλ' ἀμφότερων εἶναι κοινὸν, οὔτως ἢν ἡδὲ δεῖξαινε αὐτῷ τὴν ὀρθήν ὁδὸν τῆς τοῦ ἅληθοῦς εὑρέσεως.

'Αλλὰ περὶ μὲν τῆς κοιλίας αὕθης. ἡ δὲ τῆς τροφῆς ἀνάδοσις οὐδὲν δεῖται || τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενοῦμενον ἀκολουθίας ἀπαξ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑλκτικῆς δυνάμεως 96
say "rhetorical"? For we too are not to suppose that when certain rhetoricians pour ridicule upon that which they are quite incapable of refuting, without any attempt at argument, their words are really thereby constituted rhetoric. For rhetoric proceeds by persuasive reasoning; words without reasoning are buffoonery rather than rhetoric. Therefore, the reply of Erasistratus in his treatise "On Deglutition" was neither rhetoric nor logic. For what is it that he says? "Now, the stomach does not appear to exercise any traction." Let us testify against him in return, and set our argument beside his in the same form. Now, there appears to be no peristalsis\(^1\) of the gullet. "And how does this appear?" one of his adherents may perchance ask. "For is it not indicative of peristalsis that always when the upper parts of the gullet contract the lower parts dilate?" Again, then, we say, "And in what way does the attraction of the stomach not appear? For is it not indicative of attraction that always when the lower parts of the gullet dilate the upper parts contract?" Now, if he would but be sensible and recognize that this phenomenon is not more indicative of the one than of the other view, but that it applies equally to both,\(^2\) we should then show him without further delay the proper way to the discovery of truth.

We will, however, speak about the stomach again. And the dispersal of nutriment \([\text{anadosis}]\) need not make us have recourse to the theory regarding the

---

\(^1\) Peristalsis may be used here to translate Gk. \textit{peristolē}, meaning the contraction and dilation of muscle-fibres \textit{circularly} round a lumen. cf. p. 263, note 2.

\(^2\) For a demonstration that this phenomenon is a conclusive proof neither of \textit{peristolē} nor of real \textit{vital} attraction, but is found even in dead bodies v. p. 267.
This was Erasistratus’s favourite principle, known in Latin as the “horror vacui” and in English as “Nature’s abhorrence of a vacuum,” although these terms are not an exact translation of the Greek. τὸ κενούμενον probably means
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vacuum, not the matter evacuated, although Galen elsewhere uses Ktvoce in the latter inoii-classical) sense, e.g. pp. 67,
215.
Akoloiilliia is a folloicingxip, a sequence, almost a cott,* v. p. 123.
• /. Book II., chap. i.
eequeiice.
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ρυήναι ποτε παρὰ τὸ κενούμενον. ἂλλης γὰρ αἰτίας μηδεμίας προστεθείσης, ἂλλα μόνης τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθίας ποδηγούσης τὸ συνεχὲς, οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ πλέον ἐπιρρυνήναι ποτε τοῦ κενούμενον. ἂλλ' οὖν ἄλλην τινὰ προσθείναι πιθανῆν αἰτίαν εἴχεν, ὥσ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναδόσεως τῆς ἐκθλιψιν τῆς γαστρός. ἂλλ' αὐτὴ γ' ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν κοίλην αἳματος ἀπολολέω τελέως, οὐ τῷ μῆκει μόνον τῆς ἀποστάσεως ἐκλυθεῖσα, ἄλλα καὶ τῷ τῆς καρδίας ὑπερκειμένῃ ἐξαρτάζειν αὐτῆς σφοδρῶς καθ' ἐκάστην διαστολήν οὐκ ὅλων αἵμα.

Μόνῃ δὴ τις ἔτι καὶ πάντων ἔρημος ἀπελεύθερον τῶν σοφισμάτων ἐν τοῖς κάτω τῆς κοίλης ἡ πρὸς || 65 τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθία, διὰ τε τοὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς ἱσχυρίαις ἀποδυνακονταὶ ἀπολολεκυία τὴν πιθανότητα καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν νεφρῶν θέσιν οὐδὲν ἢττον. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἁπαν ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ἐφέρετο τὸ αἵμα, δεόντως ἀν τίς ἁπαν ἐφασκεν αὐτὸ καθαίρεσθαι. νυνὶ δὲ, οὐ γὰρ ὅλων ἄλλα τοσοῦτον αὐτοῦ μέρος, ὡσον αἱ μέχρι νεφρῶν δεχοῦνται φλέβες, ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς ἔρχεται, μόνον ἐκεῖνο καθαρθῆσται. καὶ τὸ μὲν ὁρρόδει αὐτοῦ καὶ λεπτον ὅλων δὲ ἡμῶν τινῶν τῶν νεφρῶν διαδύσται: τὸ δ' αἷματῶδες τε καὶ παχὺ κατὰ τὰς φλέβας ὑπομένου ἐμποδών στήσται τῷ κατόπιν ἐπιρρέουσι. παλινδρομεῖν οὖν αὐτὸ πρότερον ἐπὶ τὴν κοίλην ἀναγκαῖον καὶ κενὰς οὕτως ἔργαζεσθαι τὰς ἐπὶ τούς νεφρῶν ιοῦσας φλέβας, αἱ δὲντερον οὐκέτι

1 Vital factor necessary over and above the mechanical.
2 cf. p. 119, note 2. 3 pp. 91, 93.
flow into a vacuum than has run out. For, if no other factor comes into operation¹ save only this tendency by which a vacuum becomes refilled, no more could ever flow in than had been evacuated. Nor could he suggest any other plausible cause, such, for example, as the expression of nutriment by the stomach² which occurs in the process of anadosis; this had been entirely disproved in the case of blood in the vena cava;³ it is excluded, not merely owing to the long distance, but also from the fact that the overlying heart, at each diastole, robs the vena cava by violence of a considerable quantity of blood.

In relation to the lower part of the vena cava⁴ there would still remain, solitary and abandoned, the specious theory concerning the filling of a vacuum. This, however, is deprived of plausibility by the fact that people die of retention of urine, and also, no less, by the situation of the kidneys. For, if the whole of the blood were carried to the kidneys, one might properly maintain that it all undergoes purification there. But, as a matter of fact, the whole of it does not go to them, but only so much as can be contained in the veins going to the kidneys;⁵ this portion only, therefore, will be purified. Further, the thin serous part of this will pass through the kidneys as if through a sieve, while the thick sanguineous portion remaining in the veins will obstruct the blood flowing in from behind; this will first, therefore, have to run back to the vena cava, and so to empty the veins going to the kidneys; these veins will no longer be able to

¹ i.e. the part below the liver; cf. p. 91, note 2.
⁵ Renal veins.
παρακομμούσιν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς ἀκάθαρτον αἶμα· κατ·
eiληφότος γὰρ αὐτὰς τοῦ προτέρου πάροδος
ούδεμια λέγεται. τὸς οὖν ἡμῖν ἡ δύναμις ἀπά-
ξει πάλιν ὁπίσω τῶν νεφρῶν τὸ καθαρὸν αἶμα;
τὸς δὲ τούτο μὲν διαδεξαμένη κελεύσει πάλιν πρὸς
tὸ κάτω μέρος ἵνα τῆς κοῖλης, ἐτέρῳ δὲ ἀνωθέν
ἐπιφερομένῳ προστάξει, πρὶν ἢ ἐπὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς
ἀπελθεῖν, μὴ φέρεσθαι κάτω;
Ταῦτ’ οὖν ἀπαντᾷ συνιδὼν ὁ Ἑρασίστρατος
ἀποριῶν μεστὰ καὶ μιᾶς μόνης δόξαν εὐπορον
eυρῶν ἐν ἀπασι τὴν τῆς ὀλκής, οὔτ’ ἀπορεῖσθαι
βουλόμενος οὔτε τὴν Ἰπποκράτους ἐθέλων λέγειν
ἀμείων ύπελαβείς σιωπητέον εἶναι περὶ τοῦ τρό-
που τῆς διακρίσεως.
'Αλλ’ εἰ κάκεινος ἐσώγησεν, ἥμεις οὐ σιωπήσω-
μεν· ἵσμεν γὰρ, ὡς οὐκ ἐνδέχεται παρελθόντα
tὴν Ἰπποκράτευον δόξαν, εἰθ’ ἔτερον τι περὶ
νεφρῶν ἐνεργείας εἰστόντα μὴ οὐ καταγέλαστον
eἶναι παντάπασι. διὰ τοῦτ’ Ἑρασίστρατος μὲν
ἐσιώπησεν, Ἀσκληπιάδης δ’ ἐψεύσατο παραπλη-
σίως οἰκέταις λάλοις μὲν τὰ πρόσθεν τοῦ βίου
καὶ πολλὰ πολλάκις ἐγκλήματα διαλυσαμένους
ὑπὸ περιττῆς πανουργίας, ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ δὲ ποτὲ
kateilημένοις, εἰτ’ οὖδὲν ἐξευρίσκοις σόφισμα
cάπετ’ ἐνταῦθα τοῦ μὲν αἰδημονεστέρου σιωπών-
tος, οἴον ἀποπληξία τυι κατειλημένου, τοῦ δ’
ἀναισχυντοτέρου κρύπτοντος μὲν ἔθ’ ὑπὸ μάλης
tὸ χητούμενον, ἐξομυμένου δὲ καὶ μηδ’ ἔωρακέναι
πώποτε φάσκοντος. οὔτω γὰρ τοι καὶ ὁ Ἀσκλη-
πιάδης ἰ ἐπιλειποῦντοι αὐτόν τῶν τῆς πανουργίας
σοφισμάτωι καὶ μήτε τῆς πρὸς τὸ λεπτομερές
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conduct a second quantity of unpurified blood to the kidneys—occupied as they are by the blood which had preceded, there is no passage left. What power have we, then, which will draw back the purified blood from the kidneys? And what power, in the next place, will bid this blood retire to the lower part of the vena cava, and will enjoin on another quantity coming from above not to proceed downwards before turning off into the kidneys?

Now Erasistratus realized that all these ideas were open to many objections, and he could only find one idea which held good in all respects—namely, that of attraction. Since, therefore, he did not wish either to get into difficulties or to mention the view of Hippocrates, he deemed it better to say nothing at all as to the manner in which secretion occurs.

But even if he kept silence, I am not going to do so. For I know that if one passes over the Hippocratic view and makes some other pronouncement about the function of the kidneys, one cannot fail to make oneself utterly ridiculous. It was for this reason that Erasistratus kept silence and Asclepiades lied; they are like slaves who have had plenty to say in the early part of their career, and have managed by excessive rascality to escape many and frequent accusations, but who, later, when caught in the act of thieving, cannot find any excuse; the more modest one then keeps silence, as though thunderstruck, whilst the more shameless continues to hide the missing article beneath his arm and denies on oath that he has ever seen it. For it was in this way also that Asclepiades, when all subtle excuses had failed him and there was no longer any room for nonsense about "conveyance towards the
Galen

foras ἐχούσης ἐτί χώραν ἐνταυθοὶ ληρεῖσθαι μὴθ’ ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν νεφρῶν γεννᾶται τούτῳ τὸ περίττωμα, καθάπερ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ἦπατι πόρων ἡ χολή, δυνατὸν δὲν εἰπόντα μὴ οὐ μέγιστον ὄφλεῖν γέλωτα, ἐξαμυνταί τε καὶ ψεῦδεται φανερῶς, οὐ διήκειν λέγων ἐπὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς τὸ ὄνρον ἀλλ’ ἀτμοειδῶς εὐθὺς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὴν καύλην μερῶν εἰς τὴν κύστιν ἀθροίζεσθαι.

Οὕτω μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἐπ’ αὐτοφόρῳ κατειλημένοις οἰκέταις ὁμοίως ἐκπλαγέντες ο μὲν ἐσιώτησεν, ὁ δὲ ἀναισχύντως ψεῦδεται.

XVII

Τῶν δὲ νεωτέρων ὁσοὶ τοῖς τούτων ἀνόμασιν ἐαυτοὺς ἐσέμμυναν Ἐρασιστρατείους τε καὶ Ἀσκληπιαδείους ἐπονομάσαντες, ὁμοίως τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου Μενάνδρου κατὰ τὰς κωμῳδίας εἰςαγομένους οἰκέταις, Δάοις τε τισι καὶ Γέταις, οὐδὲν ἤγομένοις σφίσι πεπράξαθαι γενναίον, εἰ μὴ τρὶς ἐξαπατήσειαν τὸν δεσπότην, οὕτω καὶ αὐτοὶ κατὰ πολλὴν σχολὴν ἀναίσχυντα σοφίσματα συνέθεσαν, οἱ μὲν, ἵνα μηδ’ ὄλως ἔξελεγχθείη ποτ’ ||

68 Ἀσκληπιιώδης ψευδόμενος, οἱ δ’, ἵνα κακῶς εἰπωσίν, ἃ καλῶς ἐσιώτησεν Ἐρασιστρατος.

Ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν Ἀσκληπιαδείων ἄλις, οἱ δ’ Ἐρασιστράτειοι λέγειν ἐπιχειροῦντες, ὅτως οἱ νεφροὶ διηθοῦσι τὸ ὄνρον, ἀπαντά δρῶσι τε καὶ

1 cf. p. 87, note 3.

2 καύλην: the usual reading is κοιλίαν, which would make
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rarefied part [of the air],"¹ and when it was impossible without incurring the greatest derision to say that this superfluity [i.e. the urine] is generated by the kidneys as is bile by the canals in the liver— he, then, I say, clearly lied when he swore that the urine does not reach the kidneys, and maintained that it passes, in the form of vapour, straight from the region of the vena cava,² to collect in the bladder.

Like slaves, then, caught in the act of stealing, these two are quite bewildered, and while the one says nothing, the other indulges in shameless lying.

XVII

Now such of the younger men as have dignified themselves with the names of these two authorities by taking the appellations “Erasistrateans” or “Asclepiadeans” are like the Davi and Getae—the slaves introduced by the excellent Menander into his comedies. As these slaves held that they had done nothing fine unless they had cheated their master three times, so also the men I am discussing have taken their time over the construction of impudent sophisms, the one party striving to prevent the lies of Asclepiades from ever being refuted, and the other saying stupidly what Erasistratus had the sense to keep silence about.

But enough about the Asclepiadeans. The Erasistrateans, in attempting to say how the kidneys let the urine through, will do anything or suffer anything it “from the region of the alimentary canal.” cf. p. 118, note 1.
πάσχουσι καὶ παντοῖοι γίγνονται πίθανον ἐξευρεῖν τι ἕπτοντες αἴτιον ὀλκής μὴ δεόμενον.

Οἱ μὲν δὴ πλησίον Ἐρασιστράτου τοῖς χρόνοις γενόμενοι τὰ μὲν ἀνω τῶν νεφρῶν μόρια καθαρὸν αἷμα λαμβάνειν φασὶ, τῷ δὲ βάρῳ ἔχειν τὸ ύδατῶδες περίττωμα βρίθειν τε καὶ ὑπορρεῖν κάτω. διηθούμενον δὲ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τοὺς νεφροὺς αὐτοὺς χρήστον οὕτω γενόμενον ἀπασὶ τοῖς κάτω τῶν νεφρῶν ἐπιτέμπεσθαι τὸ αἷμα.

Καὶ μέχρι γέ τινος εὐδοκίμησεν ὡδὲ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡκμασε καὶ ἀληθῆς εὐμοίσθη· χρόνῳ δὲ ὑστερον καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς Ἐρασιστρατείοις ὑποπτος ἐφάνη καὶ τελευτώντες ἀπέστησαν αὐτῆς. αἰτεῖσθαι γὰρ ἑδόκουν δύο ταῦτα μήτε συγχωρούμενα πρὸς τινὸς ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἀποδειχθῆναι δυνάμενα, πρῶτον μὲν τὸ βάρος τῆς ὑρρόδους ύγρότητος ἐν τῇ κοίλῃ || φλέβι γενόμενον, ὡστερ οὖκ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχον, ὅποτ᾽ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας εἰς ἑπαρ ἀνεφέρετο. τι δὴ οὖν οὐκ εὐθὺς ἐν ἑκείνοις τοῖς χωρίοις ὑπέρρει κάτω; πῶς δ᾽ ἄν τῷ δόξειον εὐλόγως εἰρήσθαι συντελεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀνάδοσιν ἡ ὑδατῶδης υγρότης, εἴπερ οὕτως ἐστὶ βαρεῖα;

Δεύτερον δ᾽ ἀποτον, ὅτι καὶ κάτω συγχωρηθῇ φέρεσθαι πᾶσα καὶ μὴ κατ' ἄλλο χωρίον ἡ τῆς κοίλης φλέβα, τίνα τρόπον εἰς τοὺς νεφροὺς ἐμπεσεῖται, χαλεπῶν, μᾶλλον δ᾽ ἀδύνατον εἰπεῖν, μῆτ᾽ ἐν τοῖς κάτω μέρεσι κειμένων αὐτῶν τῆς φλεβὸς ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῶν πλαγίων μῆτ᾽ ἐμφυομένης εἰς αὐτοὺς τῆς κοίλης ἀλλ᾽ ἀπόφυσιν τινα μόνον
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or try any shift in order to find some plausible explanation which does not demand the principle of attraction.

Now those near the times of Erasistratus maintain that the parts above the kidneys receive pure blood, whilst the watery residue, being heavy, tends to run downwards; that this, after percolating through the kidneys themselves, is thus rendered serviceable, and is sent, as blood, to all the parts below the kidneys.

For a certain period at least this view also found favour and flourished, and was held to be true; after a time, however, it became suspect to the Erasistrateans themselves, and at last they abandoned it. For apparently the following two points were assumed, neither of which is conceded by anyone, nor is even capable of being proved. The first is the heaviness of the serous fluid, which was said to be produced in the vena cava, and which did not exist, apparently, at the beginning, when this fluid was being carried up from the stomach to the liver. Why, then, did it not at once run downwards when it was in these situations? And if the watery fluid is so heavy, what plausibility can anyone find in the statement that it assists in the process of anadosis?

In the second place there is this absurdity, that even if it be agreed that all the watery fluid does fall downwards, and only when it is in the vena cava, still it is difficult, or, rather, impossible, to say through what means it is going to fall into the kidneys, seeing that these are not situated below, but on either side of the vena cava, and that the vena cava is not inserted into them, but merely sends a branch.

1 Not at an earlier stage, when it is still on its way from the alimentary canal to the liver.  
2 i.e. a renal vein.
eis ἐκάτερον πεμπούσης, ὦσπερ καὶ εἰς τάλλα πάντα μόρια.

Τὸς οὖν ἡ διαδεξαμένη ταύτην δόξα καταγινωσθεῖσαν; ἔμοι μὲν ἡλιθιωτέρα μακρῶν φαίνεται τῆς προτέρας. ἤκμασε δ' οὖν καὶ αὐτὴ ποτε. φασὶ γὰρ, εἰ κατὰ τῆς γῆς ἐκχυθεῖσι μεμιγμένον ἑλαιον ὕδατι, διάφορον ἐκάτερον ὅδὸν βαδιεῖσθαι καὶ ῥυήσεσθαι τὸ μὲν τῆς, τὸ δὲ τῆς. θαυμαστὸν οὖν οὐδὲν εἰναί φασιν, εἰ τὸ μὲν ὕδατώδες ὕγρον εἰς τοὺς νεόφρους ἔρει, τὸ δὲ αἷμα διὰ τῆς κοίλης φέρεται κάτω. κατέγνωσται οὖν ἡδῆ καὶ ἡδη ἥ δόξα. διὰ τὸ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς κοίλης μυρίων ἐκπεφυκινων φλεβῶν αἷμα μὲν εἰς τὰς ἄλλας ἀπάσας, ἢ δ' ὀρρώδης ὑγρότης εἰς τὰς ἔπι τοὺς νεφρῶς φερομένας ἐκτρέπεται; τούτῳ αὐτὸ τὸ ἥττουμενον οὐκ εἰρήκασιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ γιγνόμενον εἰπόντες μόνον οἴονται τήν αἰτίαν ἀποδεδωκέναι.

Πάλιν οὖν, τὸ τρίτον τῷ σωτηρί, τῆν χειρίστην ἀπασῶν δόξαν ἐξευρημένην νῦν ὑπὸ Δάκου τοῦ Μακεδόνος, εὐδοκιμοῦσαν δὲ διὰ τὸ καίνον ἡδῆ λέγομεν. ἀπεφήνατο γὰρ δὴ ὁ Δάκος οὔτος, ὦσπερ εἰς ἀδυτοῦ τινὸς χρησμὸν ἀποφθεγμένος, περίττωμα τῆς τῶν νεφρῶν θρέψεως εἰναι τὸ οὐρον. ὅτι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ τὸ πινόμενον ἅπαν οὐρον γίγνεται, πλὴν εἰ τι μετὰ τῶν διαχωρημάτων ὑπῆλθεν ἢ εἰς ἱδρώτας ἀπεχώρησεν ἢ εἰς τὴν ἀδηλον διαπνοήν, ἐναργῶς ἐνδείκνυται τὸ πλήθος τῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἣμέραιν οὐρομένων. ἐν χειμώνι δὲ μάλιστα μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀργούντων μὲν, κωδωνιζομένων δὲ, καὶ μάλιστ' 71 εἰ λεπτὸς οὐδενὸς εἰη καὶ πόριμος. οὐροῦσι || γὰρ
into each of them, as it also does into all the other parts.

What doctrine, then, took the place of this one when it was condemned? One which to me seems far more foolish than the first, although it also flourished at one time. For they say, that if oil be mixed with water and poured upon the ground, each will take a different route, the one flowing this way and the other that, and that, therefore, it is not surprising that the watery fluid runs into the kidneys, while the blood falls downwards along the vena cava. Now this doctrine also stands already condemned. For why, of the countless veins which spring from the vena cava, should blood flow into all the others, and the serous fluid be diverted to those going to the kidneys? They have not answered the question which was asked; they merely state what happens and imagine they have thereby assigned the reason.

Once again, then (the third cup to the Saviour!), let us now speak of the worst doctrine of all, lately invented by Lycus of Macedonia, but which is popular owing to its novelty. This Lycus, then, maintains, as though uttering an oracle from the inner sanctuary, that urine is residual matter from the nutrition of the kidneys! Now, the amount of urine passed every day shows clearly that it is the whole of the fluid drunk which becomes urine, except for that which comes away with the dejections or passes off as sweat or insensible perspiration. This is most easily recognized in winter in those who are doing no work but are carousing, especially if the wine be thin and diffusible;

1 In a toast, the third cup was drunk to Zeus Sôtêr (the Saviour).
2 An anatomist of the Alexandrian school.
3 cf. nasal mucus, p. 90, note 1.
όπως διὰ ταχέως ὅλγου δεῖν, ὅσον περὶ καὶ πίνουσιν. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ὁ Ὑρασίστατος οὐτὸς ἐγνώσκεν, οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἄνεγνωκότες αὐτοῦ σύγγραμμα τῶν καθόλου λόγων ἔπιστανται. ὅσοθ' ὁ Δύκος οὕτ' ἀληθῆ φαίνεται λέγων οὕτ' Ὑρασιστάτεια, δῆλον δ' ὡς οὐδ' Ἀσκληπιάδεια, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον οὐδ' Ἰπποκράτεια. λευκῷ τοῖνυν κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἔοικε κόρακι μῷτ' αὐτοῦς τοῖς κόραξιν ἀναμιχθῆναι δυναμένοι διὰ τὴν χρόαν μῆτε ταῖς περιστεραῖς διὰ τὸ μέγεθος, ἀλλ' οὕτι ποῦ τοῦτον γ' ἑνεκα παροπτέος· ἵσως γὰρ τι λέγει ταυμαστὸν, ὁ μηδεὶς τῶν ἐμπροσθὲν ἔγγον.

Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀπαντά τὰ τρεφόμενα μόρια ποιεῖν τι περίττωμα συγχωρούμενον, τὸ δὲ τούς νεφροὺς μόνους, οὕτω σμικρὰ σώματα, χώας ὅλους τέταρας ἢ καὶ πλεῖους ἵσχειν ἐνίοτε περιττῶματος οὕθ' ὁμολογούμενον οὔτε λόγον ἔχου τὸ γὰρ ἐκάστου τῶν μειξόνων σπλάγχνων περίττωμα πλεῖον ἀναγκαῖον ὑπάρχειν. οἷον αὐτίκα τὸ τοῦ πνεύμονος, εἴπερ ἀνάλογον τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ σπλάγχνου γῆνοιτο, πολλαπλάσιον ἔσται δή, ποὺ τοῦ κατὰ τοὺς νεφρούς, ὅσθ' ὅλος μὲν ὁ θώραξ ἐμπλησθῆται, πυγησεῖται δ' αὐτίκα τὸ ἔοις. ἄλλ' εἰ ἵσων φῆσει τὴ γῆνεσθαι τὸ καθ' ἐκάστου τῶν ἄλλων μορίων περιττώμα, διὰ πολῶν κύστεων ἐκκρίνεται; εἰ γὰρ οἱ νεφροὶ τοῖς κωθωνιζομένοις τρεῖς ἢ τέταρας ἐνίοτε χώας ποιοῦσι περιττῶματος, ἐκάστου τῶν ἄλλων σπλάγχνων πολλῷ πλεῖον ἔσονται καὶ πίθου τινὸς οὕτω μεγίστου δεῖσει τοῦ δεξιομένου τὰ πάντων περιτ-

1 "Sur l'Ensemble des Choses" (Daremberg).
these people rapidly pass almost the same quantity as they drink. And that even Erasistratus was aware of this is known to those who have read the first book of his "General Principles." Thus Lycus is speaking neither good Erasistratism, nor good Asclepiadism, far less good Hippocratism. He is, therefore, as the saying is, like a white crow, which cannot mix with the genuine crows owing to its colour, nor with the pigeons owing to its size. For all this, however, he is not to be disregarded; he may, perhaps, be stating some wonderful truth, unknown to any of his predecessors.

Now it is agreed that all parts which are undergoing nutrition produce a certain amount of residue, but it is neither agreed nor is it likely, that the kidneys alone, small bodies as they are, could hold four whole congii, and sometimes even more, of residual matter. For this surplus must necessarily be greater in quantity in each of the larger viscera; thus, for example, that of the lung, if it corresponds in amount to the size of the viscus, will obviously be many times more than that in the kidneys, and thus the whole of the thorax will become filled, and the animal will be at once suffocated. But if it be said that the residual matter is equal in amount in each of the other parts, where are the bladders, one may ask, through which it is excreted? For, if the kidneys produce in drinkers three and sometimes four congii of superfluous matter, that of each of the other viscera will be much more, and thus an enormous barrel will be needed to contain the waste products of them all.

About twelve quarts. This is about five times as much as the average daily excretion, and could only be passed if a very large amount of wine were drunk.
τώματα. καίτοι πολλάκις, ὁσον ἐπὶ τις, ὀλγοὺν δὲν ὑρησεν ἀπαν, ὡς ἂν ἐτὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς φερο-μένου τοῦ πόματος ἄπαντος.

'Εσικεν οὖν ὁ τὸ τρίτον ἐξαπατῶν οὕτως οὐδὲν ἀνύειν ἀλλ' εὐθὺς γεγονέναι κατὰφωρος καὶ μένειν ἐτὶ τὸ ἔξ ἀρχῆς ἀπορον Ἐρασιστράτῳ τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄπασι πλὴν Ἰπποκράτους. διατρίβω δ' ἐκὼν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ σαφῶς εἰδῶς, ὅτι μηδὲν εἰπεῖν ἔχει μηδεὶς ἄλλος περὶ τῆς τῶν νεφρῶν ἐνεργείας, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίον ἢ τῶν μαγείρων ἀμαθεστέρους φαίνεσθαι μηδ' ὅτι διηθείται δ' αὐτῶν τὸ οὐρον ὁμολογοῦντας ἢ ἢ τούτο συγχωρήσαντας μηδὲν ἐτ' ἔχειν εἰπεῖν ἔτερον αἴτιον τῆς διακρίσεως πλὴν τῆς ὀλκῆς.

'Αλλ' εἰ μὴ τῶν οὐρών ἡ φορὰ τῇ πρῶς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθία γίγνεται, δήλον, ὡς οὐδ' ἡ τοῦ αἵματος οὐδ' ἡ τῆς χολῆς ἢ εἴπερ ἐκείνων καὶ τούτον. πάντα γὰρ ὡςαύτως ἀναγκαῖον ἐπιτε-λεῖσθαι καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ἐρασιστράτον.

Εἰρήσεται δ' ἐπὶ πλέον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ μετὰ τᾶτα γράμματι.
ON THE NATURAL FACULTIES, I. xvii

Yet one often urinates practically the same quantity as one has drunk, which would show that the whole of what one drinks goes to the kidneys.

Thus the author of this third piece of trickery would appear to have achieved nothing, but to have been at once detected, and there still remains the original difficulty which was insoluble by Erasistratus and by all others except Hippocrates. I dwell purposely on this topic, knowing well that nobody else has anything to say about the function of the kidneys, but that either we must prove more foolish than the very butchers¹ if we do not agree that the urine passes through the kidneys; or, if one acknowledges this, that then one cannot possibly give any other reason for the secretion than the principle of attraction.

Now, if the movement of urine does not depend on the tendency of a vacuum to become refilled,² it is clear that neither does that of the blood nor that of the bile; or if that of these latter does so, then so also does that of the former. For they must all be accomplished in one and the same way, even according to Erasistratus himself.

This matter, however, will be discussed more fully in the book following this.

BOOK II
"Οτι μεν ουν ἀναγκαῖον ἦστιν οὐκ Ἐρασιστράτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπασίν, ὡσοι μὲλλονσι περὶ διακρίσεως οὕρων ἐρείν τι χρηστόν, ὁμολογήσαι δύναμιν τιν' ὑπάρχειν τοῖς νεφροῖς ἐλκουσαν εἰς έαυτοὺς ποιότητα τοιαύτην, οἷα ἐν τοῖς οὕρωις ἐστὶ, διὰ τοῦ πρόσθεν ἐπιδεικταί γράμματος, ἀναμιμνησκόντων ἣμ' αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦθ' ἤμῶν, ὡς οὖν ἄλλως μὲν εἰς τὴν κύστίν φέρεται τὰ οὕρα διὰ τῶν νεφρῶν, ἄλλως δ' εἰς ἀπαντα τοῦ ζῶου τὰ μόρια τὸ αἷμα, κατ' ἄλλον δὲ τινα πρόπον ἡ ξανθή χολή διακρίνεται. ἐνακθείσης γὰρ ἐναργῶς ἐφ' ἐνὸς ὁ ὕποτοι ὀργάνου τῆς ἐλκτικῆς τε καὶ ἐπισταστικῆς ὀνωμαζομένης δυνάμεως οὐδὲν ἐτί χαλεποῦν ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μεταφέρειν αὐτήν· οὔ γὰρ δὴ τοῖς μὲν νεφροῖς ἡ φύσις ἐδωκέ τινα τοιαύτην δύναμιν, οὔχι δὲ γε καὶ τοῖς τὸ χολῶδες οὐρὸν ἐλκουσιν ἀγγείοις οὐδὲ τούτοις μὲν, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μορίων ἐκάστῳ. καὶ μὴν εἰ τοῦτ' ἀληθές ἦστι, θαυμάζειν χρῆ τοῦ Ἐρασιστράτου ψευδεῖς οὕτω λόγους ὑπὲρ ἀνα-

1 cf. p. 89. 2 This term is nowadays limited to the drawing action of a blister. cf. p. 223.
In the previous book we demonstrated that not only Erasistratus, but also all others who would say anything to the purpose about urinary secretion, must acknowledge that the kidneys possess some faculty which attracts to them this particular quality existing in the urine.¹ Besides this we drew attention to the fact that the urine is not carried through the kidneys into the bladder by one method, the blood into parts of the animal by another, and the yellow bile separated out on yet another principle. For when once there has been demonstrated in any one organ, the drawing, or so-called _epispastic_² faculty, there is then no difficulty in transferring it to the rest. Certainly Nature did not give a power such as this to the kidneys without giving it also to the vessels which abstract the biliary fluid,³ nor did she give it to the latter without also giving it to each of the other parts. And, assuredly, if this is true, we must marvel that Erasistratus should make statements concerning the delivery of nutriment from the food-canal⁴ which are

³ The radicles of the hepatic ducts in the liver were supposed to be the active agents in extracting bile from the blood. _cf._ pp. 145–149. ⁴ _Anadosis_; _cf._ p. 13, note 5.
δόσεως τροφῆς εἰπόντος, ὡς μηδ᾽ Ἀσκληπιάδην λαθεῖν. καίτοι γ’ οίεται παυτός μάλλον ἄληθές ὑπάρχειν, ὡς, εἴπερ ἐκ τῶν φλεβῶν ἀπορρέειν τι, δυοῖν ἑάτερον ἢ κενὸς ἐσται τόπος ἀθρώως ἢ τὸ συνεχές ἐπιρρυίζεται τὴν βάσιν ἀναπληροῦν τοῦ κενομένου. ἀλλ’ ὁ γ’ Ἀσκληπιάδης οὐ δυοῖν ἑάτερον φησιν, ἀλλὰ τριῶν ἐν τι χρὴνα λέγειν ἐπὶ τοῖς κενομένων ἀγγείοις ἐπεσθαι ἢ κενὸν ἀθρώως τόπον ἢ τὸ συνεχές ἄκολουθήσειν ἢ συσταλίσθησθαι τὸ ἀγγεῖον. ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν καλάμων καὶ τῶν αὐλίσκων τῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καθιεμένων ἄληθές εἰπτεῖν, ὅτι κενομένου τοῦ περιεχομένου κατὰ τὴν || εὐρυχωρίαν ἀυτὸν ἀέρος ἢ κενὸς ἀθρώως ἐσται τόπος ἢ ἄκολουθήσει τὸ συνεχές· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν φλεβῶν οὐκέτ’ ἐγχωρεῖ, δυναμένου δὴ τοῦ χυτῶνος αὐτῶν εἰς ἑαυτοῦ συνιζάνειν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καταπίπτει εἰς τὴν ἐντὸς εὐρυχωρίαν. οὕτω μὲν δὴ ἑσυδῆς ἢ περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενομένου ἄκολουθίας οὐκ ἀπόδειξις μᾶ Δίδεις ἐιπτομ’ ἄν ἀλλ’ ὑπόθεσις Ἐρασιστράτειος.

Καθ’ ἔτερον δ’ αὐτ ὑπόθυτον, εἰ καὶ ἄληθῆς εἰπεί, περιττῇ, τῆς μὲν κοιλίας ἐνθλίβειν ταῖς φλεψὶ δυναμένης, ὡς αὐτὸς ὑπέθετο, τῶν φλεβῶν δ’ αὐτ’ περιστέλλεσθαι τῷ ἐνυπάρχοντι καὶ προωθεῖν αὐτό. τὰ τε γὰρ ἀλλα καὶ πλῆθος οὐκ ἂν ἐν τῷ σώματι γένοιτο, τῇ πρὸς τὸ κενομένου ἄκολουθία μόνη τῆς ἀναδόσεως ἐπιτελουμένης. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἢ τῆς γαστρὸς ἐνθλίψις ἐκλύεται προϊόντα καὶ

1 The term κοιλία is used both specifically for the stomach proper and also (as probably here) in a somewhat wider sense for the stomach region, including the adjacent part of the small intestine; this was the part of the alimentary canal
so false as to be detected even by Asclepiades. Now, Erasistratus considers it absolutely certain that, if anything flows from the veins, one of two things must happen: either a completely empty space will result, or the contiguous quantum of fluid will run in and take the place of that which has been evacuated. Asclepiades, however, holds that not one of two, but one of three things must be said to result in the emptied vessels: either there will be an entirely empty space, or the contiguous portion will flow in, or the vessel will contract. For whereas, in the case of reeds and tubes it is true to say that, if these be submerged in water, and are emptied of the air which they contain in their lumens, then either a completely empty space will be left, or the contiguous portion will move onwards; in the case of veins this no longer holds, since their coats can collapse and so fall in upon the interior cavity. It may be seen, then, how false this hypothesis—by Zeus, I cannot call it a demonstration!—of Erasistratus is.

And, from another point of view, even if it were true, it is superfluous, if the stomach has the power of compressing the veins, as he himself supposed, and the veins again of contracting upon their contents and propelling them forwards. For, apart from other considerations, no plethora would ever take place in the body, if delivery of nutriment resulted merely from the tendency of a vacuum to become refilled. Now, if the compression of the stomach becomes weaker the further it goes, and cannot reach to an from which nutriment was believed to be absorbed by the mesenteric veins; cf. p. 309, note 2.

2 cf. p. 100, note 2; p. 167, note 2.
3 A characteristic “lesion” in Erasistratus’s pathology.
μέχρι παντὸς ἀδυνατὸς ἐστὶν ἐξικνεῖσθαι καὶ διὰ τούτ’ ἄλλης τινὸς δει τῇ χανής εἰς τὴν πάντη φοράν τοῦ αἵματος, ἀναγκαία μὲν ἢ πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθία προσεξεύρηται. πλήθος δ’ έν οὐδενὶ τῶν μεθ’ ἦπαρ ἔσται μορίων, ἥ, εἴπερ ἁρα, περὶ τὴν καρδίαν τε καὶ τὸν πνεύμονα. μόνη γὰρ αὕτη τῶν μεθ’ ἦπαρ εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτῆς κοιλίαν ἔλκει τὴν τροφήν, εἰτα διὰ τῆς φλεβῶς τῆς ἀρτηριώδους ἐκπέμπει τῷ πνεύμονι· τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων οὐδὲν οὐδ’ αὐτὸς ὁ ’Ερασίστρατος ἐκ καρδίας βουλεῖται τρέφεσθαι διὰ τὴν τῶν ύμένων ἐπίφυσιν. εἰ δὲ γ', ἵνα πλήθος γένηται, φυλάξομεν ἄχρι παντὸς τὴν ρώμην τῆς κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν ἐνθλίψεως, οὐδὲν ἐτὶ δεόμεθα τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθίας, μάλιστ’ εἰ καὶ τὴν τῶν φλεβῶν συγνοποιόμεθα περιστολὴν, ὡς αὐτ’ καὶ τούτ’ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἀρέσκει τῷ ’Ερασίστρατῳ.

II

'Αναμνηστέον οὖν αὕθις αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ βούληται, τῶν νεφρῶν καὶ λεκτέον, ὡς ἐλεγχος οὔτοι φανερώτατος ἀπάντων τῶν ἀποχωροῦντων τῆς ὀλκῆς. οὐδὲς γὰρ οὐδὲν οὔτε ἐπε τιθανόν, ἀλλ’ οὔτ’ ἐξευρέιν εἰχέ κατ’ οὖδένα τρόπον, ὡς

1 A certain subordinate place allowed to the horror vacui.
2 i.e. the parts to which the veins convey blood after it leaves the liver—second stage of anadosis; cf. p. 91, note 2; p. 13, note 5.
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indefinite distance, and if, therefore, there is need of some other mechanism to explain why the blood is conveyed in all directions, then the principle of the refilling of a vacuum may be looked on as a necessary addition;¹ there will not, however, be a plethora in any of the parts coming after the liver,² or, if there be, it will be in the region of the heart and lungs; for the heart alone of the parts which come after the liver draws the nutriment into its right ventricle, thereafter sending it through the arterioid vein ³ to the lungs (for Erasistratus himself will have it that, owing to the membranous excrescences,⁴ no other parts save the lungs receive nourishment from the heart). If, however, in order to explain how plethora comes about, we suppose the force of compression by the stomach to persist indefinitely, we have no further need of the principle of the refilling of a vacuum, especially if we assume contraction of the veins in addition—as is, again, agreeable to Erasistratus himself.

II

Let me draw his attention, then, once again, even if he does not wish it, to the kidneys, and let me state that these confute in the very clearest manner such people as object to the principle of attraction. Nobody has ever said anything plausible, nor, as we previously showed, has anyone been able to discover,

¹ What we now call the pulmonary artery. Galen believed that the right ventricle existed for the purpose of sending nutrient blood to the lungs.
² Lit. owing to the ongrowth (epiphysis) of membranes; he means the tricuspid valve; cf. p. 314, note 2; p. 321, note 4.
Ἐμπροσθεν ἐδείκνυμεν, ἔτερον αὐτιον οὖρων διακρίσεως, ἀλλ᾽ ἀναγκαῖον ἢ μαίνεσθαι δοκεῖν, εἰ 78 φήσαιμεν ἀτμοεὶ δῶς εἰς τὴν κύστιν οἷναι κο φύρον ἢ ἀσχημονεῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενοῦμενον ἀκολουθίας μνημονεύοντας, ληράδους μὲν οὕτως κατὶ τοῦ αἴματος, ἀδυνάτου δὲ καὶ ἣλιθίου παντάπασιν ἐπὶ τῶν οὖρων.

Ἐν μὲν δὴ τούτο σφάλμα τῶν ἀποστάντων τῆς ὀλκῆς: ἔτερον δὲ τὸ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ξανθῆν χολῆν διακρίσεως. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὔδ᾽ ἐκεῖ παραρρέοντος τοῦ αἴματος τὰ στόματα τῶν χοληδόχων ἀγγείων ἀκριβῶς διακριθῆσται τὸ χολῶδες περίττωμα. καὶ μὴ διακρινέσθω, φασίν, ἀλλὰ συναναφέρεσθω τῷ αἴματι πάντη τοῦ σώματος. ἀλλ᾽, ὁ σοφώτατος, προνοητικὴν τοῦ ξιφοῦ καὶ τεχνικὴν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος ὑπέθετο τὴν φυσιν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ χολῶδες ὑγρὸν ἄχρηστον εἶναι πανταπάσι τοῖς ξιφοῖς ἐφασκεν. οὐ συμβαίνει δ᾽ ἀλλήλοις ἀμφῶς ταῦτα. πῶς γὰρ ἄν ἔτι προνοεῖσθαι τοῦ ξιφοῦ δόξειν ἐπιτρέπουσα συναναφέρεσθαι τῷ αἴματι μοχθηροῦ οὕτω χυμῶν;

'Αλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν σμικρὰ τὸ δὲ μέγιστον καὶ σαφέστατον πάλιν ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἀμάρτημα καὶ δὴ φράσω. εὕπερ γὰρ δι᾽ οὐδὲν ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ὅτι παχύτερον 79 μὲν ἔστι τὸ αἷμα, λεπτότερα δ᾽ ἢ || ξανθῆ χολῆ καὶ τὰ μὲν τῶν φλεβῶν εὐρύτερα στόματα, τὰ
by any means, any other cause for the secretion of urine; we necessarily appear mad if we maintain that the urine passes into the kidneys in the form of vapour, and we certainly cut a poor figure when we talk about the tendency of a vacuum to become refilled;¹ this idea is foolish in the case of blood, and impossible, nay, perfectly nonsensical, in the case of the urine.²

This, then, is one blunder made by those who dissociate themselves from the principle of attraction. Another is that which they make about the secretion of yellow bile. For in this case, too, it is not a fact that when the blood runs past the mouths [stomata] of the bile-ducts there will be a thorough separation out [secretion] of biliary waste-matter. "Well," say they, "let us suppose that it is not secreted but carried with the blood all over the body." But, you sapient folk, Erasistratus himself supposed that Nature took thought for the animals' future, and was workmanlike in her method; and at the same time he maintained that the biliary fluid was useless in every way for the animals. Now these two things are incompatible. For how could Nature be still looked on as exercising forethought for the animal when she allowed a noxious humour such as this to be carried off and distributed with the blood? . . .

This, however, is a small matter. I shall again point out here the greatest and most obvious error. For if the yellow bile adjusts itself to the narrower vessels and stomata, and the blood to the wider ones, for no other reason than that blood is thicker and bile thinner, and that the stomata of the veins are

¹ Horror vacui. ² But Erasistratus had never upheld this in the case of urinary secretion. cf. p. 99.
This was the characteristically "anatomical" explanation of bile-secretion made by Erasistratus. cf. p. 170, note 2.
wider and those of the bile-ducts narrower, then it is clear that this watery and serous superfluity, too, will run out into the bile-ducts quicker than does the bile, exactly in proportion as it is thinner than the bile! How is it, then, that it does not run out? “Because,” it may be said, “urine is thicker than bile!” This was what one of our Erasistrateans ventured to say, herein clearly disregarding the evidence of his senses, although he had trusted these in the case of the bile and blood. For, if it be that we are to look on bile as thinner than blood because it runs more, then, since the serous residue passes through fine linen or lint or a sieve more easily even than does bile, by these tokens bile must also be thicker than the watery fluid. For here, again, there is no argument which will demonstrate that bile is thinner than the serous superfluities.

But when a man shamelessly goes on using circumlocutions, and never acknowledges when he has had a fall, he is like the amateur wrestlers, who, when they have been overthrown by the experts and are lying on their backs on the ground, so far from recognizing their fall, actually seize their victorious adversaries by the necks and prevent them from getting away, thus supposing themselves to be the winners!

Why, then, says Galen, does not urine, rather than bile, enter the bile-ducts? Urine, or, more exactly, blood-serum.
Δήρος οὖν μακρὸς ἄπασα πόρων ὑπόθεσις εἰς φυσικὴν ἐνέργειαν. εἰ μή γὰρ δύναμις τις σύμ-
φυτος ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὄργανων ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως εὔθυς ἐξ ἄρχης δοθεῖ, διαρκεῖν οὐ δυνήσται τὰ ζῶα, μὴ ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἀριθμὸν ἑτὼν ἀλλ' οὖδ' ἡμερῶν ὁλιγόστων· ἀνεπιτρόπευτα γὰρ ἔσαντες αὐτά καὶ τέχνης καὶ προνοίας ἔργα μόναις ταῖς τῶν ὑλῶν οἰκιζόμενα ῥοπαῖς, οὐδαμοῦ δυνάμεως οὕδεμας τῆς μὲν ἐλκούσης τὸ προσήκον ἐαυτῇ, τῆς δ' ἀπωθούσης τὸ ἀλλότριον, τῆς δ' ἀλλοιούσης τε καὶ προσφυούσης τὸ θρέψον, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως οὐκ ἄν εἴημεν καταγέλαστοι περί τε τῶν φυσικῶν ἐνεργειῶν διαλεγόμενοι καὶ πολὺ μάλλον ἐτί περὶ τῶν ψυχικῶν καὶ || συμπάσης γε τῆς ζωῆς.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ζῆν οὖν οὐδὲ διαμένειν οὐδενὶ τῶν ζῶων οὐδ' εἰς ἐλάχιστον χρόνον ἔσται δυνατὸν, εἰ τοσοῦτα κεκτημένον· εν ἕαυτῷ μόρια καὶ οὕτω διαφέροντα μήθ' ἐλκτικὴ τῶν οἰκείων χρῆσται δυνάμει μήτ' ἀποκριτικη τῶν ἀλλοτρίων μὴτ' ἀλλοιωτική τῶν θρεψόντων. καὶ μὴν εἰ ταύτας ἔχοιμεν, οὐδὲν ἐτί πόρων μικρῶν ἢ μεγάλων εἰς ύποθέσεως ἀναποδείκτων λαμβανομένων εἰς οὕρων καὶ χολῆς διάκρισιν δεόμεθα καὶ τινος ἐπικαίρων θέσεως, ἐν οὐ μόνω σωφρονεύειν ἐοικέν ὁ Ἐρασί-

1 Or ducts, canals, conduits, i.e. morphological factors.
2 Or artistic skill, "artistry." cf. Book I., chap. xii.
3 "Only"; cf. Introd., p. xxviii.
4 Note how Galen, although he has not yet clearly differ-
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Thus, every hypothesis of *channels*¹ as an explanation of natural functioning is perfect nonsense. For, if there were not *an inborn faculty* given by Nature to each one of the organs at the very beginning, then animals could not continue to live even for a few days, far less for the number of years which they actually do. For let us suppose they were under no guardianship, lacking in creative ingenuity² and forethought; let us suppose they were steered only by material forces,³ and not by any special *faculties* (the one attracting what is proper to it, another rejecting what is foreign, and yet another causing alteration and adhesion of the matter destined to nourish it); if we suppose this, I am sure it would be ridiculous for us to discuss natural, or, still more, psychical, activities—or, in fact, life as a whole.⁴

For there is not a single animal which could live or endure for the shortest time if, possessing within itself so many different parts, it did not employ faculties which were attractive of what is appropriate, eliminative of what is foreign, and alterative of what is destined for nutrition. On the other hand, if we have these faculties, we no longer need *channels*, little or big, resting on an unproven hypothesis, for explaining the secretion of urine and bile, and the conception of some favourable situation (in which point alone Erasistratus shows some common sense, since he does regard all the parts of the body as entiated physiological from physical processes (both are "natural") yet separates them definitely from the psychical. cf. p. 2, footnote. A psychical function or activity is, in Latin, *actio animalis* (from *anima* = psyche).
θήναι τὰ μόρια τοῦ σώματος ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως οἰόμενος.

'Αλλ' εἰ παρακολουθήσεις ἐαυτῷ φύσιν ὄνομάζουσι τεχνικῆν, εὐθὺς μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπαντᾷ καλῶς διαπλάσσασαν τε καὶ διαθείσαν τοῦ ξύῳ τὰ μόρια, μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην ἑνεργείαν, ὡς οὐδὲν ἔλειπεν, ἔτι προαγαγοῦσαν εἰς φῶς αὐτὸ σύν τισὶ δυνάμεσιν, ὅν ἀνευ ξῆν οὐκ ἡδύνατο, καὶ μετὰ ταύτα κατὰ βραχὺ προσαυξήσασαν ἄχρι τοῦ πρόποντος μεγέθους, οὐκ οἶδα πῶς ὑπομένει

82 πόρων σμικρότησιν || ἡ μεγέθεσιν ἡ τισιν ἄλλαις οὔτω ληφόδεσιν ὑποθέσεσι φυσικὰς ἑνεργείας ἐπιτρέπειν. ἡ γὰρ διαπλάττουσα τὰ μόρια φύσις ἐκεῖνη καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ προσαυξώσασα πάντως δῆποι δι' ὅλων αὐτῶν ἐκτείναται καὶ γὰρ ὅλα δι' ὅλων οὐκ ἔξωθεν μόνον αὐτὰ διαπλάττει τε καὶ 

τρέφει καὶ προσαύξει. Πραξιτέλης μὲν γὰρ ἡ 

Φειδίας ἡ τις ἄλλος ἀγαλματοποιῶς ἔξωθεν μόνον ἐκόψησεν τὰς ûλας, καθὰ καὶ ψαύσειν αὐτῶν ἡδύναντο, τὸ βάθος δὲ ἀκόσμητον καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ ἀτεχνὸν καὶ ἀπρονότον ἀπέλιπον, ὡς ἀν μὴ 

dυνάμεις κατελθεῖν εἰς αὐτὸ καὶ καταδύναι καὶ 

θυγεῖν ἀπάντων τῆς ûλης τῶν μερῶν. ἡ φύσις δ' 

οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ὀστὸν μέρος ἀπαν ὄστοιν 

ἀποτελεῖ, τὸ δὲ σαρκὸς σάρκα, τὸ δὲ πιμελῆς 

πιμελῆς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκαστὸν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν 

ἀψαυστὸν αὐτῇ μέρος οὐδ' ἀνεξέργαστον οὐδ' 

ἀκόσμητον. ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν κηρὸν ὁ Φειδίας οὐκ 

ἡδύνατο ποιεῖν ἔλεφαντα καὶ χρυσόν, ἀλλὰ οὐδὲ 

tῶν χρυσῶν κηρὸν· ἐκαστὸν γὰρ αὐτῶν μένον, οἶν 

ἦν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἔξωθεν μόνον ἡμφιεσµένον εἶδός τι
having been well and truly placed and shaped by Nature).

But let us suppose he remained true to his own statement that Nature is "artistic"—this Nature which, at the beginning, well and truly shaped and disposed all the parts of the animal,¹ and, after carrying out this function (for she left nothing undone), brought it forward to the light of day, endowed with certain faculties necessary for its very existence, and, thereafter, gradually increased it until it reached its due size. If he argued consistently on this principle, I fail to see how he can continue to refer natural functions to the smallness or largeness of canals, or to any other similarly absurd hypothesis. For this Nature which shapes and gradually adds to the parts is most certainly extended throughout their whole substance. Yes indeed, she shapes and nourishes and increases them through and through, not on the outside only. For Praxiteles and Phidias and all the other statuaries used merely to decorate their material on the outside, in so far as they were able to touch it; but its inner parts they left unembellished, unwrought, unaffected by art or forethought, since they were unable to penetrate therein and to reach and handle all portions of the material. It is not so, however, with Nature. Every part of a bone she makes bone, every part of the flesh she makes flesh, and so with fat and all the rest; there is no part which she has not touched, elaborated, and embellished. Phidias, on the other hand, could not turn wax into ivory and gold, nor yet gold into wax: for each of these remains as it was at the commencement, and becomes a perfect statue

¹ The stage of organogenesis or diaplasia; cf. p. 25, note 4.
98 καὶ σχῆμα τεχνικὸν, ἄγαλμα τέλειον || γέγονεν. ἡ φύσις δ’ οὐδεμιᾶς ἔτι φυλάττει τῶν ὑλῶν τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἰδέαν· αἷμα γὰρ ἄν ἢν οὕτως ἀπαντᾷ τοῦ ζῴου τὰ μόρια, τὸ παρὰ τῆς κνουσῆς ἐπιρρέον τῷ σπέρματι, δίκην κηροῦ τινὸς ὑλή μία καὶ μονοειδὴς ὑποβεβλημένη τῷ τεχνίτῃ. γίγνεται δ’ εξ αὐτῆς οὐδὲν τῶν τοῦ ζῴου μορίων οὔτ’ ἑρυθρῶν οὔτως οὔθ’ ύγρῶν. ὡστούν γὰρ καὶ ἄρτηρια καὶ φλέψ καὶ νεῦρον καὶ χόνδρος καὶ πιμελή καὶ ἀδην καὶ ὑμῆν καὶ μυελὸς ἀναίμα μέν, εὲς αἵματος δὲ γέγονεν.

Τίνος ἀλλοιώσαντος καὶ τίνος τιςαντος καὶ τίνος διαπλάσαντος ἐδεόμην ἃν μοι τῶν Ἐρασίστρατον αὐτῶν ἀποκρίνασθαι. πάντως γὰρ ἂν εἶπεν ἢτοι τῆν φύσιν ἡ τὸ σπέρμα, ταῦτα μὲν λέγων καθ’ ἐκάτερον, διαφόροις δ’ ἐπινοίαις ἐρμηνεύων· δ’ ἡ γὰρ ἡν πρότερον σπέρμα, τοῦτ’ ὅταν ἄρετι ταύτη σφέν τε καὶ διαπλάττειν τὸ ζῷον, φύσις τις γίγνεται. καθάπερ γὰρ ο Φειδίας εἰχε μὲν τας δυνάμεις τῆς τέχνης καὶ πρὶν ψανειν τῆς ὑλῆς, ἐνίργει δ’ αὐταῖς περὶ τῆς ὑλῆν—ἐάπσα γὰρ δύναμις ἀργεὶ ἀποροῦσα τῆς οἰκείας ὑλῆς—, οὔτω καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τὰμ μὲν δυνάμεις οἰκοθεν ἑκέκτητο, τὰς δ’ ἐνεργείας οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ὑλῆς ἔλαβεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ὑλῆν ἐπεδείξατο.

Καὶ μὴν εἰ πολλῷ μὲν ἐπικλῦσοι τῷ αἷματι τὸ σπέρμα, διαφθείροιτ’ ἀν’ εἰ δ’ ὅλως ἀποροιή

1 The spermatozoon now becomes an "organism" proper.
2 Galen attributed to the sperma or semen what we should
simply by being clothed externally in a form and artificial shape. But Nature does not preserve the original character of any kind of matter; if she did so, then all parts of the animal would be blood—that blood, namely, which flows to the semen from the impregnated female and which is, so to speak, like the statuary's wax, a single uniform matter, subjected to the artificer. From this blood there arises no part of the animal which is as red and moist [as blood is], for bone, artery, vein, nerve, cartilage, fat, gland, membrane, and marrow are not blood, though they arise from it.

I would then ask Erasistratus himself to inform me what the altering, coagulating, and shaping agent is. He would doubtless say, "Either Nature or the semen," meaning the same thing in both cases, but explaining it by different devices. For that which was previously semen, when it begins to procreate and to shape the animal, becomes, so to say, a special nature. For in the same way that Phidias possessed the faculties of his art even before touching his material, and then activated these in connection with this material (for every faculty remains inoperative in the absence of its proper material), so it is with the semen: its faculties it possessed from the beginning, while its activities it does not receive from its material, but it manifests them in connection therewith.

And, of course, if it were to be overwhelmed with a great quantity of blood, it would perish, while if it were to be entirely deprived of blood to the fertilized ovum: to him the maternal contribution is purely passive—mere food for the sperm. The epoch-making Ovum Theory was not developed till the seventeenth century.

cf. p. 19, note 3.
pantápasin árgodn, óuk án yénoito fúsis. Ín' óun múte fheírhtai kai yénohtai fúsis antí spérmatos, ólýon épirreí anagkaíon au'tí toú aímatos, mállon d' óuk ólýon légein chrí, allá sýmmetron tò plýthei toú spérmatos. Tíz oún ó metróv aútò toú poóv tís épperhí; tís ó kowlwv lénavi pléon; tís ó prottrépov, 'ín évde-ésteron mh' ýh; tìna xhtrhsmen éntauða trítov épiostáthn tòv xwrou tís yenésews, ds xorhynhs ei tò spérmati tò sýmmetron aíma; ti án éipten 'Erassístratos, ei xwv taw' hrótpírh; tò spérmma aútò dhlynnót: toútó grár éstiv ó tevntíthi ó ána- logwv tòv Æidía, tò d' aíma tòv khrwd prosoókeve.

Oúkou prèpei tòv khr̄on aútòn éaútw tò métrnov èxeurískein, allá tòv Æidían. Êlxei dh' tosóúton aímatos ó tevntíthi eis éaúton, ópòsou ðéítai. Allí' év||taudha chrí prosoéchein ḣdí tòv noúv kai skopein, mh' pòs laðwmen tò spérmati logismwv tìna kai noúv chrísamenvoi óútow grár án oútè spérmma poíhsaimen oútè fúsiv allí' ḣdí xwov aútò. Kai mh' eí fylákzomen wmfótera, tihn th' ólkhv tòv sýmmetron kai tò chrís logismwv, dúnamin tìna, katháper h lódos éltkikh évìche tòv súdhrò, kai tò spérmati fhsómven útpárkhv aímatos épistástikhvn. ḳnagkásthmen oún páviv kántaúth, katháter ḣdí pòllákis émprouseve, éltkikh tìna dúnamin ómologhísa káta tò spérmma.

1 i.e. we should be talking psychology, not biology; cf. stomach, p. 307, note 3.
2 Attraction now described not merely as qualitative but also as quantitative. cf. p. 85, note 3.
it would remain inoperative and would not turn into a *nature*. Therefore, in order that it may not perish, but may become a *nature* in place of semen, there must be an afflux to it of a little blood—or, rather, one should not say a little, but a quantity commensurate with that of the semen. What is it then that measures the quantity of this afflux? What prevents more from coming? What ensures against a deficiency? What is this third overseer of animal generation that we are to look for, which will furnish the semen with a due amount of blood? What would Erasistratus have said if he had been alive, and had been asked this question? Obviously, the semen itself. This, in fact, is the artificer analogous with Phidias, whilst the blood corresponds to the statuary's wax.

Now, it is not for the wax to discover for itself how much of it is required; that is the business of Phidias. Accordingly the artificer will draw to itself as much blood as it needs. Here, however, we must pay attention and take care not unwittingly to credit the semen with reason and intelligence; if we were to do this, we would be making neither semen nor a nature, but an actual living animal. And if we retain these two principles—that of proportionate attraction and that of the non-participation of intelligence—we shall ascribe to the semen a faculty for attracting blood similar to that possessed by the lodestone for iron. Here, then, again, in the case of the semen, as in so many previous instances, we have been compelled to acknowledge some kind of attractive faculty.

3 He still tends either to biologize physics, or to physicize biology—whichever way we prefer to look at it. cf. Book I., chap. xiv.
Aristotelian and Stoic duality of an active and a passive principle.

Note that early embryonic development is described as a process of nutrition. cf. p. 130, note 2.
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And what is the semen? Clearly the active principle of the animal, the material principle being the menstrual blood. Next, seeing that the active principle employs this faculty primarily, therefore, in order that any one of the things fashioned by it may come into existence, it [the principle] must necessarily be possessed of its own faculty. How, then, was Erasistratus unaware of it, if the primary function of the semen be to draw to itself a due proportion of blood? Now, this fluid would be in due proportion if it were so thin and vaporous, that, as soon as it was drawn like dew into every part of the semen, it would everywhere cease to display its own particular character; for so the semen will easily dominate and quickly assimilate it—in fact, will use it as food. It will then, I imagine, draw to itself a second and a third quantum, and thus by feeding it acquires for itself considerable bulk and quantity. In fact, the alterative faculty has now been discovered as well, although about this also Erasistratus has not written a word. And, thirdly the shaping faculty will become evident, by virtue of which the semen firstly surrounds itself with a thin membrane like a kind of superficial condensation; this is what was described by Hippocrates in the sixth-day birth, which, according to his statement, fell from the singing-girl and resembled the pellicle of an egg. And following this all the other stages will occur, such as are described by him in his work "On the Child's Nature."

But if each of the parts formed were to remain as small as when it first came into existence, of what use would that be? They have, then, to grow.

3 On the alterative and shaping faculties cf. p. 18, note 1.
αὐξηθήσεται; πάντη διατεινόμενα θ' ἀμα καὶ τρεφόμενα. καὶ μοι τῶν ἐμπροσθεν εἰρημένων ἐπὶ τῆς κύστεως, ἤν οἱ παῖδες ἐμφυσώντες ἔτριβον, ἀναμιμηθεὶς μαθῆσῃ μᾶλλον ἡκάκ τῶν νόν ῥήθησομένων.

'Εννόησον γὰρ δὴ τὴν καρδίαν οὕτω μὲν μικρὰν εἶναι κατ' ἀρχὰς, ώς κένχρου μηδὲν διαφέρειν ἢ, εἰ βούλει, κυμάων, καὶ ξῆτησον, ὅπως ἀν ἄλλως αὕτη γένοιτο μεγάλη χωρίς τοῦ πάντη διατεινομένην τρέφον; δι' ὅλης ἐαυτῆς, ὡς ὅλης πρόσθεν ἐδείκνυτο τὸ σπέρμα τρεφόμενον. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦτ' Ἐρασίστρατος οἶδεν ὅ τιν τῇ τεχνῇ τῆς φύσεως ὑμνῶν, ἀλλ' οὕτως αὐξάνεσθαι τὰ ξοὸν νομίζει καθάπερ τῶν κρησέραν ἢ σειρὰν ἢ σάκκον ἢ τάλαρον, ὅπως ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὸ πέρας ἐπιπλέκομενῶν ὰμοίων ἐτέρως τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς αὐτὰ συντηθεῖσιν ἢ πρόσθεσις γίγνεται.

'Αλλὰ τούτῳ γ' οὐκ αὐξησίς ἔστιν ἀλλὰ γένεσις, ὦ σοφώτατε γίγνεται γὰρ ὁ θύλακος ἐπὶ καὶ ὁ σάκκος καὶ θοιμάτιον καὶ ἡ οἰκία καὶ τὸ πλοῦτον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκαστὸν, ὅταν μηδέπω τὸ προσήκον εἰδος, οὐ χάριν ὑπὸ τοῦτον ἐννομουργεῖται, συμπεπληρωμένον ἢ. πότ' οὐν αὐξάνεται; ὅταν ἦδη τέλειος ὅ ὁ τάλαρος, ὡς ἐχεῖν πυθμένα τέ τινα καὶ στόμα καὶ οἶον γαστέρα καὶ τὰ τούτων μεταξύ, μείζων ἀπασὶ τούτως γένηται. καὶ πῶς ἢ ἐσται τούτῳ; φίλεις τις. πῶς δ' ἄλλως ἢ εἰ ξῷον ἐξαισφῆς ἢ φυτὸν ὁ τάλαρος ἡμῖν γένοιτο; μόνων γὰρ τῶν ξώντων ἡ αὐξησίς. σὺ δ' ἴσως οἴει τὴν οἰκίαν οἰκοδομουμένην αὐξάνε-
Now, how will they grow? By becoming extended in all directions and at the same time receiving nourishment. And if you will recall what I previously said about the bladder which the children blew up and rubbed,¹ you will also understand my meaning better as expressed in what I am now about to say.

Imagine the heart to be, at the beginning, so small as to differ in no respect from a millet-seed, or, if you will, a bean; and consider how otherwise it is to become large than by being extended in all directions and acquiring nourishment throughout its whole substance, in the way that, as I showed a short while ago, the semen is nourished. But even this was unknown to Erasistratus—the man who sings the artistic skill of Nature! He imagines that animals grow like webs, ropes, sacks, or baskets, each of which has, woven on to its end or margin, other material similar to that of which it was originally composed.

But this, most sapient sir, is not growth, but genesis! For a bag, sack, garment, house, ship, or the like is said to be still coming into existence [undergoing genesis] so long as the appropriate form for the sake of which it is being constructed by the artificer is still incomplete. Then, when does it grow? Only when the basket, being complete, with a bottom, a mouth, and a belly, as it were, as well as the intermediate parts, now becomes larger in all these respects. “And how can this happen?” someone will ask. Only by our basket suddenly becoming an animal or a plant; for growth belongs to living things alone. Possibly you imagine that a house grows when it is being built, or a basket when being

¹ pp. 27-29.
σθαί καὶ τὸν τάλαρον πλεκόμενον καὶ θοιμάτιον ύφαινόμενον. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥδ' ἔχει· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἡ ἀφιερωμένοι κατὰ τὸ εἰδὸς ἡ αὐξήσις, τοῦ δ' ἐτι γινομένου ἢ εἰς τὸ εἰδὸς ὁδὸς οὐκ αὐξήσις ἀλλὰ γένεσις ὀνομάζεται. αὐξάνεται μὲν γὰρ τὸ ὄν, γίγνεται δὲ τὸ οὕκ ὄν.

IV

Καὶ ταῦτ' Ἕρασίστρατος οὐκ οἴδειν, ὅπερ οὖν λαμβάνει, εἴπερ ὄλως ἀληθεύοντι οἱ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ φάσκοντες ὁμιλήκεναι τοῖς ἔκ τοῦ περιπάτου φιλοσόφων αὐτῶν. ἄχρι μὲν οὖν τού τῆς φύσις ὑμνεῖν ὡς τεχνικὴν κἀγώ γνωρίζω τὰ τοῦ περιπάτου δόγματα, τῶν δ' ἅλλων οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἐγγύς. εἰ γὰρ τὶς ὁμιλήσεις τοῖς Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου γράμμασι, τῆς Ἰπποκράτους ἂν αὐτὰ δόξεις φυσιολογίας ὑπομνήματα συγκεῖσθαι, τὸ θερμὸν καὶ τὸ ψυχρὸν καὶ τὸ ἄγρον εἰς ἅλληλα δρῶντα καὶ πάσχοντα καὶ τοῦτον αὐτῶν δραστικώτατον μὲν τὸ θερμὸν, δεύτερον δὲ τῇ δυνάμει τὸ ψυχρὸν Ἰπποκράτους ταῦτα σύμπαντα πρῶτον, δεύτερου δ' Ἀριστοτέλους εἰπόντος. τρέφεσθαι δὲ δι' ὅλων αὐτῶν τὰ τρεφόμενα καὶ κεράννυσθαι δι' ὅλων τὰ κεραννύμενα καὶ ἄλλους offenses δι' ὅλων τὰ ἄλλους offenses, καὶ ταῦθ' Ἰπποκράτεια θ' ἀμα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλεια. καὶ τὴν πέψιν ἠλλοώσιν τιν' 1 cf. Introduction, p. xxvi. 2 cf. p. 15.
plaited, or a garment when being woven? It is not so, however. Growth belongs to that which has already been completed in respect to its form, whereas the process by which that which is still becoming attains its form is termed not growth but genesis. That which is, grows, while that which is not, becomes.

IV

This also was unknown to Erasistratus, whom nothing escaped, if his followers speak in any way truly in maintaining that he was familiar with the Peripatetic philosophers. Now, in so far as he acclaims Nature as being an artist in construction, even I recognize the Peripatetic teachings, but in other respects he does not come near them. For if anyone will make himself acquainted with the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, these will appear to him to consist of commentaries on the Nature-lore [physiology]¹ of Hippocrates—according to which the principles of heat, cold, dryness and moisture act upon and are acted upon by one another, the hot principle being the most active, and the cold coming next to it in power; all this was stated in the first place by Hippocrates and secondly by Aristotle.² Further, it is at once the Hippocratic and the Aristotelian teaching that the parts which are being nourished receive that nourishment throughout their whole substance, and that, similarly, processes of mingling and alteration involve the entire substance.³ Moreover, that digestion is a species of

³ For definitions of alteration and mingling (crasis, "temperament") cf. Book I., chaps. ii. and iii.
ГАЛЕН

υπάρχειν καὶ μεταβολὴν τοῦ τρέφοντος εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν τοῦ τρεφομένου ποιότητα, τὴν δ’ ἐξαι-μάτωσιν ἀλλοίωσιν εἶναι καὶ τὴν θρέψιν ώσαύτως καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν ἐκ τῆς πάντη διατάσεως καὶ θρέψεως γίγνεσθαι, τὴν δ’ ἀλλοίωσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ θερμοῦ μάλιστα συντελεῖσθαι καὶ διὰ τούτο καὶ τὴν πέψιν καὶ τὴν θρέψιν καὶ τὴν τῶν χυμῶν ἀπώπτων γένεσιν, ἥδη δὲ καὶ τοῖς περιττώμασι τὰς ποιότητας ὑπὸ τῆς ἐμφύτου θερμασίας ἐγγί-γνεσθαι, ταῦτα σύμπαντα καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐτερα πολλά τὰ τε τῶν προειρήμενων δυνάμεων καὶ τὰ || τῶν νοσημάτων τῆς γενέσεως καὶ τὰ τῶν ιαμάτων τῆς εὐρέσεως Ἰπποκράτης μὲν πρῶτος ἀπώπτων ὅν ἱσμεν ὀρθῶς εἰπέν, Ὀριστοτέλης δὲ δεύτερος ὀρθῶς ἐξηγήσατο. καὶ μὴν εἰ ταῦτα σύμπαντα τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου δοκεῖ, καθάπερ οὐν δοκεῖ, μηδὲν δ’ αὐτῶν ἀρέσκει τῷ Ἐρασιστράτῳ, τί ποτε βούλεται τοῖς Ἐρασιστρατείοις ἡ προς τοὺς φιλοσόφους ἐκείνους τοῦ τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν ἡγεμόνος ὁμιλία; θαναμάζουσι μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὡς θεόν καὶ πάντ’ ἀληθεύειν νομίζουσιν. εἰ δ’ οὗτος ἔχει ταῦτα, παμπολὺ δήποτε τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσφάλθαι χρή νομίζειν τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου φιλοσόφους, οἷς μηδὲν δ’ Ἐρασι-στρατος ὑπελάμβανεν ἀρέσκει. καὶ μὴν ὡσπερ τιν’ ευγένειαν αὐτῷ τῆς φυσιολογίας τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἀνδρὰς ἐκείνους συνοπτίσαν ἐκπορίζουσι.

Πάλιν οὖν ἀναστρέψωμεν τὸν λόγον ἐτέρως ὡς ὀλίγως πρόσθεν ἐτύχομεν εἰπόντες. εἰπέρ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου καλῶς ἐφυσιολογήσαν, οὔτε δὲν ἐν εἰς ἁπρωδέστερον Ἐρασιστράτου καὶ δίδωμι τοῖς Ἐρασιστρατείοις αὐτοῖς τὴν αἴρεσιν.
alteration—a transmutation of the nutriment into the proper quality of the thing receiving it; that blood-production also is an alteration, and nutrition as well; that growth results from extension in all directions, combined with nutrition; that alteration is effected mainly by the warm principle, and that therefore digestion, nutrition, and the generation of the various humours, as well as the qualities of the surplus substances, result from the innate heat;¹ all these and many other points besides in regard to the aforesaid faculties, the origin of diseases, and the discovery of remedies, were correctly stated first by Hippocrates of all writers whom we know, and were in the second place correctly expounded by Aristotle. Now, if all these views meet with the approval of the Peripatetics, as they undoubtedly do, and if none of them satisfy Erasistratus, what can the Erasistrateans possibly mean by claiming that their leader was associated with these philosophers? The fact is, they revere him as a god, and think that everything he says is true. If this be so, then we must suppose the Peripatetics to have strayed very far from truth, since they approve of none of the ideas of Erasistratus. And, indeed, the disciples of the latter produce his connection with the Peripatetics in order to furnish his Nature-lore with a respectable pedigree.

Now, let us reverse our argument and put it in a different way from that which we have just employed. For if the Peripatetics were correct in their teaching about Nature, there could be nothing more absurd than the contentions of Erasistratus. And, I will leave it to the Erasistrateans themselves to decide;

¹ i.e. are associated with oxidation? cf. p. 41, note 3.
91 ἣ γὰρ τὸν πρῶτον λόγον ἡ τούτον || προσήσονται. λέγει δ’ ὁ μὲν πρῶτος οὐδὲν ὀρθῶς ἐγνωκέναι περὶ φύσεως τούς περιπατητικούς, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος 'Ερασίστρατον. ἐμὸν μὲν οὖν ὑπομνήσας τῶν δογμάτων τὴν μάχην, ἐκεῖνων δ’ ἡ αἵρεσις.

'Αλλ’ οὐκ ἂν ἀποσταίην τοῦ θαυμάζειν 'Ερασίστρατον· οὐκοῦν σιωπᾶτοσαν περὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου φιλοσοφών. παμπόλλων γὰρ ὁντων δογμάτων φυσικῶν περὶ τε γένεσιν καὶ φθοράν τῶν ξών καὶ υγείαιν καὶ νόσους καὶ τὰς θεραπείας αὐτῶν ἐν μόνον εὑρεθῆσεται ταύτῶν 'Ερασίστράτῳ κάκεινοι τοῖς ἀνδράσι, τὸ τινος ἕνεκα πάντα ποιεῖν τὴν φύσιν καὶ μάθην μηδέν.

'Αλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τούτο μέχρι λόγου κοινῶν, ἔργῳ δὲ μυρίακις 'Ερασίστρατος αὐτὸ διαφθείρει· μάτην μὲν γὰρ ὁ στηλὴν ἐγένετο, μάτην δὲ τὸ ἐπίπλουν, μάτην δ’ αἱ εἰς τοὺς νεφροὺς ἀρτηρίαι καταφυόμεναι, σχεδὸν ἀπασῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης ἀρτηρίας ἀποβλαστανοῦσῶν οὐσαί μέγισται, μάτην δ’ ἄλλα μυρία κατὰ γε τοῦ 'Ερασίστράτειον λόγον: ἀπερ εἰ μὲν οὐδ’ ἄλως γυνώσκει, βραχεῖ μαγείρου σοφώτερος ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς ἀνατομαῖς, εἰ δ’ εἰδὼς οὐ λέγει τὴν χρείαν

92 αὐτῶν, οἷται || δηλοῦντι παραπλησίως τῷ σπλήνι μάτην, αὐτὰ γεγονέναι. καίτοι τι ταῦτ’ ἐπεξ- ἔρχομαι τῆς περὶ χρείας μορίων πραγματείας διότι μελλούσης ἢμῖν ἰδίᾳ περαίνεσθαι;

1 "Useless" organs; cf. p. 56, note 2. For fallacy of Erasistratus's view on the spleen v. p. 205.
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they must either advance the one proposition or the other. According to the former one the Peripatetics had no accurate acquaintance with Nature, and according to the second, Erasistratus. It is my task, then, to point out the opposition between the two doctrines, and theirs to make the choice. . . .

But they certainly will not abandon their reverence for Erasistratus. Very well, then; let them stop talking about the Peripatetic philosophers. For among the numerous physiological teachings regarding the genesis and destruction of animals, their health, their diseases, and the methods of treating these, there will be found one only which is common to Erasistratus and the Peripatetics—namely, the view that Nature does everything for some purpose, and nothing in vain.

But even as regards this doctrine their agreement is only verbal; in practice Erasistratus makes havoc of it a thousand times over. For, according to him, the spleen was made for no purpose, as also the omentum; similarly, too, the arteries which are inserted into kidneys—although these are practically the largest of all those that spring from the great artery [aorta]! And to judge by the Erasistratean argument, there must be countless other useless structures; for, if he knows nothing at all about these structures, he has little more anatomical knowledge than a butcher, while, if he is acquainted with them and yet does not state their use, he clearly imagines that they were made for no purpose, like the spleen. Why, however, should I discuss these structures fully, belonging as they do to the treatise "On the Use of Parts," which I am personally about to complete?
The Stoics. Aristotelians. Aristotle regarded the qualitative differences apprehended by our senses (the cold, the warm, the moist, and the dry) as fundamental, while the Stoics held the four corporeal elements.
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Let us, then, sum up again this same argument, and, having said a few words more in answer to the Erasistrateans, proceed to our next topic. The fact is, these people seem to me to have read none of Aristotle's writings, but to have heard from others how great an authority he was on "Nature," and that those of the Porch follow in the steps of his Nature-lore; apparently they then discovered a single one of the current ideas which is common to Aristotle and Erasistratus, and made up some story of a connection between Erasistratus and these people. That Erasistratus, however, has no share in the Nature-lore of Aristotle is shown by an enumeration of the aforesaid doctrines, which emanated first from Hippocrates, secondly from Aristotle, thirdly from the Stoics (with a single modification, namely, that for them the qualities are bodies).

Perhaps, however, they will maintain that it was in the matter of logic that Erasistratus associated himself with the Peripatetic philosophers? Here they show ignorance of the fact that these philosophers never brought forward false or inconclusive arguments, while the Erasistratean books are full of them.

So perhaps somebody may already be asking, in some surprise, what possessed Erasistratus that he turned so completely from the doctrines of Hippocrates, and why it is that he takes away the attractive faculty from the biliary passages in the liver—for we have sufficiently discussed the kidneys—alleging [as the cause of bile-secretion] a favourable situation, the narrowness of vessels, and a

(earth, air, fire, and water) to be still more fundamental.

cf. p. 8, note 3.  
^4 Lit. bile-receiving (choledochous).
στενότητα καὶ χώραν τινὰ κοινὴν, εἰς ἐν παρ-
ἀγουσι μὲν αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πυλῶν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον αἷμα,
μεταλαμβάνουσι δὲ πρότεροι μὲν οἱ πόροι τὴν
χολήν, δεύτεραι δ’ αἱ ἀπὸ τῆς κοίλης φλεβῶς
tὸ καθαρὸν αἷμα. πρὸς γὰρ τῷ μηδὲν ἀν βλα-
βήναι τὴν ὀλκὴν εἰπὼν ἄλλων μυρίων ἐμελλεν
ἀμφισβήτουμένων ἀπαλλάξεσθαι λόγων.

V

'Ως νῦν γε πόλεμος οὐ σμικρός ἐστι τοῖς
Ἐρασιστρατεύοις οὐ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους μόνον
ἄλλα καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλους, οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ὅπως
ἐξηγήσωνται τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν καθόλου

94 λόγων λέξιν, ἐν ᾗ φησὶν. "Εἰς τὸ || αὐτὸ δ’ ἀνε-
στομωμένων ἐτέρων δύο ἄγγειῶν τῶν τ’ ἐπὶ τὴν
χοληδόχον τεινόντων καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίλην
φλέβα συμβαίνει τῆς ἀναφερομένης ἐκ τῆς
κοιλίας τροφῆς τὰ ἐναρμόζοντα ἐκατέροις τῶν
στομάτων εἰς ἐκάστηρα τῶν ἄγγειων μετα-
λαμβάνουσαι καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν χοληδόχον
φέροντα, τὰ δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν κοίλην φλέβα περαιοῦ-
σθαι." τὸ γὰρ "εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ἀνεστομωμενῶν,"
ὁ κατ’ ἀρχὰς τῆς λέξεως γέγραπται, τί ποτε χρή
νοῆσαι, χαλεπῶν εἰπεῖν. ήτοι γὰρ οὕτως εἰς
ταὐτόν, ὡστε τῷ τῆς ἐν τοῖς σίμων φλεβὸς
πέρατι συναπτεῖν δύο ἐτερα πέρατα, τὸ τ’ ἐν τοῖς

1 Jecoris portae, the transverse fissure, by which the portal
vein enters the liver.
common space into which the veins from the gateway [of the liver] conduct the unpurified blood, and from which, in the first place, the [biliary] passages take over the bile, and secondly, the [branches] of the vena cava take over the purified blood. For it would not only have done him no harm to have mentioned the idea of attraction, but he would thereby have been able to get rid of countless other disputed questions.

V

At the actual moment, however, the Erasistrateans are engaged in a considerable battle, not only with others but also amongst themselves, and so they cannot explain the passage from the first book of the "General Principles," in which Erasistratus says, "Since there are two kinds of vessels opening at the same place, the one kind extending to the gall-bladder and the other to the vena cava, the result is that, of the nutriment carried up from the alimentary canal, that part which fits both kinds of stomata is received into both kinds of vessels, some being carried into the gall-bladder, and the rest passing over into the vena cava." For it is difficult to say what we are to understand by the words "opening at the same place" which are written at the beginning of this passage. Either they mean there is a junction between the termination of the vein which is on the concave surface of the liver and two other vascular terminations (that of the vessel on the convex surface of the liver  

2 Lit. "anastomosing."  
3 More literally, "synapse."  
4 The portal vein.  
5 The hepatic vein or veins.
 κυρτοίς καὶ τὸ τοῦ χοληδόχου πόρου, ἢ, εἰ μὴ οὕτω, χώραν τινὰ κοινὴν ἐπινοήσας χρὴ τῶν τριῶν ἀγγείων οἷον δεξαμενήν τινα, πληρομένην μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς κάτω φλεβῶς, ἐκκενομένην δὲ εἰς τε τοὺς χοληδόχους πόρους καὶ τὰς τῆς κοίλης ἀποσχίδας· καθ’ ἐκατέραν δὲ τῶν ἔξηγησεων ἀτοπα πολλά, περὶ ὧν εἰ πάντων λέγομι, λάθοιμ’ ἀν ἐμαυτὸν ἔξηγησεις Ἐρασιστράτου γράφων, οὐχ, ὁπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς προϋθέμην, περαιώνω. κοινῶν δ’ ἀμφότεραις ταῖς ἔξηγησεσιν ἀτοπον τὸ μῆ || 95 καθαίρεσθαι πᾶν τὸ αἷμα. χρὴ γὰρ ὡς εἰς ἥθμον τινὰ τὸ χοληδόχου ἀγγείου ἐμπέπτειν αὐτό, οὐ παρέρχεσθαι καὶ παραμεῖν ὦκέως εἰς τὸ μεῖζον στόμα τῇ ῥύμῃ τῆς ἄναδοσεως φερόμενον.

Ἀρ’ οὖν ἐν τούτωι μονὸν ἀπορίας ἀφύκτοις ὁ Ἐρασιστράτου λόγος ἐνέχεται μὴ βουληθέντος χρήσασθαι ταῖς ἐλκτικαῖς δυνάμεσιν εἰς μηδὲν, ἢ σφοδρότατα μὲν ἐν τούτωι καὶ σαφῶς οὕτως, ὡς ἀν μηδὲ παίδα λαθεῖν;

VI

Εἰ δ’ ἐπισκοποῖτο τις ἐπιμελώς, οὐδ’ ὁ περὶ θρέψεως αὐτοῦ λόγος, ὅν ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν καθόλου λόγων διεξέρχεται, ταῖς αὐτῶς ἀπορίας ἐκφεύγει. τῇ γὰρ πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθία συγχωρηθέντος ἐνὸς λήμματος, ως πρόσθεν ἐδείκνυμεν, ἐπέρανε τῷ περὶ φλεβῶν μόνων καὶ τοῦ κατ’ αὐτὰς ἀἷματος. ἐκρέοντος γὰρ τινος

1 The portal vein. 2 cf. p. 120, note 1.
and that of the bile-duct), or, if not, then we must suppose that there is, as it were, a common space for all three vessels, which becomes filled from the lower vein, and empties itself both into the bile-duct and into the branches of the vena cava. Now, there are many difficulties in both of these explanations, but if I were to state them all, I should find myself inadvertently writing an exposition of the teaching of Erasistratus, instead of carrying out my original undertaking. There is, however, one difficulty common to both these explanations, namely, that the whole of the blood does not become purified. For it ought to fall into the bile-duct as into a kind of sieve, instead of going (running, in fact, rapidly) past it, into the larger stoma, by virtue of the impulse of anadosis.

Are these, then, the only inevitable difficulties in which the argument of Erasistratus becomes involved through his disinclination to make any use of the attractive faculty, or is it that the difficulty is greatest here, and also so obvious that even a child could not avoid seeing it?

VI

And if one looks carefully into the matter one will find that even Erasistratus's reasoning on the subject of nutrition, which he takes up in the second book of his "General Principles," fails to escape this same difficulty. For, having conceded one premise to the principle that matter tends to fill a vacuum, as we previously showed, he was only able to draw a conclusion in the case of the veins and their contained blood. That is to say, when
κατὰ τὰ στόματ' αὐτῶν καὶ διαφορομένου καὶ μήτ' άθρόως τόπου κενοῦ δυναμένου γενέσθαι μήτε τῶν φλεβῶν συμπεσείν, τούτῳ γὰρ ἢν τὸ παραλειπόμενον, ἀναγκαῖον ἢν ἔπεσθαι τὸ συνεχὲς ἀναπληρών τοῦ κενοῦ μένου τῇ βάσιν. αἱ μὲν δὴ φλέβες ἡμῖν οὔτω θρέψονται τοῦ περιεχόμενου κατ' αὐτάς αἵματος ἀπολαύουσαι τὰ δὲ νεῦρα πῶς; οὐ γὰρ δὴ κἂν τούτοις ἐστὶν αἷμα. πρό- χειρον μὲν γὰρ ἢν εἰπεῖν, ἑλκοντα παρὰ τῶν φλεβῶν ἀλλ' οὐ βούλεται. τί ποτ' οὖν κάν- ταῦθα εἰπτεχνάται; φλέβας ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἀρτηρίας τὸ νεῦρον ὁσπερ τινὰ σειρὰν ἐκ τριῶν ἱμάντων διαφερόντων τῇ φύσει πεπληγ- μένην. ὡθήγη γὰρ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐκφεύξεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ὁλκήν οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐτι δεχεσθαι τὸ νεῦρον ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιέχον αἵματος ἀγγείον ἐπιρρήτου τινὸς ἐξωθεῖν ἐκ τῆς παρα- κειμένης φλεβὸς τῆς ἀληθινῆς αἵματος ἐτέρου, ἀλλ' ἵκανον αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν θρέψιν ἔσεσθαι τὸ κατεφευσμένον ἀγγείον ἐκεῖνο τὸ λόγῳ θεω- ρητόν.

'Αλλα κάνταῦθα πάλιν αὐτοῦ ὁμοία τις ἀπορία διεδέξατο. τούτι γὰρ τὸ σμικρὸν ἀγγείου ἐαυτὸ μὲν θρέψει, τὸ παρακειμένου μέντοι νεῦρον ἐκείνο τὸ ἀπλοῦν ἢ τὴν ἀρτηρίαν οὐχ οἶνον τ' ἐσται τρέφειν ἀνευ τοῦ σύμφυτον τιν' ὑπάρχειν αὐτοῖς ὀλκήν τῆς τροφῆς. τῇ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ κενοῦ- μενον ἀκολουθία πῶς ἄν ἐτι δύνατο τὴν τροφὴν ἐπιστάσθαι τὸ ἀπλοῦν νεῦρον, ὦσπερ αἱ φλέβες

1 cf. p. 272, note 1.
2 i.e. one might assume an attraction.
blood is running away through the stomata of the veins, and is being dispersed, then, since an absolutely empty space cannot result, and the veins cannot collapse (for this was what he overlooked), it was therefore shown to be necessary that the adjoining quantum of fluid should flow in and fill the place of the fluid evacuated. It is in this way that we may suppose the veins to be nourished; they get the benefit of the blood which they contain. But how about the nerves?¹ For they do not also contain blood. One might obviously say that they draw their supply from the veins.² But Erasistratus will not have it so. What further contrivance, then, does he suppose? He says that a nerve has within itself veins and arteries, like a rope woven by Nature out of three different strands. By means of this hypothesis he imagined that his theory would escape from the idea of attraction. For if the nerve contain within itself a blood-vessel it will no longer need the adventitious flow of other blood from the real vein lying adjacent; this fictitious vessel, perceptible only in theory,³ will suffice it for nourishment.

But this, again, is succeeded by another similar difficulty. For this small vessel will nourish itself, but it will not be able to nourish this adjacent simple nerve or artery, unless these possess some innate proclivity for attracting nutriment. For how could the nerve, being simple, attract its nourishment, as do the composite veins, by virtue of the tendency

³ i.e. visible to the mind’s eye as distinguished from the bodily eye. cf. p. 21, note 4. Theoreton without qualification means merely visible, not theoretic. cf. p. 205, note 1.
According to the Pneumatist school, certain of whose ideas were accepted by Erasistratus, the air, breath pneuma, or spirit was brought by inspiration into the left side of the heart, where it was converted into natural, vital, and psychic pneuma; the latter then went to the brain, whence it was distributed through the nervous system; practically
of a vacuum to become refilled? For, although according to Erasistratus, it contains within itself a cavity of sorts, this is not occupied with blood, but with *psychic pneuma*, and we are required to imagine the nutriment introduced, not into this cavity, but into the vessel containing it, whether it needs merely to be nourished, or to grow as well. How, then, are we to imagine it introduced? For this simple vessel [*i.e. nerve*] is so small—as are also the other two—that if you prick it at any part with the finest needle you will tear the whole three of them at once. Thus there could never be in it a perceptible space entirely empty. And an emptied space which merely existed in theory could not compel the adjacent fluid to come and fill it.

At this point, again, I should like Erasistratus himself to answer regarding this small elementary nerve, whether it is actually one and definitely continuous, or whether it consists of many small bodies, such as those assumed by Epicurus, Leucippus, and Democritus. For I see that the Erasistrateans are at variance on this subject. Some of them consider it one and continuous, for otherwise, as they say, he would not have called it *simple*; and some venture to resolve it into yet other elementary bodies. But if it be one and continuous, then what is evacuated from it in the so-called *insensible transpiration* of the

this teaching involved the idea of a *psyche*, or conscious vital principle. “Psychic pneuma” is in Latin *spiritus animalis* (*anima = psyche*); cf. p. 126, note 4. Introduction, p. xxxiv.

* Observe that Erasistratus’s “simple nerve” may be almost looked on as an anticipation of the *cell*. The question Galen now asks is whether this vessel is a “unit mass of living matter,” or merely an agglomeration of *atoms* subject to mechanical law. cf. Galen’s “fibres,” p. 329.
οὔδεμίαν ἐν ἔαυτῷ καταλείψει χῶραν κενῆν. οὔτω γὰρ οὐχ ἐν ἀλλὰ πολλὰ γενήσεται, διειργώ-
μένα δὴπο ταῖς κεναῖς χώραις. εἰ δὲ ἐκ πολλῶν σύγκειται, τῇ κηπαίᾳ κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν πρὸς Ὁσκληπιάδην ἀπεχωρήσαμεν ἀναρμα τινα στοι-
χεία τιθέμενοι. πάλιν οὖν ἀτεχνὸς ἡμῖν ἡ φύσις λεγέσθω: τοῖς γὰρ τοιούτοις στοιχείοις ἐξ ἀνάγ-
κης τοῦ ὁτ' ἐπεται.

Did δὴ μοι καὶ δοκοῦσιν ἀμαθῶς πάνυ τὴν εἰς
tὰ τοιαύτα στοιχεία τῶν ἀπλῶν ἀγγείων εἰσάγειν
dιάλυσιν ἤνιοι τῶν Ἐρασίστρατείων. ἔμοι γοῦν
οὐδὲν διαφέρει. καθ' ἐκατέρως γὰρ ἀτοπος ὁ
τῆς θρέψεως ἐσται λόγος, ἐκείνου τοῖς ἀπλοῖς
ἀγγείοις τοῖς σμικροῖς τοῖς συντιθέισι τὰ μεγάλα

tε καὶ αἰσθητὰ νεῦρα κατὰ μὲν τοὺς συνεχῇ

φυλάττοντας αὐτὰ μὴ δυναμένης γενέσθαι τῆς
πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολούθιας, ὅτι μηδὲν ἐν τῷ
συνεχεὶ γίγνεται κενὸν, κἂν ἀπορρέῃ τῇ
συνέρ-
χεται γὰρ πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ καταλειπόμενα μόρια,
καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑδατος ὅραται, καὶ πάλιν ἐν

gίγνεται πάντα τὴν χῶραν τοῦ διαφορηθέντος
αὐτὰ καταλαμβάνοντα: κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἑτέρους,
ὅτι τῶν στοιχείων ἐκείνων οὐδὲν δεῖται τῆς πρὸς
τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολούθιας. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν αἰσθητῶν
μόνων, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγως θεωρητῶν ἔχει δύναμιν,
ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος ὀμολογεῖ διαρρήδην,
οὐ περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου κενοῦ φάσκων ἐκάστοτε
ποιεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον, ὁ κατὰ βραχὺ παρέσπαρται
τοῖς σώμασιν, ἄλλα περὶ τοῦ σαφοῦς καὶ αἰσθητοῦ
καὶ ἀθρόου καὶ μεγάλου καὶ ἑναργοῦς καὶ ὄπως
ἀν ἄλλως ὀνομάζειν ἐθέλησ. Ἐρασίστρατος μὲν
gambar αἰσθητὸν ἀθρόου ὅφει δύνασθαι
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physicians will leave no empty space in it; otherwise it would not be one body but many, separated by empty spaces. But if it consists of many bodies, then we have “escaped by the back door,” as the saying is, to Asclepiades, seeing that we have postulated certain inharmonious elements. Once again, then, we must call Nature “inartistic”; for this necessarily follows the assumption of such elements.

For this reason some of the Erasistrateans seem to me to have done very foolishly in reducing the simple vessels to elements such as these. Yet it makes no difference to me, since the theory of both parties regarding nutrition will be shown to be absurd. For in these minute simple vessels constituting the large perceptible nerves, it is impossible, according to the theory of those who would keep the former continuous, that any “refilling of a vacuum” should take place, since no vacuum can occur in a continuum even if anything does run away; for the parts left come together (as is seen in the case of water) and again become one, taking up the whole space of that which previously separated them. Nor will any “refilling” occur if we accept the argument of the other Erasistrateans, since none of their elements need it. For this principle only holds of things which are perceptible, and not of those which exist merely in theory; this Erasistratus expressly acknowledges, for he states that it is not a vacuum such as this, interspersed in small portions among the corpuscles, that his various treatises deal with, but a vacuum which is clear, perceptible, complete in itself, large in size, evident, or however else one cares to term it (for, what Erasistratus himself says is, that “there cannot be a
γενόθαι κενόν· ἡγώ δ’ ἐκ περιουσίας εὐπορῆσαι ὁνομάτων ταύτων δηλοῦν ἐν γε τῷ νῦν προκειμένῳ λόγῳ δυναμένων καὶ τάλλα προσέθηκα.

100 Κάλλιον οὖν μοι δοκεῖ καὶ || ὡμᾶς τι συνεισενέγκασθαι τοῖς Ἐρασιστρατείοις, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τοῦτο γεγόναμεν, καὶ συμβουλεύσαι τοῖς τὸ πρῶτον ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἀπλοῦν ὑπ’ Ἐρασιστράτου καλούμενον ἄγγεῖον εἰς ἔτερ’ ἀττά σώματα στοιχείωδη διαλύουσιν ἀποστήναι τῆς ὑπολήψεως, ὡς πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν ἔχειν πλέον ἐτί καὶ διαφερομένοις Ἐρασιστράτῳ. ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὔδὲν ἔχει πλέον, ἐπιδεδέκται σαφῶς. οὔδὲ γὰρ ἡδυνήθη διαφυγεῖν τὴν περὶ τῆς θρέψεως ἀπορίαν ἡ ὑπόθεσις. ὅτι δ’ οὐδ’ Ἐρασιστράτῳ σύμφωνός ἐστιν, ὃ ἐκεῖνος ἀπλοῦν καὶ πρῶτον ὁνομάζει, σύνθετον ἀποφαίνουσα, καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως τέχνην ἀναιροῦσα, πρόδηλον καὶ τοῦτ’ εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ. εἰ μὴ γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἀπλοῖς τοῦτοι ἐνωσὶν τινα τῆς οὐσίας ἀπολείψομεν, ἀλλ’ εἰς ἀναρμα καὶ ἀμέριστα καταβήσομεθα στοιχεία, παντάπασιν ἀναιρήσουμεν τῆς φύσεως τὴν τέχνην, ὡσπερ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐκ ταύτης ὄρμομενοι τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἑαυτῷ καὶ φιλόσοφοι. δευτέρα γὰρ τῶν τού ᾽ξόου μορίων κατὰ τὴν τοιαύτην ὑπόθεσιν ἡ φύσις, οὐ πρῶτη 101 γίγνεται. διαπλάτευε κε δὲ || καὶ δημιουργεῖν οὐ τοῦ δευτέρου γεγονότος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ προὔπάρχοντος ἐστίν. οὐσ’ ἀναγκαίον ἐστιν εὐθὺς ἐκ σπερμάτων ὑποθέσθαι τὰς δυνάμεις τῆς φύσεως, αἱς δια-

1 cf. Book I., chap xii.

2 i.e. in biology we must begin with living substance— with something which is specifically alive—here with the “unit mass of living matter.” cf. p. 73, note 3.
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perceptible space which is entirely empty"; while I, for my part, being abundantly equipped with terms which are equally elucidatory, at least in relation to the present topic of discussion, have added them as well).

Thus it seems to me better that we also should help the Erasistrateans with some contribution, since we are on the subject, and should advise those who reduce the vessel called primary and simple by Erasistratus into other elementary bodies to give up their opinion; for not only do they gain nothing by it, but they are also at variance with Erasistratus in this matter. That they gain nothing by it has been clearly demonstrated; for this hypothesis could not escape the difficulty regarding nutrition. And it also seems perfectly evident to me that this hypothesis is not in consonance with the view of Erasistratus, when it declares that what he calls simple and primary is composite, and when it destroys the principle of Nature's artistic skill. For, if we do not grant a certain unity of substance to these simple structures as well, and if we arrive eventually at inharmonious and indivisible elements, we shall most assuredly deprive Nature of her artistic skill, as do all the physicians and philosophers who start from this hypothesis. For, according to such a hypothesis, Nature does not precede, but is secondary to the parts of the animal. Now, it is not the province of what comes secondarily, but of what pre-exists, to shape and to construct. Thus we must necessarily suppose that the faculties of Nature, by which she

3 "Ad elementa quae nec coalescere possunt nec in partes dividii" (Linacre). On the two contrasted schools cf. p. 45.

4 cf. loc. cit.
πλάττει τε καὶ αὐξάνει καὶ τρέφει τὸ ζῷον. ἀλλ’ ἐκείνων τῶν σωμάτων τῶν ἀνάρμων καὶ ἀμερῶν οὐδὲν ἐν ἐαυτῷ διαπλαστικῇ ἔχει δύναμιν ἢ αὐξητικῇ ἢ θρεπτικῇ ἢ ὀλος τεχνικὴν ἀπαθεῖς γὰρ καὶ ἀμετάβλητον ὑπόκειται. τῶν δ’ εἰρημένων οὐδὲν ἀνευ μεταβολῆς καὶ ἀλλοιώσεως καὶ τῆς δ’ ὀλος κράσεως γίγνεται, καθάπερ καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν ἐνεδειξάμεθα. καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀνάγκην οὐκ ἔχοντες, ὅπως τὰ ἀκόλουθα τοῖς στοιχείοις, οἷς ὑπέθεντο, φυλάττοιεν, οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων αἱρέσεων ἀπαντῶς ἄτεχνου ἑργαζθη- σαν ἀποφήμασθαι τὴν φύσιν. καὶ ταύτα ὑ’ οὐ παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐχρῆν μανθάνειν τοὺς Ἐρασί- στρατείους, ἀλλὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν φιλοσόφων, οἷς μάλιστα δοκεῖ πρῶτον ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι τὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν ὅντων ἀπάντων.

Οὕκοινοι οὖν Ἐρασίστρατον ἄν τις ὁρθῶς ἀχρι τοσαύτης ἀμαθίας νομίζοι προήκειν, ὡς μηδὲ 102 ταύτην γνωρίσαι δυνηθήναι τὴν ἀκόλουθαν, ἀλλ’ ἀμα μὲν ὑποθέσαι τεχνικὴν τὴν φύσιν, ἀμα δ’ εἰς ἀπαθὴ καὶ ἀναρμα καὶ ἀμετάβλητα στοιχεία καταθραύσαι τὴν οὕσιαν. καὶ μὴν εὶ δώσει τιν’ ἐν τοῖς στοιχείοις ἀλλοιώσιν καὶ καὶ μεταβολὴν καὶ ἐνωσιν καὶ συνέχειαν, εὐ ἀσύνθετον αὐτῷ τὰ ἀπλοῦν ἄγχειον ἐκεῖνο, καθάπερ καὶ αὐτῶς ὁνομάζει, γενήσεται. ἀλλ’ ἡ μὲν ἀπλῆ φλέψ εὗ αὐτῆς τραφήσεται, τὸ νεῦρον δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀρτηρία παρὰ τῆς φλεβῶς.

2 "At corporum quae nec una committi nec dividi possunt nullum in se formaticem, auctricem, nutricem, aut
shapes the animal, and makes it grow and receive nourishment, are present from the seed onwards; whereas none of these inharmonious and non-partite corpuscles contains within itself any formative, incremental, nutritive, or, in a word, any artistic power; it is, by hypothesis, unimpressionable and untransformable, whereas, as we have previously shown, none of the processes mentioned takes place without transformation, alteration, and complete intermixture. And, owing to this necessity, those who belong to these sects are unable to follow out the consequences of their supposed elements, and they are all therefore forced to declare Nature devoid of art. It is not from us, however, that the Erasistrateans should have learnt this, but from those very philosophers who lay most stress on a preliminary investigation into the elements of all existing things.

Now, one can hardly be right in supposing that Erasistratus could reach such a pitch of foolishness as to be incapable of recognizing the logical consequences of this theory, and that, while assuming Nature to be artistically creative, he would at the same time break up substance into insensible, inharmonious, and untransformable elements. If, however, he will grant that there occurs in the elements a process of alteration and transformation, and that there exists in them unity and continuity, then that simple vessel of his (as he himself names it) will turn out to be single and uncompounded. And the simple vein will receive nourishment from itself, and the nerve and artery from the vein. How, and in what

in summa artificem facultatem habet; quippe quod im-patibile esse immutibileque praesumitur” (Linacre).

3 Book I, chaps. v.–xi.
πῶς καὶ τίνα τρόπον; ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ δὴ καὶ πρόσθεν γενόμενοι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς τῶν Ἐρασίστρατείων διαφωνίας ἐμνημονεύσαμεν, ἐπεδείξαμεν δὲ καὶ καθ' ἐκατέροις μὲν ἀπορον εἶναι τιν τῶν ἀπλῶν ἐκείνων ἀγγείων θρέψιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κρίνων τὴν μᾶχην αὐτῶν οὐκ ὤκυνθόμεν καὶ τιμήσαι τὸν Ἐρασίστρατον εἰς τὴν βελτίωνα μεταστήσαντες αἴρεσιν.

Αὕτης οὖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐν ἀπλοῦν ἡμωμένον ἐαυτῷ πάντη τὸ στοιχείον ἐκεῖνο νεῦρον ὑποτιθεμένην αἴρεσιν ὁ λόγος μεταβᾶς ἐπισκοπεῖσθω, πῶς τραφήσεται; τὸ γὰρ εὑρέθην ἐνταῦθα κοινὸν ἂν ἢδη καὶ τῆς Ἰπποκράτους αἴρέσεως γένοιτο.

103 Κάλλιον δ', ἂν μοι δοκῶ τὸ ζητοῦμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νευσηκότων καὶ σφόδρα καταλελεπτυσμένων βασανισθήματι. πάντα γὰρ τούτως ἐναργῶς φαίνεται τὰ μόρια τοῦ σώματος ἀτροφά καὶ λεπτὰ καὶ πολλῆς προσθήκης τε καὶ ἀναθρέψεως δεόμενα. καὶ τοίνυν καὶ τὸ νεῦρον τοῦτο τὸ αἰσθητόν, ἐφ' οὗ περὶ ἐς ἀρχής ἐποιησάμην τοῦ λόγου, ἵσχυς μὲν ἱκανῶς γέγονε, δεῖται δὲ θρέψεως. ἔχει δ' ἐν ἐαυτῷ μέρη πάμπολλα μὲν ἐκεῖνα τὰ πρῶτα καὶ ἀόρατα νεῦρα τὰ σμικρὰ καὶ τινὰς ἀρτηρίας ἀπλάς ὀλίγας καὶ φλέβας ὀμοίως. ἀπαντὶ οὖν αὐτὸ τὸ νεῦρα τὰ στοιχεῖώδη καταλελεπτυνται δηλονότι καὶ αὐτά, ἢ, εἰ μηδ' ἐκεῖνα, οὐδὲ τὸ ὄλον. καὶ τοίνυν καὶ θρέψεως οὐ τὸ μὲν ὄλον δεῖται νεῦρον, ἐκαστὸν δ' ἐκείνων οὐ δεῖται. καὶ μήν εἰ δεῖται μὲν ἀναθρέψεως, οὐδὲν δ' ἡ πρὸς τὸ κενοῦμενον ἀκολουθία
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way? For, when we were at this point before, we drew attention to the disagreement among the Erasistrateans,¹ and we showed that the nutrition of these simple vessels was impracticable according to the teachings of both parties, although we did not hesitate to adjudicate in their quarrel and to do Erasistratus the honour of placing him in the better sect.²

Let our argument, then, be transferred again to the doctrine which assumes this *elementary nerve*³ to be a single, simple, and entirely unified structure, and let us consider how it is to be nourished; for what is discovered here will at once be found to be common also to the school of Hippocrates.

It seems to me that our enquiry can be most rigorously pursued in subjects who are suffering from illness and have become very emaciated, since in these people all parts of the body are obviously atrophied and thin, and in need of additional substance and feeding-up; for the same reason the ordinary *perceptible nerve*, regarding which we originally began this discussion, has become thin, and requires nourishment. Now, this contains within itself various parts, namely, a great many of these primary, invisible, minute nerves, a few simple arteries, and similarly also veins. Thus, all its elementary nerves have themselves also obviously become emaciated; for, if they had not, neither would the nerve as a whole; and of course, in such a case, the whole nerve cannot require nourishment without each of these requiring it too. Now, if on the one hand they stand in need of feeding-up, and if on the

¹ *cf.* p. 153.
² On account of his idea of a simple tissue not susceptible of further analysis.
³ Or "cell"; *cf.* p. 153, note 2.
βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς δύναται διὰ τὰς ἐμπροσθεν εἰρημένας ἀπορίας καὶ διὰ τὴν ὑπόγυιον ἵσχυο-
tητα, καθάπερ δείξω, ξητητέον ἥμων ἐστὶν ἐτέραν αἰτίαν θρέψεως.

Πῶς οὖν ἢ πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθία τρέφειν ἀδύνατός ἐστι τὸν οὐτὸ διακείμενον; 104 ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἀκολουθεῖν || ἀναγκάζει τῶν συν-
εχῶν, ὅσον ἀπορρέει. τούτῳ δ’ ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν εὐεκτοῦντῶν ἰκανὸν ἐστίν εἰς τὴν θρέψιν, ἵσα
γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτῶν εἶναι χρὴ τοῖς ἀπορρέουσι τὰ προστιθέμενα: ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἑσχάτως ἰσχυῶν καὶ
πολλῆς ἀναθρέψεως δεομένων εἰ μὴ πολλαπλά-
σιον εἴη τὸ προστιθέμενον τοῦ κενούμενον, τὴν
ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐξιν ἀναλαβεῖν οὐκ ἂν ποτὲ δύναιντο.
ὑπὸν οὖν, ὡς ἐλκειν αὐτὰ δεῖσει τοσοῦτον
πλεῖον, ὅσο καὶ δεῖται πλεῖονος. Ἑρασίστρατος
δὲ κανταῦθα πρότερον ποιήσας τὸ δεύτερον οὐκ
οίδ’ ὅπως οὐκ αἰσθάνεται. διότι γὰρ, φησί,
πολλὴ πρόσθεσις εἰς ἀνάθρεψιν γίγνεται τοῖς
νενοσθηκόσι, διὰ τούτο καὶ ἢ πρὸς ταύτην ἀκολο-
θία πολλῆ. πῶς δ’ ἂν πολλῆ πρόσθεσις γένοιτο
μὴ προηγομένης ἀνάδοσεως δαψίλοὺς; εἰ δὲ
τὴν διὰ τῶν φλεβῶν φορὰν τῆς τροφῆς ἀνάδοσιν
καλεῖ, τὴν δ’ εἰς ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἀπλῶν καὶ ἀφράτων
ἐκεῖνων νεύρων καὶ ἀρτηριῶν μετάληψιν οὐκ
ἀνάδοσιν ἄλλα διάδοσιν, ὡς τινος ὀνομάζειν
105 ἡξίωσαν, εἰτα || τὴν διὰ τῶν φλεβῶν μόνη τῇ

1 The horror vacui.
other the principle of the refilling of a vacuum\(^1\) can give them no help—both by reason of the difficulties previously mentioned and the actual thinness, as I shall show—we must then seek another cause for nutrition.

How is it, then, that the tendency of a vacuum to become refilled is unable to afford nourishment to one in such a condition? Because its rule is that only so much of the contiguous matter should succeed as has flowed away. Now this is sufficient for nourishment in the case of those who are in good condition, for, in them, what is presented\(^2\) must be equal to what has flowed away. But in the case of those who are very emaciated and who need a great restoration of nutrition, unless what was presented were many times greater than what has been emptied out, they would never be able to regain their original habit. It is clear, therefore, that these parts will have to exert a greater amount of attraction, in so far as their requirements are greater. And I fail to understand how Erasistratus does not perceive that here again he is putting the cart before the horse. Because, in the case of the sick, there must be a large amount of presentation\(^2\) in order to feed them up, he argues that the factor of “refilling”\(^1\) must play an equally large part. And how could much presentation take place if it were not preceded by an abundant delivery\(^3\) of nutriment? And if he calls the conveyance of food through the veins delivery, and its assumption by each of these simple and visible nerves and arteries not delivery but distribution,\(^4\) as some people have thought fit to name it, and then ascribes conveyance

\(^{1}\text{Anadosis, “absorption”; cf. p.13, note 5.}\)

\(^{2}\text{Lit. diadosis.}\)
ΓΑΛΕΝ

πρός τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολούθια φησὶ γίγνεσθαι, τῇ εἰς τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ μετάληψιν ἥμιν ἔξηγη-
σάσθω. οτι μὲν γὰρ οὐκέτι ἐπὶ τούτων ή πρὸς
tὸ κενούμενον ἀκολούθια λέγεσθαι δύναται καὶ
mάλιστ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἐσχάτως ἵσχυον, ἀποδεεικταί.
tὶ δὲ φησιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν
cαθόλου λόγων ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος, ἁξιον ἐπακοὐ-
sαι τῆς λέξεως: "Τοῖς δ' ἐσχάτοις τε καὶ ἀπλοῖς,
λεπτοῖς τε καὶ στενοῖς οὕσω, ἐκ τῶν παρακει-
μένων ἅγιείων ή πρόσθεσις συμβαίνει εἰς τα
cεφόμενα τῶν ἀπενεχθέντων κατὰ τὰ πλάγια
tῶν ἅγιείων ἐλκομένης τῆς πρόφησις καὶ κατα-
χωρίζομένης." ἐκ ταύτης τῆς λέξεως πρῶτον
μὲν τὸ κατὰ τὰ πλάγια προσέρχει τα καὶ
ἀποδεχομαι κατὰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸ τὸ στόμα τὸ
ἀπλοῦν νεῦρον οὐκ ἂν δύνατο δεχόμενον τῆν
τροφῆν οὕτως εἰς ὅλου ἐαυτὸ διανέμειν· ἀνάκειται
γὰρ ἐκεῖνο τῷ ψυχικῷ πνεύματι· κατὰ δὲ τὸ
πλάγιον ἐκ τῆς παρακειμένης φλεβῶς τῆς ἁπλῆς
ἐγχωρεῖ λαβεῖν αὐτῶ. δεύτερον δ' ἀποδεχομαι
tῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἐρασίστρατος λέξεως ὀνομάτων τὸ
106 γεγραμμένον ἑφεξῆς τῷ κατὰ τὰ πλάγια. || τι
gάρ φησι; "Κατὰ τὰ πλάγια τῶν ἅγιείων ἐλκο-
μένης τῆς πρόφησις." οτι μὲν οὖν ἐλκεται, καὶ ἵµαι
ὅµολογοῦµεν, ὅτι δ' οὔ τῇ πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον
ἀκολούθια, δεδεικται πρόσθεν.

VII

Ἐξεύρωμεν οὐν κοινῆ, πῶς ἔλκεται. πῶς δὲ
ἀλλους ἢ ὅσος ὁ σίδηρος ὑπὸ τῆς ἱρακλείας λίθου

1 i.e. let him explain the diadosis.
through the veins to the principle of vacuum-refilling alone, let him explain to us the assumption of food by the hypothetical elements. For it has been shown that at least in relation to these there is no question of the refilling of a vacuum being in operation, and especially where the parts are very attenuated. It is worth while listening to what Erasistratus says about these cases in the second book of his "General Principles": "In the ultimate simple [vessels], which are thin and narrow, presentation takes place from the adjacent vessels, the nutriment being attracted through the sides of the vessels and deposited in the empty spaces left by the matter which has been carried away." Now, in this statement firstly I admit and accept the words "through the sides." For, if the simple nerve were actually to take in the food through its mouth, it could not distribute it through its whole substance; for the mouth is dedicated to the psychic pneuma. It can, however, take it in through its sides from the adjacent simple vein. Secondly, I also accept in Erasistratus's statement the expression which precedes "through the sides." What does this say? "The nutriment being attracted through the sides of the vessels." Now I, too, agree that it is attracted, but it has been previously shown that this is not through the tendency of evacuated matter to be replaced.

VII

Let us, then, consider together how it is attracted. How else than in the way that iron is attracted by

2 "Spiritus animalis"; cf. p. 152, note 1. The nutriment was for the walls of the vessels, not for their cavities. cf. p. 319, note 3.
δύναμιν ἐχούσης ἐλκτικῆς τοιαύτης ποιότητος; ἀλλ' εἰ τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἀναδόσεως ἢ τῆς κοιλίας ἐνθληψις παρέχεται, τὴν δὲ μετὰ ταύτα φοράν ἀπασαν αἱ τε φλέβες περιστελλόμεναι καὶ προσθοῦσαι καὶ τὸν τρεφομένων ἐκαστὸν ἐπιστῶμενον εἰς ἑαυτό, τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθίας ἀποστάντες, ὡς οὐ πρεσόψης ἀνδρὶ τεχνικὴν ὑποθεμένῳ τὴν φύσιν, οὔτως ἂν ἦδη καὶ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν εἶχες πεφευγότες τῇν Ἀσκληπιάδου μή δυνάμενοι γε λύειν αὐτὴν. τὸ γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἀπόδειξιν παραλαμβανόμενον λήμμα τὸ διεξευγμένον οὐκ ἐκ δυοὶ ἀλλ' ἐκ τριῶν ἔστι κατὰ γε τὴν ἀλήθειαν διεξευγμένον. εἰ μὲν οὖν 107 ὡς ἐκ δυοίν αὐτῷ χρῆ||σαίμεθα, τεῦδος ἐσται τι τῶν εἰς τὴν ἀπόδειξιν παρειλημμένων: εἰ δ' ὡς ἐκ τριῶν, ἀπέραντος ὁ λόγος γενήσεται.

VIII

Καὶ ταύτ’ οὐκ ἔχρην ἀγνοεῖν τὸν 'Ερασίστρατον, εἴπερ κἂν ἄναρ ποτὲ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου συνέτυχε, ὦστερ οὖν οὐδὲ τὰ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τῶν χυμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὧν οὐδὲν ἔχων εἴπειν οὐδὲ μέχρι τοῦ μετρίου πιθανὸν οἴεται παρακρούσθαι σκηντόμενος, ὡς οὐδὲ χρήσιμος ὀλως ἐστὶν ἢ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπίσκεψις. εἴτ', ὦ πρὸς θεῶν, ὅπως μὲν τὰ σιτία κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα πέπτεται χρήσιμον ἐπίστασθαι, πῶς δ' ἐν ταῖς φλεψίν ἢ
the lodestone, the latter having a faculty attractive of this particular quality [existing in iron]? But if the beginning of anadosis depends on the squeezing action of the stomach, and the whole movement thereafter on the peristalsis and propulsive action of the veins, as well as on the traction exerted by each of the parts which are undergoing nourishment, then we can abandon the principle of replacement of evacuated matter, as not being suitable for a man who assumes Nature to be a skilled artist; thus we shall also have avoided the contradiction of Asclepiades though we cannot refute it: for the disjunctive argument used for the purposes of demonstration is, in reality, disjunctive not of two but of three alternatives; now, if we treat the disjunction as a disjunction of two alternatives, one of the two propositions assumed in constructing our proof must be false; and if as a disjunctive of three alternatives, no conclusion will be arrived at.

VIII

Now Erasistratus ought not to have been ignorant of this if he had ever had anything to do with the Peripatetics—even in a dream. Nor, similarly, should he have been unacquainted with the genesis of the humours, about which, not having even anything moderately plausible to say, he thinks to deceive us by the excuse that the consideration of such matters is not the least useful. Then, in Heaven's name, is it useful to know how food is digested in the stomach, but unnecessary to know how bile comes into existence.

1 Specific attraction; cf. Book I., chap. xiv.
2 cf. p. 100, note 2.
3 In Book II., chap. i.
χολή γίγνεται, περιττόν; καὶ τῆς κενώσεως ἄρα φροντιστεὶν αὐτῆς μόνης, ἀμελητέων δὲ τῆς
gενέσεως; ὡσπερ οὖκ ἀμεινὸν ὑπάρχον μακρῷ
tὸ κωλύειν εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεννᾶσθαι πλεῖονα
τοῦ πρᾶγματ' ἔχειν ἐκκενοῦντας. θαυμαστὸν δὲ
cαὶ τὸ διαπορεῖν, εἰτ' ἐν τῷ σώματι τὴν γένεσιν
αὐτῆς ὑποθετέων εἰτ' εὐθὺς ἐξωθεὶν ἐν τοῖς συτίοις
περιέχεσθαι φατέον. εἰ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο καλῶς
ηὐτρήται, τί οὐχὶ καὶ περὶ τοῦ αἴματος ἐπισκε-
108 ψόμεθα, πότερον ἐν τῷ σώματι || λαμβάνει τὴν
gένεσιν ἡ τοῖς συτίοις παρέσπαρται, καθάπερ οἱ
τὰς ὁμοιομερεῖας ὑποτιθέμενοι φασί; καὶ μὴν
πολλῷ γ' ἡ χρησιμότερον ζητεῖσθαι, ποιὰ τῶν
συτίων ὠμολογεῖ τῇ τῆς αἴματόσωσις ἐνεργεία καὶ
ποῖα διαφέρεται, τοῦ ζητεῖν, τίνα μὲν τῇ τῆς
γαστρὸς ἐνεργεία ἐνκαταί ῥάδιως, τίνα δ' ἀντι-
βαίνει καὶ μάχεται. τοῦτων μὲν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλεῖς
εἰς πένθιν μόνην, ἐκείνων δ' εἰς αἴματος χρῆστοῦ
diαφέρει γένεσιν. οὔδὲ γὰρ ἴσον ἐστὶν ἡ μὴ
cαλῶς ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ χυλωθῆναι τὴν τροφὴν ἢ
μὴ χρῆστον αἷμα γεννηθῆναι. πῶς δ' οὖκ αἰδεῖται
tὰς μὲν τῆς πένθεως ἀποτυχίας διαιρόμενος,
ὡς πολλαῖ τ' εἰσὶ καὶ κατὰ πολλὰς γίγνονται
προφάσεις, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν τῆς αἴματόσωσις σφαλ-
μάτων οὐδ' ἀχρι ρήματος εὐδ' οὐδ' ἀχρὶ συλλαβῆς
μᾶς φθεγξάμενος; καὶ μὴν εὐρίσκεται γε καὶ
παχὺ καὶ λεπτὸν ἐν ταῖς φλεγίναι aίμα καὶ τοῖς
μὲν ἔρυθροτέρον, τοῖς δὲ ξανθότερον, τοῖς δὲ
μελάντερον, τοῖς δὲ φλεγματωδέστερον. εἰ δ' ὅτι

1 Prevention better than cure.
2 e.g. Anaxagoras; cf. p. 7, note 5; p. 20, note 3.
3 Lit. haematosia.
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in the veins? Are we to pay attention merely to the evacuation of this humour, and not to its genesis? As though it were not far better to prevent its excessive development from the beginning than to give ourselves all the trouble of expelling it! And it is a strange thing to be entirely unaware as to whether its genesis is to be looked on as taking place in the body, or whether it comes from without and is contained in the food. For, if it was right to raise this problem, why should we not make investigations concerning the blood as well—whether it takes its origin in the body, or is distributed through the food as is maintained by those who postulate homœcomeries? Assuredly it would be much more useful to investigate what kinds of food are suited, and what kinds unsuited, to the process of blood-production rather than to enquire into what articles of diet are easily mastered by the activity of the stomach, and what resist and contend with it. For the choice of the latter bears reference merely to digestion, while that of the former is of importance in regard to the generation of useful blood. For it is not equally important whether the aliment be imperfectly chylified in the stomach or whether it fail to be turned into useful blood. Why is Erasistratus not ashamed to distinguish all the various kinds of digestive failure and all the occasions which give rise to them, whilst in reference to the errors of blood-production he does not utter a single word—nay, not a syllable? Now, there is certainly to be found in the veins both thick and thin blood; in some people it is redder, in others yellower, in some blacker, in others more of the nature of phlegm. And one who realizes that it
Galen

καὶ δυσώδες οȗχ ἕν τρόπον ἀλλ' ἐν πολλαῖς

109 πάνυ διαφοραίς ἀρρήτοις μὲν λόγῳ, σαφ᾽ ἱφεστάταις

δ᾽ αἰσθήσει φαίνεται γιγνόμενον, εἰδεὶς τις, οὗκ ἂν οἷσαι μετρίως ἐτὶ καταγνώσεσθαι τῆς Ἕρας τῆς στράτου ῥαθύμίας αὐτὸν οὕτω γ᾽ ἀναγκαίαν εἰς τὰ ἑργα τῆς τέχνης θεωρίαν παραλπόντος.

Ἐναργή γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν υδέρων ἀμαρτήματα τῆς ῥαθύμίας ταύτῃ κατὰ λόγον ἡκολουθηκότα. τὸ τε γὰρ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ τῶν ὁδῶν κωλύεσθαι νομίζειν πρόσω τοῦ ἦπατος ἑνεῖ τὸ αἷμα καὶ μηδέποτ᾽ ἂν ἄλλως υδέρων δύνασθαι συστήναι πῶς οὐκ ἐσχάτην ἐνδείκνυται ῥαθύμίαν; τὸ τε μὴ διὰ τὸν σπλήνα μηδὲ δὴ ἄλλο τὶ μόριον, ἀλλ᾽ ἀεὶ διὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ ἦπατι σκίρρων υδέρων ὀἰεσθαι γίγνεσθαι τελέως ἄργον τὴν διάνοιαν ἀνθρώπου καὶ μηδενί τῶν ὀσθηρείᾳ γιγνομένων παρακολουθοῦντος. ἔπὶ μὲν γε χρονίας αἰμορροϊσιν ἐπισχεθεῖσαι ἡ διὰ κένωσιν ἀμετρον οἷς ψύξιν ἐσχάτην ἀγαγοῦσας τὸν ἀνθρώπου οὐχ ἀπαξ οὖν δὴ ἂλλα πολλάκις ἡδὲ τεθεάμεθα συστάντας υδέρους, ὥσπερ γε καὶ γυναικῖς ἢ τε τῆς ἐφ᾽ ἐκάστῳ μηνι καθάρσεως ἀπώλεια παντελῆς καὶ ἀμετρὸς κένωσις, ὅταν αἰμορραγῆσωσι

110 ποθ᾽ αἱ μὴ τραίρα ἐφοδρῶς ἐπεκαλέσαντο πολλάκις υδέρους καὶ τισιν αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ γυναικεῖος ὀνομαξόμενος ροῦς εἰς τὸῦτ ἐτελευτησὲ τὸ πάθος, ἦνα

1 Erasistratus held the spleen to be useless, cf. p. 143.

2 Induration : Gk. σκίρρος, Lat. scirrhous. The condition is now commonly known by Laennec's term cirrhosis, from Gk. kirros, meaning yellow or tawny. Here again we have an example of Erasistratus's bias towards anatomical or structural rather than functional explanations of disease. cf. p.124, note 1.
may smell offensively not in one way only, but in a
great many different respects (which cannot be put
into words, although perfectly appreciable to the
senses), would, I imagine, condemn in no measured
terms the carelessness of Erasistratus in omitting
a consideration so essential to the practice of our
art.

Thus it is clear what errors in regard to the
subject of dropsies logically follow this carelessness.
For, does it not show the most extreme carelessness
to suppose that the blood is prevented from going
forward into the liver owing to the narrowness of the
passages, and that dropsy can never occur in any
other way? For, to imagine that dropsy is never
caused by the spleen\(^1\) or any other part, but always by
induration of the liver,\(^2\) is the standpoint of a man
whose intelligence is perfectly torpid and who is
quite out of touch with things that happen every
day. For, not merely once or twice, but frequently,
we have observed dropsy produced by chronic
haemorrhoids which have been suppressed,\(^3\) or
which, through immoderate bleeding, have given
the patient a severe chill; similarly, in women, the
complete disappearance of the monthly discharge,\(^4\)
or an undue evacuation such as is caused by
violent bleeding from the womb, often provoke
dropsy; and in some of them the so-called female
flux ends in this disorder. I leave out of account

\(^3\) On the risks which were supposed to attend the checking
of habitual bleeding from piles cf. Celsus (De Re Med. VI.
xviii. 9), “Atque in quibusdam parum tuto supprimitur, qui
sanguinis profluvio imbecilliores non fiunt; habent enim
purgationem hanc, non morbum.” (i.e. the habit was to be
looked on as a periodical cleansing, not as a disease.)

\(^4\) Lit. catharsis.
τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν κενεώννυ ἀρχομένους ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν ἐπικαίρων μορίων ύδέρους παραλίπτω, σαφῶς μὲν καὶ αὐτοὺς ἔξελέγχοντας τὴν Ἑρασιστράτειον ὑπόληψιν, ἄλλῳ οὐχ οὗτως ἐναργῶς ὡς οἱ διὰ κατάψυξιν σφοδράν τῆς οἷλης ἐξεως ἀποτελοῦμενοι. πρώτη γὰρ αὕτη γενέσεως ύδέρων αὐτία διὰ τὴν ἀποτυχίαν τῆς αἰματώσεως γιγνομένη τρόπου ὁμοιότατον ταῖς ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν σωτίων ἀπεψία διαρροίαις. οὐ μὴν ἐσκήρωται γε κατὰ τοὺς τοιούτους ύδέρους οὐδ’ ἄλλο τι σπλάγχνον οὐδὲ τὸ ἦπαρ.

Ἀλλ’ Ἑρασιστράτος ὁ σοφὸς ὑπεριδὼν καὶ καταφρονήσας, ὃν οὐθ’ Ἱπποκράτης οὔτε Διοκλῆς οὔτε Πραξιγόρας οὔτε Φιλιστίων ἄλλῳ οὔδε τῶν ἀρίστων φιλοσόφων οὔδεις κατεφρόνησέν οὔτε Πλάτων οὔθ’ Ἀριστοτέλης οὔτε Θεόφραστος, ὅλας ἐνεργείας ὑπερβαίνει καθάπερ τι σμικρὸν καὶ τὸ τυχόν τῆς τέχνης παραλιπὼν μέρος οὐδ’ ἀντεπείν ἀξιώσας, εὔτ’ ὅρθως εὑτε καὶ μὴ || σύμπαντες οὕτοι θερμῶ καὶ ψυχρῶ καὶ ἑρῶ καὶ ὑγρῶ, τοῖς μὲν ὡς ὅρωσι, τοῖς δ’ ὡς πάσχουσι, τά κατὰ τὸ σῶμα τῶν ξών ἀπάντων διοικεῖσθαι φασὶ καὶ ὡς τὸ θερμὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰς ἄλλας ἐνεργείας καὶ μάλιστ’ εἰς τὴν τῶν χυμῶν γένεσιν τὸ πλείστον δύναται. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν μὴ πείθεσθαί τοσοῦτοι τε καὶ τηλικοῦτοις ἀνδράσι καὶ πλέον αὐτῶν οἶεσθαί τι γιγνόσκειν ἀνεμέσθητον, τὸ δὲ μὴν ἀντιλογίας ἀξιώσαι μήτε μνήμης οὕτως ἐνδοξον δόγμα θαιμαστὴν τινα τὴν ὑπεροψίαν ἐνδείκνυται.

1 Apparently some form of anaemia.
the dropsy which begins in the flanks or in any other susceptible part; this clearly confutes Erasistratus’s assumption, although not so obviously as does that kind of dropsy which is brought about by an excessive chilling of the whole constitution; this, which is the primary reason for the occurrence of dropsy, results from a failure of blood-production, very much like the diarrhoea which follows imperfect digestion of food; certainly in this kind of dropsy neither the liver nor any other viscus becomes indurated.

The learned Erasistratus, however, overlooks—nay, despises—what neither Hippocrates, Diocles, Praxagoras, nor Philistion despised, nor indeed any of the best philosophers, whether Plato, Aristotle, or Theophrastus; he passes by whole functions as though it were but a trifling and casual department of medicine which he was neglecting, without deigning to argue whether or not these authorities are right in saying that the bodily parts of all animals are governed by the Warm, the Cold, the Dry and the Moist, the one pair being active and the other passive, and that among these the Warm has most power in connection with all functions, but especially with the genesis of the humours. Now, one cannot be blamed for not agreeing with all these great men, nor for imagining that one knows more than they; but not to consider such distinguished teaching worthy either of contradiction or even mention shows an extraordinary arrogance.

2 Philistion of Locri, a contemporary of Plato, was one of the chief representatives of the Sicilian school of medicine. For Diocles and Praxagoras see p. 51, note 1.

3 cf. Book I., chap. iii.
Γάλεν

Καὶ μὴν σμικρότατος ἐστὶ τὴν γνώμην καὶ ταπεινὸς ἐσχάτως ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς ἀντιλογίαις ἐν μὲν τοῖς περὶ τῆς πέψεως λόγοις τοῖς σήμεσθαι τὰ σιτία νομίζουσι φιλοτίμως ἀντιλέγον, ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τῆς ἀναδόσεως τοῖς διὰ τὴν παράθεσιν τῶν ἀρτηρίων ἀναδίδοσθαι τὸ διὰ τῶν φλεβῶν αἷμα νομίζουσιν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τῆς ἀναπνοῆς τοῖς περιωθεῖσθαι τῶν ἀέρα φάσκουσιν. οὐκ ὅκινησε δ' οὐδὲ τοῖς ἀτμοειδῶς εἰς τὴν κύστιν ἱέναι τὰ οὐρα νομίζουσιν αντειπεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς εἰς ἵνα τὸν πνεύμονα φέρεσθαι τὸ ποτὸν. οὕτως ἐν ἀπασί ταῖς χειρίστασι ἐπιλεγόμενοι δόξας ἀγάλλεται διατρίβων ἐπὶ πλέον ἐν ταῖς ἀντιλογίαις· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ αἷματος γενέσεως οὐδὲν ἀτιμοτέρας οὐσίας τῆς ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ χυλώσεως τῶν σιτίων οὔτ' ἀντειπεῖν τινι τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἥξιωσεν οὔτ' αὐτὸς εἰσηγήσασθαι τινι ἔτεραν γνώμην ἔτολμησεν, ὅ περι πασῶν τῶν φυσικῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν καθόλου λόγων ὑποσχόμενος ἔρειν, ὅπως τε γίγνονται καὶ δι' ὅντινων τοῦ ξύλου μορίων. ἤ τῆς μὲν πέττειν τὰ σιτία περικνίας δυνάμεως ἀρρωστοῦσης ἀπεπτήσει τὸ ξύλον, τῆς δ' αἷματούσης τὰ πεφθέντα οὐδὲν ἐσται πάθημα τὸ παράπαν, ἀλλ' ἀδαμαντίνη τες ἡμῖν αὐτὴ μόνη καὶ ἀπαθῆς ἐστιν; ἢ ἀλλ' τι τῆς ἀρρωστίας αὐτῆς ἐκγονον ὑπάρξει

1 Gk. pepsis; otherwise rendered coction.
2 cf. p. 13, note 5. 3 e.g. Asclepiades.
4 Lit. chyllosia; cf. p. 238, note 2.
5 That is to say, the haematopoietic function deserves
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Now, Erasistratus is thoroughly small-minded and petty to the last degree in all his disputations—when, for instance, in his treatise "On Digestion," 1 he argues jealously with those who consider that this is a process of putrefaction of the food; and, in his work "On Anadosis," 2 with those who think that the anadosis of blood through the veins results from the contiguity of the arteries; also, in his work "On Respiration," with those who maintain that the air is forced along by contraction. Nay, he did not even hesitate to contradict those who maintain that the urine passes into the bladder in a vaporous state, 3 as also those who say that imbibed fluids are carried into the lung. Thus he delights to choose always the most valueless doctrines, and to spend his time more and more in contradicting these; whereas on the subject of the origin of blood (which is in no way less important than the chylification 4 of food in the stomach) he did not deign to dispute with any of the ancients, nor did he himself venture to bring forward any other opinion, despite the fact that at the beginning of his treatise on "General Principles" he undertook to say how all the various natural functions take place, and through what parts of the animal! Now, is it possible that, when the faculty which naturally digests food is weak, the animal's digestion fails, whereas the faculty which turns the digested food into blood cannot suffer any kind of impairment? 5 Are we to suppose this latter faculty alone to be as tough as steel and unaffected by circumstances? Or is it that weakness of this faculty will result in some-

consideration as much as the digestive processes which precede it
καὶ οὐχ ὑδερος; δήλος οὖν ἐναργὼς ἐστιν ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος ἐξ ὧν ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀλλοις οὐδὲ ταῖς φαυλοτάταις δόξαις ἀντιλέγειν ὁκυνθεῖν, ἐνταυθοῖ γ' οὕτ' ἀντεπειν τοῖς πρόσθεν οὕτ' αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν τι καὶ ὄντον ἐτόλμησε, τὸ σφάλμα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γνωρίζων αἰρέσεως.

Τι γὰρ ἂν καὶ λέγειν ἐσχεν ὑπὲρ αἵματος || 113 ἀνθρώπος εἶς μηδὲν τῷ συμφύτῳ θερμῷ χρῶμενος; τί δὲ περὶ ξανθῆς χολῆς ἢ μελαίνης ἢ φλέγματος; ὅτι νὴ Δία δυνατὸν ἔστιν ἀναμεμεγμένην τοῖς σιτίοις εὐθὺς ἐξωθεῖν παραγίγνεσθαι τῇ χολῆν, λέγει γοῦν ὥδε πως αὐτὸς ὁνόμασι: "Πότερον δ' ἐν τῇ περὶ τῆς κοιλίας κατεργασίᾳ τῆς τροφῆς γεννᾶται τοιαύτη ύγρασία ἢ μεμυμένη τοῖς ἐξωθεῖν προσφερομένοις παραγίγνεται, οὔτ᾽ ἥπερ σιμπλοκον πρὸς ἰατρικὴν ἐπεσκέψατο." καὶ μὴν, ὦ γενναίοτατε, καὶ κενούσθαι χρήναι φάσκεις ἐκ τοῦ ζώου τὸν χυμὸν τούτον καὶ μεγάλως λυπεῖν, εἰ μὴ κενοθείη ὡς οὖν οὐδὲν ἐξ αὐτοῦ χρηστὸν ὑπολαμβάνων γίγνεσθαι τολμᾶσ αἰχρηστον λέγειν εἰς ἰατρικὴν εἶναι τὴν περὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ σκέψιν;

Τοποκείσθω γὰρ ἐν μὲν τοῖς σιτίοις περιέχεσθαι, μη διακρίνεσθαι δ' ἀκριβῶς ἐν ἡπατηταῦται γὰρ ἀμφότερα νομίζεις εἶναι δυνατά. καὶ μὴν οὐ σμικρὸν ἐνταῦθα τὸ διαφέρον ἡ ἐλαχίστην ἢ παμπόλλην χολῆν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς περιέχοντα προσάρασθαι συνία. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκίνδυνα, τὰ δὲ παμπόλλην περιέχοντα τῷ μή δύνασθαι πᾶσαν

1 i.e. Erasistratus could obviously say nothing about any of the humours or their origins, since he had not postulated
thing else than dropsy? The fact, therefore, that Erasistratus, in regard to other matters, did not hesitate to attack even the most trivial views, whilst in this case he neither dared to contradict his predecessors nor to advance any new view of his own, proves plainly that he recognized the fallacy of his own way of thinking. ¹

For what could a man possibly say about blood who had no use for innate heat? What could he say about yellow or black bile, or phlegm? Well, of course, he might say that the bile could come directly from without, mingled with the food! Thus Erasistratus practically says so in the following words: "It is of no value in practical medicine to find out whether a fluid of this kind ² arises from the elaboration of food in the stomach-region, or whether it reaches the body because it is mixed with the food taken in from outside." But, my very good Sir, you most certainly maintain also that this humour has to be evacuated from the animal, and that it causes great pain if it be not evacuated. How, then, if you suppose that no good comes from the bile, do you venture to say that an investigation into its origin is of no value in medicine?

Well, let us suppose that it is contained in the food, and not specifically secreted in the liver (for you hold these two things possible). In this case, it will certainly make a considerable difference whether the ingested food contains a minimum or a maximum of bile; for the one kind is harmless, whereas that containing a large quantity of bile, owing to the fact that it cannot be properly purified ³ the four qualities (particularly the Warm—that is, innate heat). ² i.e. bile. ³ i.e. deprived of its bile.
114 αὐτήν ἐν ἡπατὶ καθαρθῆναι καλῶς αἰτία καταστῆσεται τῶν τ’ ἄλλων παθῶν, δὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος ἐπὶ πλήθει χολῆς γίγνεσθαι φήσει, καὶ τῶν ἰκτέρων οὐχ ἤκιστα. πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἀναγκαίωτατον ἰατρῷ γεγυωσκεῖν, πρῶτον μὲν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς σιτίοις αὐτοῖς ἔξωθεν ἡ χολή περιέχεται, δεύτερον δ’, ὡς τὸ μὲν τεύτλου, εἰ τύχοι, παμπόλλην, ὁ δ’ ἅρτος ἐλαχίστην καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐλαιον πλείστην, ὁ δ’ οίνος ὀλιγίστην ἔκαστον τε τῶν ἄλλων ἀνύσου τῷ πλήθει περιέχει τὴν χολήν; πῶς γὰρ οὖν ἂν εἰς γελοιοτάτος, ὅς ἂν ἐκὼν αἰρῆται τὰ πλείστα χολὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς περιέχοντα πρὸ τῶν ἑαυτῶν;

Τὸ δ’ εἰ μὴ περιέχεται μὲν ἐν τοῖς σιτίοις ἡ χολή, γίγνεται δ’ ἐν τοῖς τῶν ξύλων σώμασιν; ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο χρήσιμον ἐπίστασθαι, τίνι μὲν καταστάσει σῶματος ἐπεταί πλείων αὐτῆς ἡ γένεσις, τίνι δ’ ἐλάττων; ἄλλοιον γὰρ δὴπον καὶ μεταβάλλειν οἷοι τ’ ἐσμὲν καὶ τρέπειν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἀεὶ τὰς μοχθηρὰς καταστάσεις τοῦ σώματος. ἀλλ’ εἰ μὴ γιγνώσκοιμεν, καθότι μοχθηραὶ καὶ ὅπως τῆς δεόντης ἐξίσται, πῶς ἂν αὐτὰς

115 ἐπανάγειν οἷοί τ’ εἴημεν ἐπὶ τὸ πρεῖπτον; Οὐκοῦν ἄχρηστον ἐστὶν εἰς τὰς ἱάσεις, ὡς Ἐρασίστρατος φῆσιν, ἐπίστασθαι τάληθες αὐτὸ περὶ γενέσεως χολῆς. οὐ μὴν οὖν ἀδύνατον οὖν ἀσαφές ἐξευρεῖν, ὅτι μὴ τῷ πλείστῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιέχειν τὸ μέλι τὴν ἕανθην χολὴν ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ σώματι μεταβαλλόμενον εἰς αὐτὴν ἄλλοιούτατον τε καὶ τρέπεται. πικρόν τε γὰρ ἂν ἦν γευμένοις, εἰ χολὴν ἔξωθεν εὐθὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιέχειν ἀπασί τ’ ἂν ὁσαύτως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἵσον αὐτῆς ἐγέννα
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in the liver, will result in the various affections—particularly jaundice—which Erasistratus himself states to occur where there is much bile. Surely, then, it is most essential for the physician to know in the first place, that the bile is contained in the food itself from outside, and, secondly, that for example, beet contains a great deal of bile, and bread very little, while olive oil contains most, and wine least of all, and all the other articles of diet different quantities. Would it not be absurd for any one to choose voluntarily those articles which contain more bile, rather than those containing less?

What, however, if the bile is not contained in the food, but comes into existence in the animal’s body? Will it not also be useful to know what *state of the body* is followed by a greater, and what by a smaller occurrence of bile? For obviously it is in our power to alter and transmute morbid states of the body—in fact, to give them a turn for the better. But if we did not know in what respect they were morbid or in what way they diverged from the normal, how should we be able to ameliorate them?

Therefore it is not useless in treatment, as Erasistratus says, to know the actual truth about the genesis of bile. Certainly it is not impossible, or even difficult to discover that the reason why *honey* produces yellow bile is not that it contains a large quantity of this within itself, but because it [the honey] undergoes change, becoming *altered* and transmuted into bile. For it would be bitter to the taste if it contained bile from the outset, and it would produce an equal quantity of bile

---

1 Here it is rather the living organism we consider than the particular food that is put into it.
GALEN

τὸ πλήθος. ἀλλ' οὕχ ὡδ' ἔχει τάληθες. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἀκμάζουσι καὶ μᾶλιςτ' εἰ φύσει θερμοτεροὶ καὶ βίον εἰς μιαντεῖς Ταλαίπωρον, ἀπαν εἰς ξανθὴν χολὴν μεταβάλλει τὸ μέλι τοῖς γέρουσι δ' ἰκανῶς ἐστιν ἐπιτήδειον, ὡς ἂν οὐκ εἰς χολὴν ἀλλ' εἰς αἷμα τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν ἐν ἑκείνοις λαμβάνον. 'Ερασίστρατος δὲ πρὸς τῷ μηδέν τούτων γυγνώσκειν ουδὲ περὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν τοῦ λόγου σωφρονεῖ, πότερον ἐν τοῖς σιτίοις ἡ χολὴ περιέχεται εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ κατεργασίαν ἐγένετο, μηδὲν εἶναι χρήσιμων εἰς ιατρικὴν ἀπεσκέφθαι λέγων. ἔχρην || γὰρ δὴπον προσθείναι τί καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν ἑτατει καὶ φλεψὶ γενέσεως αὐτῆς, ἐν τοῖς τοῖς ὀργάνοις γεννᾶσθαι τὴν χολὴν ἁμα τῷ αἴματι τῶν παλαιῶν ιατρῶν τε καὶ φιλοσόφων ἀποφημαμένων. ἀλλὰ τοῖς εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς σφαλεῖσι καὶ διαμαρτάνουσι τῆς ὀρθῆς ὁδοῦ τοιαύτα τε ληρεῖν ἀναγκαῖον ἐστι καὶ προσέτε τῶν χρησιμωτάτων εἰς τὴν τέχνην παραλιπεῖν τὴν ζητησιν.

Ἡδέως δ' ἂν ἐνταῦθα τοῦ λόγου γεγονὼς ἡρόμην τοὺς ὁμιλήσαι φάσκοντας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πλείστοιν τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ περιπάτου φιλοσόφων, εἰ γυγνώσκουσιν, ὡσα περὶ τοῦ κεκράσθαι τά σώματα ἡμῶν ἐκ θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ ὕγροῦ πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλους εἴρηται τε καὶ ἀποδεδεικται, καὶ ὡς τὸ θερμὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστι τὸ δραστικώτατον καὶ ὡς τῶν ξών ὡσα μὲν θερμότερα φύσει, ταῦτα πάντως ἐναίμα, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ πλέον ψυχρότερα πάντως ἐναίμα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοῦ χειμώνος ἀργά
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in every person who took it. The facts, however, are not so. For in those who are in the prime of life, especially if they are warm by nature and are leading a life of toil; the honey changes entirely into yellow bile. Old people, however, it suits well enough, inasmuch as the alteration which it undergoes is not into bile, but into blood. Erasistratus, however, in addition to knowing nothing about this, shows no intelligence even in the division of his argument; he says that it is of no practical importance to investigate whether the bile is contained in the food from the beginning or comes into existence as a result of gastric digestion. He ought surely to have added something about its genesis in liver and veins, seeing that the old physicians and philosophers declare that it along with the blood is generated in these organs. But it is inevitable that people who, from the very outset, go astray, and wander from the right road, should talk such nonsense, and should, over and above this, neglect to search for the factors of most practical importance in medicine.

Having come to this point in the argument, I should like to ask those who declare that Erasistratus was very familiar with the Peripatetics, whether they know what Aristotle stated and demonstrated with regard to our bodies being compounded out of the Warm, the Cold, the Dry and the Moist, and how he says that among these the Warm is the most active, and that those animals which are by nature warmest have abundance of blood, whilst those that are colder are entirely lacking in blood, and consequently in winter lie idle and motionless, lurking

1 Supreme importance of the "soil." cf. Introduction, pp. xii. and xxxi.
καλ ἀκίνητα κεῖται φωλεύοντα δίκην νεκρῶν. εἰρηταὶ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς χρονᾶς τοῦ αἵματος ὅν Ἀριστοτέλει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πλάτωνι. καὶ
117 ἡμείς νῦν, ὁπερ Ἡδῆ καὶ πρόσθεν εἰπον, || οὐ τὰ καλῶς ἀποδεδειγμένα τοῖς παλαιοῖς λέγειν πρού-
θεμεθα, μήτε τῇ γυνώμη μήτε τῇ λέξει τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐκείνους ὕπερβαλέσθαι δυνάμενοι. τὰ δ' ἦτοι χωρὶς ἀποδείξεως ὃς ἐναργῇ πρὸς αὐτῶν εἰρημένα διὰ τὸ μηδ' ὑπονόησαι μοχθηροὺς οὕτως ἔσεσθαι τινας σοφιστάς, οἱ καταφρονήσουσι τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀληθείας, ἢ καὶ παραλειμμένα τελέως ὕπ' ἐκείνων ἀξιοῦμεν εὐρίσκειν τε καὶ ἀποδεικνύων.

Περὶ δὲ τῆς τῶν χυμῶν γενέσεως οὐκ οἶδ', εἰ ἔχει τις ἐτερον προσθείναι σοφότερον ὁν Ἰππο-
κράτης εἶπε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Πραξιάγορας καὶ Φιλότιμος καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν παλαιῶν. ἀποδεικται γὰρ ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἄνδρασιν ἀλλοιου-
μένης τῆς τροφῆς ἐν ταῖς φλεψίν ὑπὸ τῆς εἵμυτου θερμασίας αἶμα μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς συμμετρίας τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι χυμοὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμετρίας γι-
γγομένου καὶ τοῦτῳ τῷ λόγῳ πάνθ' ὑμολογεῖ τὰ φαινόμενα. καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων ὅσα μὲν ἐστὶ
θερμότερα φύσει, χολωδέστερα, τὰ δὲ ψυχρότερα
φλεγματικῶτερα: καὶ τῶν ἡλικίων ὅσαυτως χο-
118 λωδέστε||ραi μὲν αἱ θερμότεραι φύσει, φλεγμα-
τωδέστεραι, δ' αἱ ψυχρότεραι: καὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευ-
μάτων δὲ καὶ τῶν χωρῶν καὶ τῶν ὀρῶν καὶ πολὺ
δὴ πρότερον ἐτὶ τῶν φύσεων αὐτῶν αἱ μὲν ψυ-
χρότεραι φλεγματωδέστεραι, χολωδέστεραι δ' αἱ

1 Aristotle, Hist. Animal., iii. xix.; Plato, Timaeus, 80 κε.
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in holes like corpses. Further, the question of the colour of the blood has been dealt with not only by Aristotle but also by Plato.¹ Now I, for my part, as I have already said, did not set before myself the task of stating what has been so well demonstrated by the Ancients, since I cannot surpass these men either in my views or in my method of giving them expression. Doctrines, however, which they either stated without demonstration, as being self-evident (since they never suspected that there could be sophists so degraded as to contemn the truth in these matters), or else which they actually omitted to mention at all—these I propose to discover and prove.

Now in reference to the genesis of the humours, I do not know that any one could add anything wiser than what has been said by Hippocrates, Aristotle, Praxagoras, Philotimus ² and many other among the Ancients. These men demonstrated that when the nutriment becomes altered in the veins by the innate heat, blood is produced when it is in moderation, and the other humours when it is not in proper proportion. And all the observed facts ³ agree with this argument. Thus, those articles of food, which are by nature warmer are more productive of bile, while those which are colder produce more phlegm. Similarly of the periods of life, those which are naturally warmer tend more to bile, and the colder more to phlegm. Of occupations also, localities and seasons, and, above all, of natures ⁴ themselves, the colder are more phlegmatic, and the warmer more

¹ Philotimus succeeded Diocles and Praxagoras, who were successive leaders of the Hippocratic school. cf. p. 51, note 1.
² Lit. phénoména.
³ i.e. living organisms; cf. p. 47, note 1.
Erasistratus rejected the idea of innate heat; he held that the heat of the body was introduced from outside.
bilious. Also cold diseases result from phlegm, and warmer ones from yellow bile. There is not a single thing to be found which does not bear witness to the truth of this account. How could it be otherwise? For, seeing that every part functions in its own special way because of the manner in which the four qualities are compounded, it is absolutely necessary that the function [activity] should be either completely destroyed, or, at least hampered, by any damage to the qualities, and that thus the animal should fall ill, either as a whole, or in certain of its parts.

Also the diseases which are primary and most generic are four in number, and differ from each other in warmth, cold, dryness and moisture. Now, Erasistratus himself confesses this, albeit unintentionally; for when he says that the digestion of food becomes worse in fever, not because the innate heat has ceased to be in due proportion, as people previously supposed, but because the stomach, with its activity impaired, cannot contract and triturate as before—then, I say, one may justly ask him what it is that has impaired the activity of the stomach.

Thus, for example, when a bubo develops following an accidental wound gastric digestion does not become impaired until after the patient has become fevered; neither the bubo nor the sore of itself impedes in any way or damages the activity of the stomach. But if fever occurs, the digestion at once deteriorates, and we are also right in saying that the activity of the stomach at once becomes impaired. We must add, however, by what

2 As a *bubo* is a swelling in the groin, we must suppose that the wound referred to would be in the leg or lower abdomen.
χρη τῷ λόγῳ. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐλκος οὐχ οἶνον τῷ ἀυτῇν βλάπτειν, ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ βουβάων. ἡ γὰρ ἀν ἐβλαψε καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ. εἰ δὲ μὴ ταύτα, δῆλον, ὡς ἡ τῆς θερμασίας πλεονεξία. δύο γὰρ ταύτα προσεγένετο τῷ βουβῶν, ἡ τῆς κατὰ τὰς ἀρτηρίας τε καὶ τὴν καρδιὰν κινήσεως ἀλλοίωσις καὶ ἡ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν θερμασίας πλεονεξία. ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν τῆς κινήσεως ἀλλοίωσις οὐ μόνον οὔδεν

120 βλάψει τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς γαστρός, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσωφελήσει κατ' ἐκείνα τῶν ζῴων, ἐν οἷς εἰς τὴν πέψιν ὑπέθετο πλειστὸν δύνασθαι τὸ διὰ τῶν ἀρτηρίων εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν ἐμπίπτοντο πνεῦμα. διὰ λοιπὴν οὖν ἔτι καὶ μόνην τὴν ἀμετρὸν θερμασίαν ἡ βλάβη τῆς ἐνεργείας τῇ γαστρί. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πνεῦμα σφοδρότερον τε καὶ συνεχέστερον καὶ πλέον ἐμπίπτει νῦν ἡ πρότερον. ὡστε ταύτῃ μὲν μάλλον πέψει τὰ διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα καλῶς πέττοντα ζῶα, διὰ λοιπὴν δ' ἔτι τὴν παρὰ φύσιν θερμασίαν ἀπεπτήσει. τὸ γὰρ καὶ τὸ πνεῦματι φάναι τιν' ὑπάρχειν ἰδιότητα, καθ' ἦν πέττει, κάπειτα ταύτῃ πυρεττῶν διαφθείρεσθαι καθ' ἐτερον τρόπον ἐστὶν ὀμολογῆσαι τὸ ἀτοπον. ἐρωτηθέντες γὰρ αὐθις, ὑπὸ τίνος ἠλλοιώθη τὸ πνεῦμα, μόνην ἐξουσιν ἀποκρίνεσθαι τὴν παρὰ φύσιν θερμασίαν καὶ μάλιστ' ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν

1 i.e. fever as a cause of disease.
2 As we should say, "circulatory" changes.
3 This is the "vital spirit" or pneuma which, according to Erasistratus and the Pneummatist school, was elaborated in the left ventricle, and thereafter carried by the arteries all over the body, there to subserve circulatory processes. It
it has been impaired. For the wound was not capable of impairing it, nor yet the bubo, for, if they had been, then they would have caused this damage before the fever as well. If it was not these that caused it, then it was the excess of heat (for these two symptoms occurred besides the bubo—an alteration in the arterial and cardiac movements and an excessive development of natural heat). Now the alteration of these movements will not merely not impair the function of the stomach in any way: it will actually prove an additional help among those animals in which, according to Erasistratus, the \textit{pneuma}, which is propelled through the arteries and into the alimentary canal, is of great service in digestion; there is only left, then, the disproportionate heat to account for the damage to the gastric activity. For the pneuma is driven in more vigorously and continuously, and in greater quantity now than before; thus in this case, the animal whose digestion is promoted by pneuma will digest more, whereas the remaining factor—abnormal heat—will give them indigestion. For to say, on the one hand, that the pneuma has a certain property by virtue of which it promotes digestion, and then to say that this property disappears in cases of fever, is simply to admit the absurdity. For when they are again asked what it is that has altered the pneuma, they will only be able to reply, “the abnormal heat,” and particularly if it be the pneuma in the food canal which is in

has some analogy with oxygen, but this is also the case with the “\textit{natural spirit}” or pneuma, whose seat was the liver and which was distributed by the \textit{veins} through the body; it presided over the more \textit{vegetative} processes. \textit{cf. p. 152, note 1; Introduction, p. xxxiv.}
κοιλίαν. οὔδὲ γὰρ πλησιάζει κατ’ οὖδὲν τούτο τῷ βουσών.

Καίτοι τί τῶν ζώων ἐκείνων, ἐν οἷς ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος ἰδιότης μέγα δύναται, μνημονεύω, παρόν ἐπ’ ἀνθρώποις, ἐν οἷς ἡ οὐδὲν ἡ παντάπασιν ἀμνῷ δρόν τι καὶ μικρὸν ὄφελεῖ, ποιεῖσθαι τῶν λόγων; ἀλλ’ ὅτι μὲν ἐν τοῖς πυρετοῖς οὐτοὶ κακῶς πέττουσιν, ὁμολογεῖ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὴν γ’ αἰτίαν προστίθεις βεβλάφθαι φησὶ τῆς γαστρὸς τῆς ἐνέργειαν. οὐ μὴν ἄλλην γέ τινα πρόφασιν τῆς βλάβης εἰπεῖν ἔχει πλὴν τῆς παρὰ φύσιν θερμασίας. ἀλλ’ εἰ βλάπτει τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡ παρὰ φύσιν θερμασία μὴ κατὰ τὶ συμβεβηκός, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν αὐτῆς οὐσίαν τε καὶ δύναμιν, ἐκ τῶν πρῶτων ἀν’ εἰς νοσημάτων καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐνδέχεται τῶν πρῶτων μὲν εἰσαι νοσημάτων τὴν ἀμετρίαν τῆς θερμασίας, τὴν δ’ ἐνέργειαν ὑπὸ τῆς εὐκρασίας μὴ γίγνεσθαι. οὔδὲ γὰρ δι’ ἄλλο τι δυνατὸν γίγνεσθαι τὴν δυσκρασίαν αἰτίαν τῶν πρῶτων νοσημάτων ἀλλ’ ἣ διὰ τὴν εὐκρασίαν διαφθειρομένην. τῷ γὰρ ὑπὸ ταύτης γίγνεσθαι τὰς ἐνέργειας ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰς πρῶτας αὐτῶν βλάβας διαφθειρομένης γίγνεσθαι.

"Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἐρασίστρατον ἡ εὐκρασία τοῦ θερμοῦ τῶν ἐνέργειῶν αἰτία, τοῖς θεωρεῖν τὸ ἀκόλουθον δυναμένοις ἱερῶς ἀποδεδείγχαι νομίζω. τούτων δ’ ὑπάρχοντος ἡμῖν οὖδὲν ἔτι χαλεπῶν || ἐφ’ ἐκάστης ἐνέργειας

1 Even leaving the pneuma out of account, Galen claims that he can still prove his thesis.
2 In other words: if dysrrasia is a first principle in pathology, then eucrasia must be a first principle in physiology.
question (since this does not come in any way near the bubo).

Yet why do I mention those animals in which the property of the pneuma plays an important part, when it is possible to base one's argument upon human beings, in whom it is either of no importance at all, or acts quite faintly and feebly? But Erasistratus himself agrees that human beings digest badly in fevers, adding as the cause that the activity of the stomach has been impaired. He cannot, however, advance any other cause of this impairment than abnormal heat. But if it is not by accident that the abnormal heat impairs this activity, but by virtue of its own essence and power, then this abnormal heat must belong to the primary diseases. But, indeed, if disproportion of heat belongs to the primary diseases, it cannot but be that a proportionate blending [eucrasia] of the qualities produces the normal activity. For a disproportionate blend [dyscrasia] can only become a cause of the primary diseases through derangement of the eucrasia. That is to say, it is because the [normal] activities arise from the eucrasia that the primary impairments of these activities necessarily arise from its derangement.

I think, then, it has been proved to the satisfaction of those people who are capable of seeing logical consequences, that, even according to Erasistratus's own argument, the cause of the normal functions is eucrasia of the Warm. Now, this being so, there is nothing further to prevent us from saying

---

3 The above is a good instance of Galen's "logical" method as applied to medical questions; an appeal to those who are capable of following "logical sequence." cf. p. 209, note 1.
τῇ μὲν εὐκρασίᾳ τὸ βέλτιον ἐπεσθαί λέγειν, τῇ δὲ δυσκρασίᾳ τὰ χείρω. καὶ τοῖνυν εἰπερ ταὐθ’ οὕτως ἔστὶ, τὸ μὲν αἷμα τῆς συμμέτρου θερμασίας, τὴν δὲ ξανθὴν χολήν τῆς ἀμέτρου νομιστέου ὑπάρχειν ἐγγονον. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ταῖς θερμαῖς ἡλικίαις καὶ τοῖς θερμοῖς χωρίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀραίς τοῦ ἔτους ταῖς θερμαῖς καὶ ταῖς θερμαίς καταστάσεων, ὦστις δὲ καὶ ταῖς θερμαίς κράσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι τε καὶ τοῖς διαιτήμασι καὶ τοῖς νοσήμασι τῶν θερμοῖς εὐλόγως ἡ ξανθὴ χολή πλείστη φαίνεται γιγνομένη.

Τὸ δ’ ἀπορεῖν, εἰτ’ ἐν τοῖς σώμασι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ χυμὸς οὕτως ἔστὶ τῇ γένεσιν εἰτ’ ἐν τοῖς συτίοις περιέχεται, μηδ’ ὅτι τοῖς υγιαίνοισιν ἀμέμπτως, ὅταν ἀσιτήσωσι παρὰ τὸ ἔθος ὑπὸ τινος περιστάσεως πραγμάτων ἀναγκασθέντες, πικρὸν μὲν τὸ στόμα γίγνεται, χολόδη δὲ τὰ ὀύρα, δάκνεται δ’ ἡ γαστήρ, ἑωρακότος ἐστὶν ἀλλ’ ὅσπερ ἐξαίφνης νῦν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐληλυθότος καὶ μῆπω τὸ κατ’ αὐτὸν φαινόμενα γιγνόσκοντος. ἐπεὶ τῆς οὐκ οἶδεν, ὡς ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἐφομένων ἐπὶ πλέον ἀλυκότερον μὲν τὸ 123 πρῶτον, ὑστερον || δὲ πικρότερον γίγνεται; κἂν εἰ τὸ μὲλι βουλήθεις αὐτὸ τὸ πάντων γλυκύτατον ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐγείν, ἀποδείξεις καὶ τοῦτο πικρότατον. δ’ γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὅσα μὴ φύσει θερμὰ, παρὰ τῆς ἐφήσεως ἐγγίγνεται, τοῦτ’ ἐκ φύσεως ὑπάρχει τῷ μέλιτι. διὰ τούτ’ οὖν ἐφώμενον οὐ γίγνεται γλυκύτερον. ὅσον γὰρ ἔχρην εἶναι θερμότητος εἰς γένεσιν γλυκύτητος, ἀκριβῶς αὐτῷ τοῦτο πᾶν οἴκοθεν ὑπάρχει. δ’ τοῖνυν 190
that, in the case of each function, eucrasia is followed by the more, and dyscrasia by the less favourable alternative. And, therefore, if this be the case, we must suppose blood to be the outcome of proportionate, and yellow bile of disproportionate heat. So we naturally find yellow bile appearing in greatest quantity in ourselves at the warm periods of life, in warm countries, at warm seasons of the year, and when we are in a warm condition; similarly in people of warm temperaments, and in connection with warm occupations, modes of life, or diseases.

And to be in doubt as to whether this humour has its genesis in the human body or is contained in the food is what you would expect from one who has—I will not say failed to see that, when those who are perfectly healthy have, under the compulsion of circumstances, to fast contrary to custom, their mouths become bitter and their urine bile-coloured, while they suffer from gnawing pains in the stomach—but has, as it were, just made a sudden entrance into the world, and is not yet familiar with the phenomena which occur there. Who, in fact, does not know that anything which is overcooked grows at first salt and afterwards bitter? And if you will boil honey itself, far the sweetest of all things, you can demonstrate that even this becomes quite bitter. For what may occur as a result of boiling in the case of other articles which are not warm by nature, exists naturally in honey; for this reason it does not become sweeter on being boiled, since exactly the same quantity of heat as is needed for the production of sweetness exists from beforehand in the honey. Therefore the external heat,
έξωθεν τοῖς ἐλλιπῶις θερμοῖς ἢν ὀφέλιμον, τούτ᾽ ἔκείνῳ βλάβη τε καὶ ἀμετρία γίγνεται καὶ διὰ τούτο θάττον τῶν ἄλλων ἐφόμενον ἀποδείκνυται πικρόν. δι᾽ αὐτὸ δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τοῖς θερμοῖς φύσει καὶ τοῖς ἀκμάζουσιν εἰς χολήν ἔτοίμως μεταβάλλεται. θερμῷ γὰρ θερμὸν πλησιάζον εἰς ἀμετρίαν κράσεως ἔτοιμως ἐξίσταται καὶ φθάνει χολὴ γιγνόμενον, οὐχ αἴμα. δεῖται τοῖς ψυχραῖς μὲν κράσεως ἀνθρώπου, ψυχρᾶς δ᾽ ἡλικίας, ἣν εἰς αἵματος ἄγγιται φύσιν. οὕκοιν ἀπὸ τρόπου συνεβουλευσεν Ἰπποκράτης τοῖς φύσει πικροχόλοις μὴ προσφέρειν τὸ μέλι, ὡς ἐν θερμοτέρας || δηλονοτί κράσεως ὑπάρχοντι.

οὕτω δὲ καὶ τοῖς νοσήμασι τοῖς πικροχόλοις πολέμιον εἰναι τὸ μέλι καὶ τῇ τῶν γεροῦτων ἡλικία φίλιον οὐχ Ἰπποκράτης μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες ἰατροὶ λέγουσιν, οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν ἐνδειξαμενὴς εὐρύτερες, οἱ δ᾽ ἐκ τῆς πείρας μόνης. οὔδε γὰρ οὔδε τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἰατροῖς ἑτερον τι παρὰ ταύτα τετήρηται γιγνόμενον, ἀλλὰ χρηστῶν μὲν ἔρεντι, νέῳ δʼ οὐ χρηστῶν, καὶ τῷ μὲν φύσει πικροχόλω βλαβερόν, ὀφέλιμον δὲ τῷ φλεγματώδει καὶ τῶν νοσημάτων ὁσαύτων τοῖς μὲν πικροχόλοις ἐχθρόν, τοῖς δὲ φλεγματώδει φίλιον· εἰ δὲ λόγῳ τοῖς μὲν θερμοῖς σώμασιν ἢ διὰ φύσιν ἢ διὰ νόσον ἢ δι᾽ ἡλικίαν ἢ δι᾽ ᾅραν ἢ διὰ χώραν ἢ δι᾽ ἐπιτήδευμα χολῆς γεννητικοῦ, αἵματος δὲ τοῖς ἐναπτίοις.

Καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐνδέχεται ταύτων ἐδεσμα τοῖς μὲν χολήν γεννᾶν, τοῖς δ’ αἷμα μὴ οὖκ ἐν τῷ σώματι
which would be useful for insufficiently warm substances, becomes in the honey a source of damage, in fact an excess; and it is for this reason that honey, when boiled, can be demonstrated to become bitter sooner than the others. For the same reason it is easily transmuted into bile in those people who are naturally warm, or in their prime, since warm when associated with warm becomes readily changed into a disproportionate combination and turns into bile sooner than into blood. Thus we need a cold temperament and a cold period of life if we would have honey brought to the nature of blood.\(^1\) Therefore Hippocrates not improperly advised those who were naturally bilious not to take honey, since they were obviously of too warm a temperament. So also, not only Hippocrates, but all physicians say that honey is bad in bilious diseases but good in old age; some of them having discovered this through the indications afforded by its nature, and others simply through experiment,\(^2\) for the Empiricist physicians too have made precisely the same observation, namely, that honey is good for an old man and not for a young one, that it is harmful for those who are naturally bilious, and serviceable for those who are phlegmatic. In a word, in bodies which are warm either through nature, disease, time of life, season of the year, locality, or occupation, honey is productive of bile, whereas in opposite circumstances it produces blood.

But surely it is impossible that the same article of diet can produce in certain persons bile and in others blood, if it be not that the genesis of these humours is

\(^1\) The aim of dietetics always being the production of moderate heat—i.e. blood.

\(^2\) Note contrasted methods of Rationalists and Empiricists.
Galen

the γενέσεως αυτῶν ἐπιτελομενής. εἰ γὰρ δὴ οὐκοθέν γε καὶ παρ’ ἐαυτοῦ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων ἐκαστον ἔχον καὶ οὐκ ἐν τοῖς τῶν ξώνα σώμασι. || 125 μεταβαλλόμενον ἐγέννα τὴν χολήν, ἐν ἀπασίν ἄν ὀμοίως αὐτὴν τοῖς σώμασιν ἐγέννα καὶ τὸ μὲν πικρὸν ἐξω γενομένοις ἤν ἂν οἶμαι χολῆς ποιητικόν, εἰ δὲ τι γλυκὺ καὶ χρυστόν, οὐκ ἂν οὗτὸ τὸ βραχύτατον ἐξ αὐτοῦ χολῆς ἐγεννᾶτο. καὶ μὴν οὐ τὸ μέλι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκαστον τῶν γλυκέων τοῖς προειρημένοις σώμασι τοῖς δι’ ὅτι τῶν εἰρημένων θερμοὶ οὖσιν εἰς χολὴν ἐτόιμοι εὐσίται.

Καὶ τοιαὶ ταύτ’ οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως ἐξηνέχθην εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀκολούθια ἀναγκασθεῖσ. εἶρηται δ’ ἐπὶ πλείοστον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν Ἀριστοτέλει τε καὶ Πραξιγόρα τὴν Ἰπποκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος γνώμην ὀρθῶς ἐξηγησαμένοις.

IX

Μὴ τοῖνυν ὡς ἀποδείξεις υφ’ ἡμῶν εἰρήσθαι νομίζειν τὰ τοιαῦτα μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ τῆς τῶν ἄλλως γνωσκότων ἀναίσθησιας ἐνδείξεις, οὐ μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς ἀπάντων ὀμολογούμενα καὶ καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν φαινόμενα γιγνώσκοντων τὰς δ’ ἀποδείξεις αὐτῶν τὰς κατ’ ἐπιστήμην ἐξ ἐκείνων χρῆ λαμβάνειν τῶν ἀρχῶν, ὅπως ἡ ἰδίᾳ 126 καὶ πρόσθεν || εὐπομεν, ὡς τὸ δραῖν καὶ πάσχειν εἰς ἄλληλα τοῖς σώμασιν ὑπάρχει κατὰ τὸ θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν καὶ ξηρὸν καὶ ύγρὸν. καὶ

1 Lit. anaesthesia. Linacre renders it indocilitas.
accomplished *in the body*. For if all articles of food contained bile from the beginning and of themselves, and did not produce it by undergoing change in the animal body, then they would produce it similarly in all bodies; the food which was bitter to the taste would, I take it, be productive of bile, while that which tasted good and sweet would not generate even the smallest quantity of bile. Moreover, not only honey but all other sweet substances are readily converted into bile in the aforesaid bodies which are warm for any of the reasons mentioned.

Well, I have somehow or other been led into this discussion,—not in accordance with my plan, but compelled by the course of the argument. This subject has been treated at great length by Aristotle and Praxagoras, who have correctly expounded the view of Hippocrates and Plato.

**IX**

For this reason the things that we have said are not to be looked upon as proofs but rather as indications of the dulness\(^1\) of those who think differently, and who do not even recognise what is agreed on by everyone and is a matter of daily observation. As for the scientific proofs of all this, they are to be drawn from these principles of which I have already spoken\(^2\)—namely, that bodies act upon and are acted upon by each other in virtue of the Warm, Cold, Moist and Dry. And if one is

\(^1\) p. 15.
eîte φλέβας εἰθ’ ἦπαρ εἰτ’ ἀρτηρίας εἶτε καρδίαν
eîte κοιλίαν εἰτ’ ἀλλο τι μόριον ἐνεργείαν τις
φήσειεν ἡντινοῦν ἐνεργειαν, ἀφύκτους ἀνάγκας
ἀναγκασθῆσεται διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν τεττάρων ποιαν
κρᾶσιν ὁμολογῆσαι τὴν ἐνεργειαν ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ.
diâ tî gâr ἡ γαστήρ περιστέλλεται τοίς σειτίοις,
diâ tî 딧 αἰ φλέβες αἶμα γεννῶσι, παρὰ τὸν
Ἐρασιστρατείων ἐδεόμην ἀκοῦσαι. ὶ τὸ γâr ὅτι
περιστέλλεται μόνον αὐτῷ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ γιγνῶσκειν
οὐδὲν χρηστὸν, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν εἰδεῖμεν·
οὕτῳ γâr ἄν οἶμαι καὶ τὰ σφάλματα θερα-
πεύσαιμεν. οὐ μὲλεῖ, φασίν, ἡμῖν οὐδὲ πολυ-
πραγμονοῦμεν ἐτὶ τὰς τοιαύτας αἰτίας· ὑπὲρ
ιατρὸν γâr εἰσὶ καὶ τῷ φυσικῷ προσήκονσι.
πότερον οὐν οὐδ’ ἀντερεῖτε τῷ φάσκοντι τὴν μὲν
ἐγκρασίαν τὴν κατὰ φύσιν αἰτίαν εἶναι τῆς ἐνερ-
γειας ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὀργάνων, τὴν δ’ αὖ δυσκρασίαν
127 νῦσσων τ’ ἥδη καλεῖσθαι καὶ πάντως ὑπ’ αὐ||τῆς
βλάπτεσθαι τὴν ἐνεργειαν; ἡ πεισθῇσθε ταῖς
tῶν παλαιῶν ἀποδείξεσιν; ἡ τρίτον τι καὶ μέσον
ἐκατέρω τούτων πράξετε μήθ’ ὡς ἀληθήσει τοῖς
λόγοις ἕξ ἀνάγκης πειθόμενοι μήτ’ ἀντιλέγοντες
ὡς ψευδέσιν, ἄλλα ἀπορητικοί τινες ἕξαίφυσι καὶ
Πυρρώνειοι γενήσεθε; καὶ μὴν εἰ τότῳ δράσετε,
tὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναγκαῖον ὑμῖν προστησάσθαι. τῷ
γâr ἄν ἐτι τρόπῳ καὶ τῶν ἰαμάτων εὐποροῦντε
τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκάστον τῶν νοσημάτων ἄγνοοντες;
tὶ οὖν οὐκ ἕξ ἠρχῆς ἐμπειρικοὺς ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς
ἐκαλέσατε; τὶ δὲ πράγμαθ’ ἡμῖν παρέχετε φυ-

1 Iatros: lit. “heu’er.”
2 Lit. “physicist” or “physiologist,” the student of the
physi.e. cf. p. 70, note 2.
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speaking of any activity, whether it be exercised by vein, liver, arteries, heart, alimentary canal, or any part, one will be inevitably compelled to acknowledge that this activity depends upon the way in which the four qualities are blended. Thus I should like to ask the Erasistrateans why it is that the stomach contracts upon the food, and why the veins generate blood. There is no use in recognizing the mere fact of contraction, without also knowing the cause; if we know this, we shall also be able to rectify the failures of function. “This is no concern of ours,” they say; “we do not occupy ourselves with such causes as these; they are outside the sphere of the practitioner, and belong to that of the scientific investigator.” Are you, then, going to oppose those who maintain that the cause of the function of every organ is a natural eucrasia, that the dyscrasia is itself known as a disease, and that it is certainly by this that the activity becomes impaired? Or, on the other hand, will you be convinced by the proofs which the ancient writers furnished? Or will you take a midway course between these two, neither perforce accepting these arguments as true nor contradicting them as false, but suddenly becoming sceptics—Pyrrhonists, in fact? But if you do this you will have to shelter yourselves behind the Empiricist teaching. For how are you going to be successful in treatment, if you do not understand the real essence of each disease? Why, then, did you not call yourselves Empiricists from the beginning? Why do you confuse us by announcing that you are

3 That is, a blending of the four principles in their natural proportion; Lat. temperies. Dyscrasia = interperia, “dis-temper.”
σικᾶς ἐνεργείας ἐπαγγελλόμενοι ζητεῖν ἱάσεως ἔνεκεν; εἰ γὰρ ἀδύνατος ἢ γαστήρ ἐστὶ τινι περιστελλοσθαι καὶ τρίβειν, πῶς αὐτὴν εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἐπανάξομεν ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἀδύναμίας; ἐγὼ μὲν φημι τὴν μὲν ὑπερτεθερμασμένην ἐμψυκτέον ἦμιν εἶναι, τὴν δ' ἐψυχομένην θερμαντέον· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐξηρασμένην ύγραντέον, τὴν δ' ὑγρασμένην ἕραντέον. ἀλλὰ καὶ || κατὰ συζυγίαν, εἰ θερμοτέρα τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἄμα καὶ ξηροτέρα τύχοι γεγενημένη, κεφάλαιον εἶναι τῆς ἱάσεως ἐμψυχέων θ' ἄμα καὶ ὑγραίνεων· εἰ δ' αὖ ψυχροτέρα τε καὶ ὑγροτέρα, θερμαίνειν τε καὶ ξηραίνειν κατὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὠσαύτως· οἱ δ' ἀπ' 'Ερασίστρατον τί ποτε καὶ πράξονσιν οὐδ' ὅλως ζητεῖν τῶν ἐνεργειῶν τὰς αἰτίας ὑμολογοῦντες; ὁ γὰρ τοις καρποῖς τῆς περὶ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν ζητήσεως οὕτος ἐστὶ, τὸ τὰς αἰτίας τῶν δυσκρασίων εἰδότα εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἐπανάγειν αὐτᾶς, ὡς αὐτὸ γε μόνον τὸ γρόνου τὴν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀργάνων ἐνέργειαν ἢτίς ἐστὶν οὕτω χρηστὸν εἰς τὰς ἱάσεις.

'Ερασίστρατος δὲ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἀγνοεῖν, ώς, ἢτίς ἂν ἐν τῷ σώματι διάθεσις βλάπτῃ τὴν ἐνέργειαν μη κατὰ τι συμβεβηκός ἀλλὰ πρῶτος τε καὶ καθ' ἕαυτὴν, αὐτὴ τὸ νόσημα ἐστὶν αὐτὸ. πῶς οὖν ἐτὶ διαγνωστικός τε καὶ ιατικός ἐσται τῶν νοσημάτων ἀγνοοῦν ὅλως αὐτὰ τίνα τ' ἐστὶ καὶ πόσα καὶ ποῖα; κατὰ μὲν δὴ τὴν γαστήρα τὸ γε τοσοῦτον 'Ερασίστρατος ἥξισε 198
investigating natural activities with a view to treatment? If the stomach is, in a particular case, unable to exercise its peristaltic and grinding functions, how are we going to bring it back to the normal if we do not know the cause of its disability? What I say is⁴ that we must cool the over-heated stomach and warm the chilled one; so also we must moisten the one which has become dried up, and conversely; so, too, in combinations of these conditions; if the stomach becomes at the same time warmer and drier than normally, the first principle of treatment is at once to chill and moisten it; and if it become colder and moister, it must be warmed and dried; so also in other cases. But how on earth are the followers of Erasistratus going to act, confessing as they do that they make no sort of investigation into the cause of disease? For the fruit of the enquiry into activities is that by knowing the causes of the dyscrasiae one may bring them back to the normal, since it is of no use for the purposes of treatment merely to know what the activity of each organ is.

Now, it seems to me that Erasistratus is unaware of this fact also, that the actual disease is that condition of the body which, not accidentally, but primarily and of itself, impairs the normal function. How, then, is he going to diagnose or cure diseases if he is entirely ignorant of what they are, and of what kind and number? As regards the stomach, certainly, Erasistratus held that one should at least

¹ This is the orthodox Hippocratic treatment, that of opposites by opposites. Contrast the homoeopathic principle which is the basis of our modern methods of immunisation (similia similibus carentur, Hahnemann).
129 ζητείσθαι τὸ πῶς πέττεται τὰ σιτία; || τὸ δ’ ἢτις πρώτη τε καὶ ἀρχηγὸς αὐτία τούτου, πῶς οὐκ ἐπεσκέψατο; κατὰ δὲ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὸ ἀἷμα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ πῶς παρέλιπεν.

'Αλλ' οὖθ' Ἰπποκράτης οὐ' ἄλλος τις ὁν ὁλίγῳ πρόσθεν ἐμνημόνευσα φιλοσόφων ἢ ἰατρῶν ἄξιον φετ' εἶναι παραλιπεῖν. ἀλλὰ τὴν κατὰ φύσιν ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἐξὸν θερμασίαν εὑκράτον τε καὶ μετρίως ὕγραν οὐσαν αἵματος εἶναι φασί γεννητικὴν καὶ δι’ αὐτὸ γε τούτο καὶ τὸ ἀἷμα θερμὸν καὶ ὕγρον εἶναι φασὶ τῇ δυνάμει χυμὸν, ὥσπερ τὴν ξανθήν χολήν θερμὴν καὶ ξηρὰν εἶναι, εἰ καὶ ὅτι μάλιστ' ὕγρα φαίνεται. διαφέρειν γὰρ αὐτοῖς δοκεῖ τὸ κατὰ φαντασίαν ὕγρον τοῦ κατὰ δύναμιν. ἢ τὶς οὐκ οἴδεν, ὡς ἀληθὲς μὲν καὶ θάλαττα ταριχεύει τὰ κρέα καὶ ἀσηπτὰ διαφυλάττει, τὸ δ’ ἄλλο πᾶν ὑδωρ τὸ πότιμον ἐτοίμως διαφθείρει τε καὶ σήπει; τὶς δ’ οὐκ οἴδεν, ὡς ξανθῆς χολῆς ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ περιεχομένης πολλῆς ἀπαύστῳ δίψει συνεχόμεθα καὶ ὡς ἐμέσαντες αὐτὴν εὐθὺς ἄδυψοι γιγνόμεθα μᾶλλον ἢ εἰ

130 πάμπολυ ποτὸν προσηράμεθα; || θερμὸς οὐν εὐλόγως ὁ χυμὸς οὕτος εὑρῆται καὶ ξηρὸς κατὰ δύναμιν, ὥσπερ γε καὶ τὸ φλέγμα Ψυχρὸν καὶ ὕγρον. ἐναργεῖς γὰρ καὶ περὶ τούτου πίστεις Ἰπποκράτει τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὑρηνται παλαιοῖς.

Πρόδικος δ’ ἐν τῷ περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου γράμματι τὸ συγκεκαυμένον καὶ οἶνον ὑπερωπτημένον ἐν τοῖς χυμοῖς ὁνομάζων φλέγμα παρὰ τὸ πεφλέχθαι τῇ λέξει μὲν ἐτέρως χρηται, φυλάττει
investigate \textit{how} it digests the food. But why was not investigation also made as to the primary originative cause of this? And, as regards the veins and the blood, he omitted even to ask the question \textit{"how?"} Yet neither Hippocrates nor any of the other physicians or philosophers whom I mentioned a short while ago thought it right to omit this; they say that when the heat which exists naturally in every animal is well blended and moderately moist it generates blood; for this reason they also say that the blood is a \textit{virtually} warm and moist humour, and similarly also that yellow bile is warm and dry, even though for the most part it appears moist. (For in them the \textit{apparently} dry would seem to differ from the \textit{virtually} dry.) Who does not know that brine and sea-water preserve meat and keep it uncorrupted,\textsuperscript{1} whilst all other water—the drinkable kind—readily spoils and rots it? And who does not know that when yellow bile is contained in large quantity in the stomach, we are troubled with an unquenchable thirst, and that when we vomit this up, we at once become much freer from thirst than if we had drunk very large quantities of fluid? Therefore this humour has been very properly termed warm, and also virtually dry. And, similarly, \textit{phlegm} has been called cold and moist; for about this also clear proofs have been given by Hippocrates and the other Ancients.

Prodicus\textsuperscript{2} also, when in his book \textquote{On the Nature of Man} he gives the name \textquote{phlegm} (from the verb $\pi\varepsilon\phi\lambda\varepsilon\chi\theta\alpha\iota$) to that element in the humours which has been burned or, as it were, \textit{over-roasted}, while using

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1} Lit. \textit{aseptic}.
\textsuperscript{2} Prodicus of Ceos, a Sophist, contemporary of Socrates.
\end{footnotesize}
μέντοι τὸ πράγμα κατὰ ταύτο τοῖς ἄλλοις. τὴν δ' ἐν τοῖς ὄνομασὶ τάνδρας τοῦτον καινοτομίαν ἰκανῶς εὑδείκνυται καὶ Πλάτων. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο γε τὸ πρὸς ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων ὄνομαξόμενον φλέγμα τὸ λευκὸν τὴν χρῶσιν, ὁ βλέπων ὄνομάζει Πρόδικος, ὁ ψυχρὸς καὶ υγρὸς χυμὸς ἐστὶν οὕτως καὶ πλεῖστος τοῖς τε γέρουσι καὶ τοῖς ὀπωσδήποτε ψυγείσιν ἀθροίζεται καὶ σύδεις σύδε μανώμενος ἀν ἄλλο τι ἡ ψυχρῶν καὶ υγρῶν εἴποι ἀν αὐτῶν.

Ἀρ' οὖν θερμὸς μὲν τίς ἐστι καὶ υγρὸς χυμὸς καὶ θερμὸς καὶ ξηρὸς ἐτερος καὶ υγρὸς καὶ ψυχρὸς ἄλλος, σύδεις δ' ἐστι ψυχρὸς καὶ ξηρὸς τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἡ τετάρτη συζύγια τῶν κράτων οὖν τὸν ἀπασι τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπάρχουσα μόνος τοῖς χυμοῖς οὐχ ὑπάρχει; καὶ μὴν ἢ γε μέλαινα χολὴ τοιούτος ἐστι χυμὸς, διὸ οἱ σωφρονοῦντες αὐτοῖς καὶ φιλόσοφοι πλεονεκτεῖν ἐφασαν τῶν μὲν ὁρῶν τοῦ ἐτους ἐν φθινοπώρῳ μάλιστα, τῶν δ' ἣλικιῶν ἐν ταῖς μετὰ τὴν ἀκμῆν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ διαίτήσιμα καὶ χωρία καὶ καταστάσεις καὶ νόσους τινῶς ψυχρὰς καὶ ξηρὰς εἰναὶ φασίν οὐ γὰρ δὴ χωλήν ἐν ταύτῃ μόνῃ τῇ συζύγιᾳ τὴν φύσιν εἰναι νομίζουσιν ἀλλ' ὡσπέρ τὰς ἄλλας τρεῖς οὕτω καὶ τὴν διὰ πάντων ἐκτετάσθαι.

Ἡξύμην οὖν κανταῦθ' ἐρωτήσαι δύνασθαι τοῦ Ἐρασίστρατον, εἰ μηδὲν ὀργανὸν ἢ τεχνικὴ φύσις ἐδημιουργησε καθαρτικὸν τοῦ τοιούτου χυμοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν οὐρῶν ἀρα τῆς διακρίσεως ἐστὶν ὀργανα δύο καὶ τῆς ξανθῆς χολῆς ἐτερον οὐ
a different terminology, still keeps to the fact just as the others do; this man’s innovations in nomenclature have also been amply done justice to by Plato. Therefore, the white-coloured substance which everyone else calls phlegm, and which Prodicus calls blenna [mucus], is the well-known cold, moist humour which collects mostly in old people and in those who have been chilled in some way, and not even a lunatic could say that this was anything else than cold and moist.

If, then, there is a warm and moist humour, and another which is warm and dry, and yet another which is moist and cold, is there none which is virtually cold and dry? Is the fourth combination of temperaments, which exists in all other things, non-existent in the humours alone? No; the black bile is such a humour. This, according to intelligent physicians and philosophers, tends to be in excess, as regards seasons, mainly in the fall of the year, and, as regards ages, mainly after the prime of life. And, similarly, also they say that there are cold and dry modes of life, regions, constitutions, and diseases. Nature, they suppose, is not defective in this single combination; like the three other combinations, it extends everywhere.

At this point, also, I would gladly have been able to ask Erasistratus whether his “artistic” Nature has not constructed any organ for clearing away a humour such as this. For whilst there are two organs for the excretion of urine, and another of considerable size for that of yellow bile, does the

---

2 cf. the term blennorrhoea, which is still used.
3 cf. the Scotch term “colded” for “affected with a cold”; Germ. *erkältet.*
σμικρόν, ὁ δὲ τοὺτων κακοηθέστερος χυμὸς ἀλάται διὰ παντὸς ἐν ταῖς φλεψίν ἀναμεμβηκάμενος τῷ αἵματι. καῖτοι “Δυσεντερίη,” φησί που Ἰπποκράτης, “ἡν ἀπὸ χολῆς μελάνῃς ἀρέξῃ-132 ταί, θανάσιμον,” οὔ μὴν ἡ γ’ ἀπὸ τῆς ξανθῆς χολῆς ἀρχομένη πάντως ὀλέθριος, ἀλλ’ οἱ πλείουσ ἐξ αὐτῆς διασφάζονται. τοσοῦτο κακοηθέστερα τε καὶ δρμυντέρα τήν δύναμιν ἡ μέλαινα χολή τῆς ξανθῆς ἐστιν. ἀρ’ οὖν οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων ἀνέγυο τι τῶν του Ἰπποκράτους γραμμάτων ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος οὖθεν οὔτε τὸ περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώ-που βιβλίον, ἵν’ οὕτως ἀργῶς παρέλθου θήν περὶ τῶν χυμῶν ἐπίσκεψιν, ἢ γιγνώσκει μέν, ἔκδω δὲ παραλείπει καλλίστην τῆς τέχνης θεωρίαν; ἐξρήν οὖν αὐτὸν μηδὲ περὶ τοῦ σπληνὸς εὐρη-κέναι τι μηδ’ ἄσχημονεὶν ὑπὸ τῆς τεχνικῆς φύ-σεως ὀργανον τηλικοῦτον μάτην ἡγούμενον κατε-σκευᾶσθαι. καὶ μὴν οὖχ Ἰπποκράτης μόνον ἦ Πλάτων, οὔθεν τι χεῖρος Ἐρασίστρατον περὶ φύσιν ἄνδρες, ἐν τὶ τῶν καθαιρόντων τὸ αἷμα καὶ τοῦτ’ εἶναι φασὶ τὸ σπλάγχνον, ἄλλα καὶ μυρίῳ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἄλλοι τῶν παλαιῶν ἰατρῶν τε καὶ φιλοσόφων, ὅν ἀπάντων προσποιησάμενος ὑπερφρονεῖν ὁ γενναῖος Ἐρασίστρατος οὖτ’ ἀν-τείπειν οὖθ’ ὀλος τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν ἐμνήμονεσε. καὶ μὴν ὅσοις γε τὸ σῶμα θάλλει, τούτους ὁ σπλήν φθίνει, φησὶν Ἰπποκράτης, καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ 133 τῆς ἐμπειρίας ὀρμῶμενοι πάντες ὀμολογοῦσιν ἰατροί. καὶ ὅσοις γ’ αὐ μέγας καὶ ὑπούλος 204
humour which is more pernicious than these wander about persistently in the veins mingled with the blood? Yet Hippocrates says, "Dysentery is a fatal condition if it proceeds from black bile"; while that proceeding from yellow bile is by no means deadly, and most people recover from it; this proves how much more pernicious and acrid in its potentialities is black than yellow bile. Has Erasistratus, then, not read the book, "On the Nature of Man," any more than any of the rest of Hippocrates's writings, that he so carelessly passes over the consideration of the humours? Or, does he know it, and yet voluntarily neglect one of the finest studies in medicine? Thus he ought not to have said anything about the spleen, nor have stultified himself by holding that an artistic Nature would have prepared so large an organ for no purpose. As a matter of fact, not only Hippocrates and Plato—who are no less authorities on Nature than is Erasistratus—say that this viscus also is one of those which cleanse the blood, but there are thousands of the ancient physicians and philosophers as well who are in agreement with them. Now, all of these the high and mighty Erasistratus affected to despise, and he neither contradicted them nor even so much as mentioned their opinion. Hippocrates, indeed, says that the spleen wastes in those people in whom the body is in good condition, and all those physicians also who base themselves on experience agree with this. Again, in those cases in which the spleen is large and is increasing from

1 The word théoria used here is not the same as our theory. It is rather a "contemplation," the process by which a theory is arrived at. cf. p. 226, note 2.
2 Erasistratus on the uselessness of the spleen. cf. p. 143.
αὔξάνεται, τούτως καταφθείρει τε καλ κακόχυμα τὰ σώματα τίθησιν, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν οὕχ Ιπποκράτης μόνον ἄλλα καὶ Πλάτων ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἁπὸ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ὀμολογοῦσιν ιατροὶ. καὶ οἱ ἁπὸ σπλήνος δὲ κακοπραγοῦντος ἐκτεροι μελάντεροι καὶ τῶν ἐλκών αἱ οὐλαὶ μελαιναί. καθόλου γὰρ, ὅταν ἐνδεέστερον ἢ προσήκειν εἰς ἑαυτοῦ ἐλκή τὸν μελαγχολικὸν χυμόν, ἀκάθαρτον μὲν τὸ αἷμα, κακόχρουν δὲ τὸ πάν γίγνεται σῶμα. πότε ὃ ἐνδεέστερον ἐλκεί; ἢ δῆλον ὅτι κακῶς διακείμενος; ὡσπερ οὖν τοῖς νεφροῖς ἐνεργείας οὕσης ἐλκεῖν τὰ σύρα κακῶς ἐλκεῖν υπάρχει κακοπραγοῦσιν, ωὐτῷ καὶ τῷ σπλήνι ποιότητος μελαγχολικῆς ἐλκτικῆν ἐν ἑαυτῷ δύναμιν ἔχουτε σύμφυτον ἀρρωστήσαντι ποτε ταῦτῃ τίνας ἀναγκαίον ἐλκεῖν κακῶς καὶ τῶδε παχύτερον ἢδη καὶ μελάντερον γίγνεσθαι τὸ αἷμα.

Ταῦτ’ οὖν ἀπαντά πρὸς τε τὰς διαγνώσεις τῶν νοσημάτων καὶ τὰς ιάσεις μεγίστην παρεχό-134 μενα χρείαν || ὑπερεπηθήςει τελεώς ὁ ἕρως-στρατος καὶ καταφρονεῖν προσεποιήσατο τηλικοῦτων ἄνδρῶν ὁ μηδὲ τῶν τυχόντων καταφρονῶν ἀλλ’ ἄει φιλοτίμως ἀντιλέγων ταῖς ἡλιθιωτάταις δόξαις. ὥς καὶ δῆλος, ὡς οὖδεν ἔχων οὔτ’ ἀντειπεῖν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπεφήμαιντο περὶ σπλήνος ἐνεργείας τε καὶ χρείας οὔτ’ αὐτὸς ἐξευρίσκων τι καινὸν εἰς τὸ μηδὲν ὅλως εἶπεῖν ἀφίκετο. ἀλλ’ ἥμεις καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῶν αἰτίων, οἷς ἀπαντᾶ διοικεῖται τὰ κατὰ τὰς

1 Enlargement and suppuration (?) of spleen associated with toxaemia or "cacochoymy." 2 Lit. "melancholic."
internal suppuration, it destroys the body and fills it with evil humours;¹ this again is agreed on, not only by Hippocrates, but also by Plato and many others, including the Empiric physicians. And the jaundice which occurs when the spleen is out of order is darker in colour, and the cicatrices of ulcers are dark. For, generally speaking, when the spleen is drawing the atrabiliary² humour into itself to a less degree than is proper, the blood is unpurified, and the whole body takes on a bad colour. And when does it draw this in to a less degree than proper? Obviously, when it [the spleen] is in a bad condition. Thus, just as the kidneys, whose function it is to attract the urine, do this badly when they are out of order, so also the spleen, which has in itself a native power of attracting an atrabiliary quality,³ if it ever happens to be weak, must necessarily exercise this attraction badly, with the result that the blood becomes thicker and darker.

Now all these points, affording as they do the greatest help in the diagnosis and in the cure of disease were entirely passed over by Erasistratus, and he pretended to despise these great men—he who does not despise ordinary people, but always jealously attacks the most absurd doctrines. Hence, it was clearly because he had nothing to say against the statements made by the ancients regarding the function and utility of the spleen, and also because he could discover nothing new himself, that he ended by saying nothing at all. I, however, for my part, have demonstrated, firstly from the causes by which everything throughout nature is governed (by

³ i.e. the combination of sensible qualities which we call black bile. cf. p. 8, note 3.
φύσεις, τού θερμοῦ λέγω καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ ύγροῦ, δεύτερον δὲ ἔξι αὐτῶν τῶν ἐναργῶς φαινομένων κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ψυχρὸν καὶ ξηρὸν εἶναι τινα χρῆναι χυμὸν ἀπεδείξαμεν. ἔξις δὲ, ὅτι καὶ μελαγχολικὸς οὐτος ὑπάρχει καὶ τὸ καθαίρον αὐτὸν σπλάγχνον ὁ σπλήν ἔστιν, διὰ βραχέως ὡς ἐν μάλιστα τῶν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀποδεειγμένων ἀναμνήσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ λείπον ἐτὶ τοῖς παροῦσι λόγοις ἀφιξόμεθα.

Τὰ δὲ ἄν εἰὴ λείπον ἀλλο γ’ ἐξηγήσασθαι 135 σαφῶς, οἴον τι βούλονται τε || καὶ ἀποδεικνύοντι περὶ τὴν τῶν χυμῶν γένεσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ συμβαίνειν. ἐναργεστέρον δ’ ἀν γυνωσθείη διὰ παραδείγματος. οἴον δὴ μοι νόει γλεύκινον οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ τῶν σταφυλῶν ἐκτεθλημένον ξένοντά τε καὶ ἀλλοιούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ θερμασίας ἐπείτα κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ μεταβολὴν δύο γεννώμενα περιττῶματα τὸ μὲν κουφότερον τε καὶ ἀερωδέστερον, τὸ δὲ βαρύτερον τε καὶ γεωδέστερον, ὅν τὸ μὲν ἄνθος, οἶμαι, τὸ δὲ τρύγα καλούσι. τούτων τῷ μὲν ἐτέρῳ τὴν ξανθὴν χόλην, τῷ δ’ ἐτέρῳ τὴν μέλαιναν εἰκάζων οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτωσι, οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐχόντων ἱδέαν τῶν χυμῶν τούτων ἐν τῷ κατὰ φύσιν διοικοῖσθαι τὸ ξύλον, οἶαν καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἔχοντος ἐπιφαίνονται πολλάκις. ἦ μὲν γὰρ ξανθὴ λεκιθώδης γίγνεται καὶ γὰρ ὀνομάζουσιν οὕτως αὐτὴν, ὅτι ταῖς τῶν ὀδῶν λεκίθοις ὁμοιοῦται κατὰ τε χρόαν καὶ πάχος. ἦ δ’ αὐ μέλαινα κακοθέστερα μὲν πολὺ καὶ 208
the causes I mean the Warm, Cold, Dry and Moist) and secondly, from obvious bodily phenomena, that there must needs be a cold and dry humour. And having in the next place drawn attention to the fact that this humour is black bile [atrabiliary] and that the viscus which clears it away is the spleen—having pointed this out by help of as few as possible of the proofs given by ancient writers, I shall now proceed to what remains of the subject in hand.

What else, then, remains but to explain clearly what it is that happens in the generation of the humours, according to the belief and demonstration of the Ancients? This will be more clearly understood from a comparison. Imagine, then, some new wine which has been not long ago pressed from the grape, and which is fermenting and undergoing alteration through the agency of its contained heat. Imagine next two residual substances produced during this process of alteration, the one tending to be light and air-like and the other to be heavy and more of the nature of earth; of these the one, as I understand, they call the floater and the other the lees. Now you may correctly compare yellow bile to the first of these, and black bile to the latter, although these humours have not the same appearance when the animal is in normal health as that which they often show when it is not so; for then the yellow bile becomes vitelline, being so termed because it becomes like the yolk of an egg, both in colour and density; and again, even the black bile itself becomes much more malignant than when in

1 Thus Galen has demonstrated the functions of the spleen both deductively and inductively. For another example of the combined method cf. Book III., chaps. i. and ii.; cf. also Introd. p. xxxii. 2 i.e. its innate heat. 3 Lit. lecithoid.
GALEN

autē tīs katā φύσιν ὄνομα δ᾽ ούδὲν ἵδιον κεῖται τῷ τοιοῦτῳ χυμῷ, πλὴν εἰ ποῦ τινες ἦ ἐξυστικόν ἦ ὀξύδη κεκλήκασιν αὐτὸν, ὅτι καὶ δριμὺς ὀμοίως

136 οἷς γίγνεται καὶ || ξύει γε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ξύου καὶ τὴν γῆν, εἰ κατ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐκχυθεῖν, καὶ τίνα μετὰ πομφόλυγων οἰνον ξύμωσιν τε καὶ ξέσιν ἔργαζεται, σηπεδόνος ἐπικτήτου προσελθοῦσις ἐκείνῳ τῷ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχοντι χυμῷ τῷ μέλαινι. καὶ μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν παλαιῶν ἱερῶν αὐτῷ μὲν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχον τοῦ τοιοῦτου χυμοῦ καὶ διαχωροῦν κάτω καὶ πολλάκις ἐπιπολάζον ἄνω μέλαινα καλεῖν χυμόν, οὐ μέλαιναν χολήν, τὸ δ᾽ ἐκ συγκαύσεως τινος καὶ σηπεδόνος εἰς τὴν οἷαν μεθυστάμενον ποιότητα μέλαιναν ὄνομάζειν χολήν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τῶν ὑδροματῶν οὐ χρη διαφέρεσθαι, τὸ δ᾽ ἅλθεῖς ὁδ᾽ ἔχον εἰδέναι.

Κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἁίματος γένεσιν ὅσον ἂν ἰκανῶς παχὺ καὶ γεώδες ἐκ τῆς τῶν σιτίων φύσεως ἐμφερόμενον τῇ τροφῇ μὴ δέξηται καλῶς τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐμφύτου θερμασίας ἄλλοισιν, οὐ σπλήν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἔλκει τοῦτο. τὸ δ᾽ ὁπτιθὲν, ὡς ἂν τις εὕτως, καὶ συγκαυθεῖν τῆς τροφῆς, εἰθ᾽ ἂν τοῦτο το θερμοτατον ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ γλυκύτατον, οἰον τὸ τε μέλι καὶ ἡ τιμελὶ, ξανθὴ γενόμενον χολὴ διὰ τῶν χοληδόχων ὄνομαζομένων ἄγγειλων

137 ἐκκαθαίρεται. || λεπτὸν δ᾽ ἐστὶ τοῦτο καὶ ῥγρόν καὶ ῥυτὸν οὕς ὀσπερ ὅταν ὀπτιθὲν ἐσχύτως ξανθὸν καὶ πυρῶδες καὶ παχὺ γένηται ταῖς τῶν

1 Note that there can be “normal” black bile.
2 The term food here means the food as introduced into the stomach; the term nutriment (trophē) means the same
its normal condition, but no particular name has been given to [such a condition of] the humour, except that some people have called it corrosive or acetose, because it also becomes sharp like vinegar and corrodes the animal’s body—as also the earth, if it be poured out upon it—and it produces a kind of fermentation and seething, accompanied by bubbles—an abnormal putrefaction having become added to the natural condition of the black humour. It seems to me also that most of the ancient physicians give the name black humour and not black bile to the normal portion of this humour, which is discharged from the bowel and which also frequently rises to the top [of the stomach-contents]; and they call black bile that part which, through a kind of combustion and putrefaction, has had its quality changed to acid. There is no need, however, to dispute about names, but we must realise the facts, which are as follow:—

In the genesis of blood, everything in the nutriment which belongs naturally to the thick and earth-like part of the food, and which does not take on well the alteration produced by the innate heat—all this the spleen draws into itself. On the other hand, that part of the nutriment which is roasted, so to speak, or burnt (this will be the warmest and sweetest part of it, like honey and fat), becomes yellow bile, and is cleared away through the so-called biliary vessels; now, this is thin, moist, and fluid, not like what it is when, having been roasted to an excessive degree, it becomes yellow, fiery, and thick, like the yolk of food in the digested condition, as it is conveyed to the tissues. cf. pp. 41–43. Note idea of imperfectly oxidized material being absorbed by the spleen. cf. p. 214, note 1.

* Lit. choledochous, bile-receiving.
净资产 λέκιθοις. τούτο μὲν γὰρ ἢδη παρὰ φύσιν θάτερον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον εἰρημένον κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ὡσπερ γε καὶ τοῦ μέλανος χυμοῦ τὸ μὲν μῆτω τὴν οἰον ξέσιν τε καὶ ξύμωσιν τῆς γῆς ἐργαζόμενον κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶ, τὸ δ’ εἰς τοιαύτην μεθιστάμενον ἵδειν τε καὶ δύναμιν ἢδη παρὰ φύσιν θερμοῦ προσειληφὸς δρμύτητα καὶ οἶον τέφρα τις ἢδη γεγονός. ὡδὲ πως καὶ ἡ κεκαυμένη τρυξί τῆς ἀκαύστου διήνεγκε. θερμὸν γὰρ τι χρῆμα αὐτὴ γ’ ἰκανῶς ἐστίν, ὡστε καὶ εἰς τε καὶ τῆς εἰς καὶ διαφθείρειν τὴν σάρκα. τῇ δ’ ἐτέρᾳ τῇ μῆπω κεκαυμένῃ τοὺς ἰατροὺς ἐστιν εὐρέων χρωμένους οἷς ὀσαπερ καὶ τῇ γῇ τῇ καλομένῃ κεραμίτιδι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὥστε ἡραίνειν θ’ ἀμα καὶ ψύχειν πέφυκεν.

Εἰς τὴν τῆς οὔτω συγκαυθείσης μελαίνης χολῆς ἱδέαν καὶ ἡ λεκιθώδης ἐκείνη μεθίσταται πολλάκις, ὅταν καὶ αὐτῇ ποθ’ οἶον ὀπτηθεῖσα 138 τῆς πυρὸς διαθείσι θερμασία. τὰ δ’ ἀλλα ἡ τῶν χολῶν εὐθ’ σὐμπαντα τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς τῶν εἰρημένων κράσεως γίγνεται, τὰ δ’ οἶον ὀδόν τινας εἰς τῆς τούτων γενέσεως τε καὶ εἰς ἀλληλα μεταβολῆς. διαφέρουσι δὲ τῇ τὰς μὲν ἀκράτους εἶναι καὶ μόνας, τὰ δ’ οἶον ὀρροὺς τις ἐξυγρασμένας. ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν ὄρροι τῶν χυμῶν ἁπαντες περιττώματα καὶ καθαρῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι δεῖται τοῦ ξύου τὸ σῶμα. τῶν δ’ εἰρημένων χυμῶν ἐστὶ τῆς χρεία τῇ φύσει καὶ τοῦ παχέος καὶ τοῦ λεπτοῦ καὶ καθαίρεται πρὸς τε τοῦ σπληνῶς καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ ἦπατι κύστεως τῷ αἴμα καὶ ἀποτίθεται τοσοῦτον τε καὶ τοιοῦτον ἐκατέρου μέρος, ὥσον καὶ οἶον, εἴπεο εἰς
eggs; for this latter is already abnormal, while the previously mentioned state is natural. Similarly with the black humour: that which does not yet produce, as I say, this seething and fermentation on the ground, is natural, while that which has taken over this character and faculty is unnatural; it has assumed an acridity owing to the combustion caused by abnormal heat, and has practically become transformed into ashes. In somewhat the same way burned lees differ from unburned. The former is a warm substance, able to burn, dissolve, and destroy the flesh. The other kind, which has not yet undergone combustion, one may find the physicians employing for the same purposes that one uses the so-called potter’s earth and other substances which have naturally a combined drying and chilling action.

Now the vitelline bile also may take on the appearance of this combusted black bile, if ever it chance to be roasted, so to say, by fiery heat. And all the other forms of bile are produced, some from a blending of those mentioned, others being, as it were, transition-stages in the genesis of these or in their conversion into one another. And they differ in that those first mentioned are unmixed and unique, while the latter forms are diluted with various kinds of serum. And all the serums in the humours are waste substances, and the animal body needs to be purified from them. There is, however, a natural use for the humours first mentioned, both thick and thin; the blood is purified both by the spleen and by the bladder beside the liver, and a part of each of the two humours is put away, of such quantity and

1 Thus over-roasting—shall we say excessive oxidation?—produces the abnormal forms of both black and yellow bile.
The term “catarrh” refers to this “running down,” which was supposed to take place through
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quality that, if it were carried all over the body, it would do a certain amount of harm. For that which is decidedly thick and earthy in nature, and has entirely escaped alteration in the liver, is drawn by the spleen into itself\(^1\); the other part which is only moderately thick, after being elaborated [in the liver], is carried all over the body. For the blood in many parts of the body has need of a certain amount of thickening, as also, I take it, of the \(fibr\)es which it contains. And the use of these has been discussed by Plato\(^2\) and it will also be discussed by me in such of my treatises as may deal with the use of parts. And the blood also needs, not least, the yellow humour, which has as yet not reached the extreme stage of combustion; in the treatises mentioned it will be pointed out what purpose is subserved by this.

Now Nature has made no organ for clearing away \(phlegm\), this being cold and moist, and, as it were, half-digested nutriment; such a substance, therefore, does not need to be evacuated, but remains in the body and undergoes \(alteration\) there. And perhaps one cannot properly give the name of \(phlegm\) to the surplus-substance which runs down from the brain\(^3\) but one should call it \(mucus\) \([\text{blenna}]\) or \(coryza\)—as, in fact, it is actually termed; in any case it will be pointed out, in the treatise “On the Use of Parts,” how Nature has provided for the evacuation of this substance. Further, the device provided by Nature which ensures that the phlegm which forms in the stomach and intestines may be evacuated in the most rapid and effective way possible—this also will be described in that com-

the pores of the cribriform plate of the ethmoid into the nose.
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140 ὑπομνῆμα μάτων. ὅσον οὖν ἐμφέρεται ταῖς φλεψὶ φλέγμα χρῆσιμον ὑπάρχον τοῖς ζῴοις, οὐδεμιᾶς δεῖται κενώσεως. προσέχειν δὲ χρή κἂνταῦθα τὸν νοῦν καὶ γιγνώσκειν, ὁσπερ τῶν χολῶν ἐκατέρας τὸ μὲν τὶ χρῆσιμὸν ἐστὶ καὶ κατὰ φύσιν τοῖς ζῴοις, τὸ δ’ ἀχρηστῶν τε καὶ παρὰ φύσιν, οὔτω καὶ τοῦ φλέγματος, ὅσον μὲν ἢ ἡ γλυκύς, χρῆστον εἶναι τοῦτο τῷ ζῷῳ καὶ κατὰ φύσιν, ὅσον δ’ ὃξι καὶ ἄλμυρὸν ἐγένετο, τὸ μὲν ὃξι τελέως ἡπεπτήσθαι, τὸ δ’ ἄλμυρὸν διασεσῆθαι. τελείαν δ’ ἀπεψίαν φλέγματος ἀκούειν χρῆ τὴν τῆς δευτέρας πέψεως δηλονότι τῆς ἐν φλεψὶν οὐ γὰρ δὴ τῆς γε πρώτης τῆς κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν ἡ οὖν ἂν ἐγεγένητο τὴν ἀρχὴν χυμὸς, εἰ καὶ ταῦτην διεπεφέυγει.

Ταῦτ’ ἀρκεῖν μοι δοκεῖ περὶ γενέσεως τε καὶ διαφθορᾶς χυμῶν ὑπομνήματ’ εἶναι τῶν Ἰπποκράτει τε καὶ Πλάτωνι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ Πραξιγόρᾳ καὶ Διοκλεί καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν παλαιῶν εἰρημένων: οὐ γὰρ ἐδικαίωσα πάντα μεταφέρειν εἰς τόνδε τὸν λόγον τὰ τελέως ἐκείνοις γεγραμμένα. τοσοῦτον δὲ μόνον ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου 141 εἶπον, ὅσον ἐξορμήσει τε τούς ἐντυγχάνοντας, εἰ μὴ παντάπασιν εἰεν σκαίοι, τοῖς τῶν παλαιῶν ὁμιλήσαι γράμματι καὶ τήν εἰς τὸ βάον αὐτοῖς συνειναι βοήθειαν παρέξει. γεγραττεί δὲ σοι καὶ δ’ ἑτέρον λόγον περὶ τῶν κατὰ Πραξιγόραν τῶν Νικάρχου χυμῶν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὃτι μάλιστα
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mentary. As to that portion of the phlegm which is carried in the veins, seeing that this is of service to the animal it requires no evacuation. Here too, then, we must pay attention and recognise that, just as in the case of each of the two kinds of bile, there is one part which is useful to the animal and in accordance with its nature, while the other part is useless and contrary to nature, so also is it with the phlegm; such of it as is sweet is useful to the animal and according to nature, while, as to such of it as has become bitter or salt, that part which is bitter is completely undigested, while that part which is salt has undergone putrefaction. And the term "complete indigestion" refers of course to the second digestion—that which takes place in the veins; it is not a failure of the first digestion—that in the alimentary canal—for it would not have become a humour at the outset if it had escaped this digestion also.

It seems to me that I have made enough reference to what has been said regarding the genesis and destruction of humours by Hippocrates, Plato, Aristotle, Praxagoras, and Diocles, and many others among the Ancients; I did not deem it right to transport the whole of their final pronouncements into this treatise. I have said only so much regarding each of the humours as will stir up the reader, unless he be absolutely inept, to make himself familiar with the writings of the Ancients, and will help him to gain more easy access to them. In another treatise¹ I have written on the humours according to Praxagoras, son of Nicarchus; although this authority makes as many as ten humours, not

¹ Now lost.
δέκα ποιεῖ χωρίς τοῦ ἀλματος, ἐνδέκατος γὰρ ἀν εἴη χυμὸς αὐτὸ τὸ ἄλμα, τῆς Ἰπποκράτους οὐκ ἀποχωρεῖ διδασκαλίας. ἀλλ’ εἰς εἰδὴ τινὰ καὶ διαφορὰς τέμνει τοὺς ὑπ’ ἐκείνου πρότου πάντων ἁμα ταῖς οἰκείαις ἀποδείξεσιν εἰρημένους χυμοὺς.

'Επαινεῖν μὲν οὖν χρὴ τούς τ’ ἐξηγησαμένους τὰ καλῶς εἰρημένα καὶ τοὺς εἰ τι παραλέλειπται προστιθέντας’ οὐ γὰρ οἴον τε τὸν αὐτὸν ἄρξασθαι τε καὶ τελεῖσαι μέμφεσθαι δὲ τοὺς οὔτως ἀταλαιπώρους, ὡς μηδὲν ὑπομένειν μαθεῖν τῶν ὀρθῶς εἰρημένων, καὶ τοὺς εἰς τοσοῦτον φιλοτίμονες, ὡστ’ ἐπιθυμία νεωτέρων δογμάτων ἀεὶ πανοργεῖν τι καὶ σοφίζεσθαι, τὰ μὲν ἐκόντας παραλιπόντας, ὡσπερ Ἔρασίστρατος ἐπὶ τῶν χυμῶν ἐποίησε, τὰ δὲ παρουργοὶ ἀντιλέγοντας, ὡσπερ αὐτὸς θ’ οὔτος καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν νεωτέρων.

'Αλλ’ οὔτος μὲν ο λόγος ἐνταυθοὶ τελευτᾶτο, τὸ δ’ ὑπόλοιπον ἀπαν ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ προσθήσο.
including the blood (the blood itself being an eleventh), this is not a departure from the teaching of Hippocrates; for Praxagoras divides into species and varieties the humours which Hippocrates first mentioned, with the demonstration proper to each.

Those, then, are to be praised who explain the points which have been duly mentioned, as also those who add what has been left out; for it is not possible for the same man to make both a beginning and an end. Those, on the other hand, deserve censure who are so impatient that they will not wait to learn any of the things which have been duly mentioned, as do also those who are so ambitious that, in their lust after novel doctrines, they are always attempting some fraudulent sophistry, either purposely neglecting certain subjects, as Erasistratus does in the case of the humours, or unscrupulously attacking other people, as does this same writer, as well as many of the more recent authorities.

But let this discussion come to an end here, and I shall add in the third book all that remains.
BOOK III
143 "Οτι μὲν οὖν ἡ θρέψις ἀλλοιωμένου τε καὶ ὁμοιουμένου γίγνεται τὸν τρέφοντος τῷ τρεφόμενῳ καὶ ως ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν τοῦ ξύλου μορίων ἐστὶ τις δύναμις, ἢν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας ἀλλοιωτικῆς μὲν κατὰ γένος, ὁμοιωτικῆς δὲ καὶ θρεπτικῆς κατ’ εἶδος ὀνομάζομεν, ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν δεδήλωται λόγῳ. τὴν δὲ εὐπορίαν τῆς υλῆς, ἢν τροφὴν ἐαυτῷ ποιεῖται τὸ τρεφόμενον, ἐξ ἑτέρας τινὸς ἐχεῖν ἐδείκνυτο δυνάμεως ἐπιστᾶσθαι περικυάς τὸν οἰκείον χυμὸν, εἶναι δ’ οἰκείον εἰκάστῳ τῶν μορίων χυμὸν, διὰ ἀν ἐπιτηδείους εἰς τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἂν, καὶ τὴν ἐλκουσαν αὐτὸν δύναμιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας ἐλκτικῆς τῆς τινὰ καὶ ἐπισταστικῆς ὀνομάζεσθαι. δεδεικταὶ δὲ καὶ, ωσ πρὸ μὲν τῆς ὁμοιώσεως ἡ πρόσφυσις ἐστὶν, ἐκείνης δὲ ἐμπροσθεν ἡ πρόσθεσις γίγνεται, τέλος, ὡς ἄν εἰποί τις, οὕσα τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐπισταστικῆς δύναμιν ἐνεργείας. αὐτὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ παράγεσθαι τὴν τροφὴν ἐκ τῶν φλεβῶν εἰς ἑκαστόν τῶν μορίων τῆς ἐλκτικῆς ἐνεργοῦσης γίγνεται δυνά-

1 "Of food to feeder," i.e. of the environment to the organism. cf. p. 39, chap. xi.
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It has been made clear in the preceding discussion that nutrition occurs by an alteration or assimilation of that which nourishes to that which receives nourishment,¹ and that there exists in every part of the animal a faculty which in view of its activity we call, in general terms, alterative, or, more specifically, assimilative and nutritive. It was also shown that a sufficient supply of the matter which the part being nourished makes into nutriment for itself is ensured by virtue of another faculty which naturally attracts its proper juice [humour] that that juice is proper to each part which is adapted for assimilation, and that the faculty which attracts the juice is called, by reason of its activity, attractive or epispastic.² It has also been shown that assimilation is preceded by adhesion, and this, again, by presentation,³ the latter stage being, as one might say, the end or goal of the activity corresponding to the attractive faculty. For the actual bringing up of nutriment from the veins into each of the parts takes place through the activation of the attractive faculty,⁴ whilst to

³ For these terms (prosthesis and prosphysis in Greek) cf. p. 39, notes 5 and 6. ⁴ Lit. “through the energizing (or functioning) of the attractive faculty”; the faculty (δυναμίς) in operation is an activity (ἐνέργεια). cf. p. 3, note 2.
μεως, τὸ δ’ ἦδη παρῆχθαι τε καὶ προστίθεσθαι τῷ μορίῳ τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν αὐτό, δε’ δ’ καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνέργειας ἐδεήθημεν. ἵνα γὰρ προστεθῇ, διὰ τοῦθ’ ἐλκεται. ἥρων δ’ ἐντεύθεν ἦδη πλειόνος εἰς τὴν θρέψιν τοῦ ζώου δεῖ· ἐλαχῆναι μὲν γὰρ καὶ διὰ ταχέων τι δύναται, προσφύναι δὲ καὶ ἀλλοιωθῆναι καὶ τελέως ὀμοιωθῆναι τῷ τρεφόμενῷ καὶ μέρος αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι παραχρῆμα μὲν οὐχ οἶνον τε, ἥρων δ’ ἄν πλείονον συμβάινοι καλῶς. ἀλλ’ εἰ μὴ μένοι κατὰ τὸ μέρος ὁ προστεθεὶς οὔτος χυμός, εἰς ἑτέρου δὲ τι μεθύσκαι τοί παραρρέου διὰ παντὸς ἀμείβων τε καὶ ὑπαλλήλων τὰ χωρία, κατ’ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν || οὐτε πρόσφυσις οὔτ’ ἐξομοίωσις ἐσται. δε’ δὲ κανταυθά τυχός τῇ φύσει δυνάμεως ἑτέρας εἰς πολυχρόνιον μονὴν τοῦ προστεθέντος τῷ μορίῳ χυμοῦ καὶ ταύτης οὐκ ἐξωθεὶν ποθεὶν ἐπιρρεύσας ἀλλ’ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ θρεψιμένῳ κατωκισμένης, ἡν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας πάλιν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν ἡναγκάσθησαν ὀνομάσαι καθεκτικὴν.

‘Ο μὲν δὴ λόγος ἦδη σαφῶς ἐνεδείξατο τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς γενέσεως τῆς τοιαύτης δυνάμεως καὶ ὅστις ἀκολουθίας σύνεσιν ἔχει, πέπεισται βεβαιώς ἐξ δὲ εἰπομεν, ὡς ὑποκειμένου τε καὶ προσποδεδειγμένου τοῦ τεχνικῆς εἰναι τήν φύσιν καὶ τοῦ ζώου κηδεμονικῆν ἀναγκαίον ὑπάρχειν ἀὑτῇ καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης δύναμιν.
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have been finally brought up and presented to the part is the actual end for which we desired such an activity; it is attracted in order that it may be presented. After this, considerable time is needed for the nutrition of the animal; whilst a thing may be even rapidly attracted, on the other hand to become adherent, altered, and entirely assimilated to the part which is being nourished and to become a part of it, cannot take place suddenly, but requires a considerable amount of time. But if the nutritive juice, so presented, does not remain in the part, but withdraws to another one, and keeps flowing away, and constantly changing and shifting its position, neither adhesion nor complete assimilation will take place in any of them. Here too, then, the [animal's] nature has need of some other faculty for ensuring a prolonged stay of the presented juice at the part, and this not a faculty which comes in from somewhere outside but one which is resident in the part which is to be nourished. This faculty, again, in view of its activity our predecessors were obliged to call retentive.

Thus our argument has clearly shown 1 the necessity for the genesis of such a faculty, and whoever has an appreciation of logical sequence must be firmly persuaded from what we have said that, if it be laid down and proved by previous demonstration that Nature is artistic and solicitous for the animal's welfare, it necessarily follows that she must also possess a faculty of this kind.

1 This chapter is an excellent example of Galen's method of reasoning a priori. The complementary inductive method, however, is employed in the next chapter. cf. p. 209, note 1.
GALEN

II

'Αλλ' ἡμεῖς οὐ τούτῳ μόνῳ τῷ γένει τῆς ἀποδείξεως εἰδισμένοι χρησιμεῖ καὶ προστιθέντες δ' αυτῷ καὶ τάς ἐκ τῶν ἐναργῶς φαινομένων ἀναγκαζούσας τε καὶ βιαζομένας πίστεις ἐπὶ τάς τοιαύτας καὶ νῦν ἀφιξόμεθα καὶ δείξομεν ἐπὶ μὲν τινῶν μορίων τοῦ σώματος οὖτως ἐναργή τὴν καθεκτικὴν ὑπάρχουσαν, ὅσ αυταῖς ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν διαγνωσκεῦσαι τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτής, ἐπὶ δὲ τινῶν ἑπτῶν μὲν ἐναργῶς ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν, λόγῳ δὲ κάνταῦθα φωράθηναι δυναμένην.

'Ἄρξωμεθ' οὖν τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ τέως πρώτων μεθὸς των προχειρίσασθαι μόρι' ἀττα τοῦ σώματος, ἐφ' ὃν ἀκριβῶς ἔστι βασανίσαι τε καὶ ξητήσαι τὴν καθεκτικὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ὑποῖα ποτ' ἐστίν.

'Ἀρ' οὖν ἂμεινον ἂν τις ἐτέρωθεν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν μεγίστων τε καὶ κοιλοτάτων ὄργανον ὑπάρξαι τῆς ξητήσεως; ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἂν δοκεῖ βέλτιον. ἐναργεῖς γοῦν εἰκὸς ἐπὶ τούτων φανῆται τὰς ἐνεργείας διὰ τὸ μέγεθος: ὡς τὰ γε σμικρὰ τὰ' ἂν, εἰ καὶ σφοδρὰν ἔχει τὴν τοιαύτην δύναμιν, ἄλλ' οὖκ αἰσθήσει γ' ἐτοίμην διαγνωσκεῦσαι τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτῆς.

'Ἀλλ' ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα κοιλοτάτα καὶ μεγιστά τῶν τοῦ ζωῆς μορίων ἢ τε γαστήρ καὶ <αἰ> μήτραι τε καὶ υστέραι καλοῦμεναι. τι οὖν κολύει ταύτα πρώτα προχειρισαμένους ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰς ἐνεργείας αὐτῶν, ὃσα μὲν καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀνατομῆς

1 The deductive.
2 The logos is the argument or “theory” arrived at by the
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Since, however, it is not our habit to employ this kind of demonstration alone, but to add thereto cogent and compelling proofs drawn from obvious facts, we will also proceed to the latter kind in the present instance: we will demonstrate that in certain parts of the body the retentive faculty is so obvious that its operation can be actually recognised by the senses, whilst in other parts it is less obvious to the senses, but is capable even here of being detected by the argument. ¹

Let us begin our exposition, then, by first dealing systematically for a while with certain definite parts of the body, in reference to which we may accurately test and enquire what sort of thing the retentive faculty is.

Now, could one begin the enquiry in any better way than with the largest and hollowest organs? Personally I do not think one could. It is to be expected that in these, owing to their size, the activities will show quite clearly, whereas with respect to the small organs, even if they possess a strong faculty of this kind, its activation will not at once be recognisable to sense.

Now those parts of the animal which are especially hollow and large are the stomach and the organ which is called the womb or uterus.² What prevents us, then, from taking up these first and considering their activities, conducting the enquiry on our own process of λογικὴ Θεωρία or "theorizing"; cf. p. 151, note 3; p. 205, note 1.

¹ The Greek words for the uterus (μέτραe and ηυστεραe) probably owe their plural form to the belief that the organ was bicornuate in the human, as it is in some of the lower species.
ΓΑΛΕΝ

dήλαι, τὴν ἐξέτασιν ἐφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ποιουμένων, ὅσα δ' ἀμυδρότεραι, τὰ παραπλήσια διαίροντας ἀνθρώπῳ ζῶα, || οὐχ ὥσ· οὐκ ἂν ἰκανῶς τὸ γε καθόλου περὶ τῆς ἤτοιμήνης δυνάμεως καὶ τῶν ἀνομοίων ἐνδειξομένων, ἀλλ' ὦς ἴν' ἄμα τῷ κοινῷ καὶ τὸ ἰδιόν ἐφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἔγνωκότες εἰς τε τὰς διαγράψεις τῶν νοσημάτων καὶ τὰς ἱάσεις εὐ-πορώτεροι γιγνώμεθα.

Περὶ μὲν οὖν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ὀργάνων ἂμα λέγειν ἀδύνατον, ἐν μέρει δ' ὑπὲρ ἐκατέρου ποιησόμεθα τῶν λόγων ἀπὸ τοῦ σαφέστερον ἐνδειξασθαί δυνάμενον τὴν καθεκτικήν δύναμιν ἀρξάμενοι. κατέχει μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἡ γαστὴρ τὰ σιτία, μέχρι περὶ ἄν ἐκπέψῃ, κατέχουσι δὲ καὶ αἱ μήτραι τὸ ἐμβρύων, ἔστ' ἄν τελείωσωσιν ἀλλὰ πολλαπλάσιος ἠστιν ὁ τῆς τῶν ἐμβρύων τελεώ-σεως χρόνος τῆς τῶν σιτίων πέψεως.

III

Εἰκὸς οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἐναργέστερον ἐν ταῖς μήτραις φωράσειν ἡμᾶς τὴν καθεκτικὴν, ὡσ φαίνεται πολυχρονιστέραν τῆς γαστρός τὴν ἐνέργειαν κέκτηται. μησὶ γὰρ ἐννέα ποὺ ταῖς πλείσταις τῶν γυναικῶν ἐν αὐταῖς τελειοῦται τὰ κυήματα, μεμυκυῖαις μὲν ἀπαντὶ τῷ αὐχένι, περιεχούσαις δὲ πανταχόθεν αὐτὰ σὺν τῷ χορίῳ. || καὶ πέρας γε τῆς τοῦ στόματος μύσεως καὶ τῆς τοῦ κυουμένου κατὰ τὰς μήτρας μονῆς ἡ χρεία τῆς ἐνεργείας ἔστιν· ὦ γὰρ ὡς ἐτυχεῖν οὐδὲ ἀλόγως ἰκανὰς περιστελλεσθαί καὶ κατέχειν τὸ 228
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persons in regard to those activities which are obvious without dissection, and, in the case of those which are more obscure, dissecting animals which are near to man;¹ not that even animals unlike him will not show, in a general way, the faculty in question, but because in this manner we may find out at once what is common to all and what is peculiar to ourselves, and so may become more resourceful in the diagnosis and treatment of disease.

Now it is impossible to speak of both organs at once, so we shall deal with each in turn, beginning with the one which is capable of demonstrating the retentive faculty most plainly. For the stomach retains the food until it has quite digested it, and the uterus retains the embryo until it brings it to completion, but the time taken for the completion of the embryo is many times more than that for the digestion of food.

III

We may expect, then, to detect the retentive faculty in the uterus more clearly in proportion to the longer duration of its activity as compared with that of the stomach. For, as we know, it takes nine months in most women for the foetus to attain maturity in the womb, this organ having its neck quite closed, and entirely surrounding the embryo together with the chorion. Further, it is the utility of the function which determines the closure of the os and the stay of the foetus in the uterus. For it is not casually nor without reason that Nature has made

¹ Note this expression. For Galen's views on the origin of species, cf. Introduction, p. xxxi., footnote.
ἐμβρυνον ἡ φύσις ἀπείργασατο τὰς ύστερας, ἀλλ' ἐν εἰς τὸ πρέπον ἀφίκηται μέγεθος τὸ κυούμενον. ὅταν οὖν, οὐ χάριν ἐνήργουν τῇ καθεκτικῇ δυνάμει, συμπεπληρομένον ἦ, ταύτην μὲν ἀνέπαυσάν τε καὶ εἰς ἥρεμιαν ἑπανήγαγον, ἀντ' αὐτῆς δ' ἐτέρα χρόνως τῇ τέως ἁσυχαζόγη, τῇ προωστικῇ. ἦν δ' ἀρα καὶ τῆς ἐκείνης ἁσυχίας ὁρος ἡ χρεία καὶ τῆς γ' ἐνεργείας ὥσαύτως ἡ χρεία· καλούσης μὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐνεργεῖ, μὴ καλούσης δ' ἁσυχάζει.

Καὶ χρή πάλιν κανταῦθα καταμαθεῖν τῆς φύσεως τὴν τέχνην, ὡς οὐ μόνον ἐνεργειῶν χρησίμων δυνάμεις ἐνέθηκεν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὄργανων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτίων τε καὶ κινήσεων κατ' ἐνονόματο. καλώς μὲν γὰρ ἀπάντων γεγονομένων τῶν κατὰ τὴν κύριον ἡ ἀποκριτικὴ δύναμις ἁσυχάζει τελέως ὡσπερ οὐκ οὔσα, κακοπραγίας δὲ τινος γεγομένης ἡ περὶ τὸ χωρίου ἡ 149 περὶ τινα τῶν ἄλλων || ὑμένων ἡ περὶ τὸ κυούμενον αὐτὸ καὶ τῆς τελεῖωσεως αὐτοῦ παντάπασιν ἀπογυνοσθείσης οὐκέτ' ἀναμένουσι τῶν ἐννεάμηνον αἰ μὴ οίραι χρόνον, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν καθεκτικὴ δύναμις αὐτικά δὴ πεπαυσαι καὶ παραχωρεῖ κινεῖσθαι τῇ πρότερον ἄργουση, πράττει δ' ἣδη τι καὶ πραγματεύεται χρηστῶν ἡ ἀποκριτικὴ τε καὶ προωστικὴ· καὶ γὰρ οὖν καὶ ταύτην οὕτως ἔκαλεσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν αὐτῆ τὰ ὀνόματα θέμενοι καθάπερ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις.

Καὶ πως ὁ λόγος ἐοικεν ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων ἀποδείξειν ἂμα· καὶ γὰρ τοι καὶ διαδεχομένας αὐτὰς ἀλλήλας καὶ παραχωροῦσαν ἀεὶ τὴν ἐτέραν τῇ λοιπῇ, καθότι ἂν ἡ χρεία κελεῦη, καὶ 230
the uterus capable of contracting upon, and of retaining the embryo, but in order that the latter may arrive at a proper size. When, therefore, the object for which the uterus brought its retentive faculty into play has been fulfilled, it then stops this faculty and brings it back to a state of rest, and employs instead of it another faculty hitherto quiescent—the propulsive faculty. In this case again the quiescent and active states are both determined by utility; when this calls, there is activity; when it does not, there is rest.

Here, then, once more, we must observe well the Art [artistic tendency] of Nature—how she has not merely placed in each organ the capabilities of useful activities, but has also fore-ordained the times both of rest and movement. For when everything connected with the pregnancy proceeds properly, the eliminative faculty remains quiescent as though it did not exist, but if anything goes wrong in connection either with the chorion or any of the other membranes or with the foetus itself, and its completion is entirely despaired of, then the uterus no longer awaits the nine-months period, but the retentive faculty forthwith ceases and allows the heretofore inoperative faculty to come into action. Now it is that something is done—in fact, useful work effected—by the eliminative or propulsive faculty (for so it, too, has been called, receiving, like the rest, its names from the corresponding activities).

Further, our theory can, I think, demonstrate both together; for seeing that they succeed each other, and that the one keeps giving place to the other according as utility demands, it seems not unreason-
oriously καθεκτικής δυνάμεως ἔργον περιστεῖλαι τὰς μήτρας τῷ κυνουμένῳ πανταχόθεν, ὡστ' εὐλόγως ἀπτομέναις μὲν ταῖς μαλευτρίαις τὸ στόμα μεμυκὸς αὐτῶν φαίνεται, ταῖς κυνοῦσαις δ' αὐταῖς κατὰ τὰς πρώτας ἴμερας καὶ μάλιστα κατ' αὐτὴν ἐκείνην, ἐν ἦπερ ἢ τῆς γονῆς σύλληψις γέννηται, κυνουμένων τε καὶ συν-150 τρεχουσῶν εἰς ἑαυτὰς τῶν ύστερῶν αἴσθησις γίνεται καὶ ἦν ἁμφο ταύτα συμβῇ, μῦσαι μὲν τὸ στόμα χωρίς φλεγμονῆς ἢ τῶν ἄλλων παθήματος, αἴσθησιν δὲ τῆς κατὰ τὰς μήτρας κυνήσεως ἀκολουθήσαι, πρὸς αὐτὰς ἢδη τὸ σπέρμα τὸ παρὰ τάνδρος εἰληφέναι τε καὶ κατέχειν αἰ γυναῖκες νομίζουσι.

Ταύτα δ' οὐχ ἢμεῖς νῦν ἀναπλάττομεν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐκ μακρᾶς πείρας δοκιμασθέντα πᾶσι γέγραπται σχεδὸν τι τοῖς περὶ τοῦτων πραγματευσάμενοι. Ὑρόφιλος μὲν γε καὶ ὡς οὐδὲ πυρήνα μῆλης ἢν δεχοίτο τῶν μητρῶν τὸ στόμα, πρὶν ἀποκυνίν τὴν γυναίκα, καὶ ὡς οὐδὲ τούλαχιστον ἐτι διέστηκεν, ἦν ὑπάρχειται κύρειν, καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ πλέον ἀναστομοῦνται κατὰ τὰς τῶν ἐπιμηνίων φοράς, οὐκ ἁκούσει γράφειν· σωμομολογοῦσι δ' αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες οἱ περὶ τούτων πραγματευσάμενοι καὶ πρῶτος γ' ἀπάντων ἱατρῶν τε καὶ φιλοσόφων Ἰπποκράτης ἀπεφήρησε ὑπέρ τοῦ στόμα τῶν ύστερῶν ἐν τε ταῖς κυνήσεις καὶ ταῖς φλεγμοναῖς, ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν ταῖς κυνήσεωι οὐκ ἐξιστάμενον τῆς φύσεως, ἐν δὲ ταῖς φλεγμοναῖς σκληρῶν γυνόμενον.
able to accept a common demonstration also for both. Thus it is the work of the retentive faculty to make the uterus contract upon the foetus at every point, so that, naturally enough, when the midwives palpate it, the os is found to be closed, whilst the pregnant women themselves, during the first days—and particularly on that on which conception takes place—experience a sensation as if the uterus were moving and contracting upon itself. Now, if both of these things occur—if the os closes apart from inflammation or any other disease, and if this is accompanied by a feeling of movement in the uterus—then the women believe that they have received the semen which comes from the male, and that they are retaining it.

Now we are not inventing this for ourselves: one may say the statement is based on prolonged experience of those who occupy themselves with such matters. Thus Herophilus¹ does not hesitate to state in his writings that up to the time of labour the os uteri will not admit so much as the tip of a probe, that it no longer opens to the slightest degree if pregnancy has begun—that, in fact, it dilates more widely at the times of the menstrual flow. With him are in agreement all the others who have applied themselves to this subject; and particularly Hippocrates, who was the first of all physicians and philosophers to declare that the os uteri closes during pregnancy and inflammation, albeit in pregnancy it does not depart from its own nature, whilst in inflammation it becomes hard.

¹ Herophilus of Chalcedon (circa 300- B.C.) was, like Erasistratus, a representative of the anatomical school of Alexandria. His book on Midwifery was known for centuries. cf. Introduction, p. xii.
Ἐπὶ δὲ γε τῆς ἐναντίας τῆς ἐκκριτικῆς ἀνοικταί μὲν τὸ στόμα, προέρχεται δ’ ὁ πυθμῆν || 151 ἀπασ ὡσον οἶν ο’ ἐγγυτάτω τοῦ στόματος ἀπωθούμενος ἔξω τὸ ἐμβρυον, ἁμα δ’ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ συνεχὴ μέρη τὰ οἶν πλευρὰ τοῦ παντὸς ὄργανον συνεπιλαμβανόμενα τοῦ ἔργου θλίβει τε καὶ προωθεί πάν ἔξω τὸ ἐμβρυον. καὶ πολλαῖς τῶν γυναικῶν ὅδινες βίαιοι τὰς μήτρας ὅλας ἐκπεσεῖν ἦνάγκασαν ἀμέτρως χρησαμέναις τῇ τοιαύτῃ δυνάμει, παραπλησίου τινὸς γνωμομένου τῷ πολλάκις ἐν πάλαις τισὶ καὶ φιλονεικίας συμβαίνοντι, ὅταν ἀνατρέψαι τε καὶ καταβαλεῖν ἑτέρους σπεύδοντες αὐτοὶ συγκαταπέσομεν. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ αἱ μήτραι τὸ ἐμβρυον ὠδοῦσαι συνεξέπεσον ἐνίοτε καὶ μάλισθ’ ὅταν οἱ πρὸς τὴν ῥάχιν αὐτῶν σύνδεσμοι χαλαροὶ φύσει τυνχάνωσιν ὄντες.

"Εστι δὲ καὶ τούτῳ θαυμαστὸν τι τῆς φύσεως σόφισμα, τὸ ξύντος μὲν τοῦ κυνήματος ἀκριβῶς πάνυ μεμυκέναι τὸ στόμα τῶν μητρῶν, ἀποθανόντος δὲ παραχρῆμα διανοίγεσθαι τοσοῦτον, ὡσον εἰς τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ διαφέρει. καὶ μέντοι καὶ αἱ μαίαι τὰς τικτούσας οὐκ εἰδύς ἀνιστάσιν οὖδ’ ἐπὶ τὸν δίφρον καθίζουσιν, ἀλλ’ ἀπτούται 152 πρότερον ἀνουγομένου τοῦ στόματος || κατὰ βραχὺ καὶ πρωτὸν μὲν, ὡστε τὸν μικρὸν δάκτυλον καθιέναι, διεστηκέναι φασίν, ἐπεὶ τῇ ἤδη καὶ μεῖζον καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ δὴ πυνθανομένοις ἡμῖν ἀποκρίνονται τὸ μέγεθος τῆς διαστάσεως ἐπανεξανόμενον. ὅταν δ’ ἵκανον γ’ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κυνουμένου δίοδον, ἀνιστάσιν αὐτὰς καὶ καθίζουσιν
In the case of the opposite (the eliminative) faculty, the os opens, whilst the whole fundus approaches as near as possible to the os, expelling the embryo as it does so; and along with the fundus the contiguous parts—which form as it were a girdle round the whole organ—co-operate in the work; they squeeze upon the embryo and propel it bodily outwards. And, in many women who exercise such a faculty immoderately, violent pains cause forcible prolapse of the whole womb; here almost the same thing happens as frequently occurs in wrestling-bouts and struggles, when in our eagerness to overturn and throw others we are ourselves upset along with them; for similarly when the uterus is forcing the embryo forward it sometimes becomes entirely prolapsed, and particularly when the ligaments connecting it with the spine happen to be naturally lax.¹

A wonderful device of Nature’s also is this—that, when the foetus is alive, the os uteri is closed with perfect accuracy, but if it dies, the os at once opens up to the extent which is necessary for the foetus to make its exit. The midwife, however, does not make the parturient woman get up at once and sit down on the [obstetric] chair, but she begins by palpating the os as it gradually dilates, and the first thing she says is that it has dilated “enough to admit the little finger,” then that “it is bigger now,” and as we make enquiries from time to time, she answers that the size of the dilatation is increasing. And when it is sufficient to allow of the transit of the foetus,² she then makes the patient get up from her bed and

¹ Relaxation of utero-sacral ligaments as an important predisposing cause of prolapsus uteri.
² That is, at the end of the first stage of labour.
καὶ προθυμεῖσθαι κελεύουσιν ἀπώσασθαι τὸ παιδίον. ἦστι δ’ ἦδη τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον, ὦ παρ’ ἐαυτῶν αἱ κύουσαι προστιθέασιν, οὐκέτι τῶν ὑστερῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν κατ’ ἐπιγάστριον μνῶν, οὐ πρὸς τὴν ἀποπάτησιν τε καὶ τὴν ὑφησιν ἦμῖν συνεργοῦσιν.

IV

Οὗτῳ μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν μητρῶν ἐναργῶς αἱ δύο φαίνονται δυνάμεις, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς γαστρὸς ὀδε. πρῶτον μὲν τοῖς κλύδωσιν, οὐ δὴ καὶ πεπίστευνται τοῖς ἱατρῶις ἀρρόστου κοιλίας εἶναι συμπτώματα καὶ κατὰ λόγον πεπίστευνται· ἐνίστε μὲν γὰρ ἐλάχιστα προσευμενεῖ τὸν ἡγίασθαι περιστεραλμένης ἀκριβῶς αὐτοῖς τῆς γαστρὸς καὶ σφιγγοῦσης πανταχόθεν, ἐνίστε δὲ μεστῇ μὲν ἡ 153 γαστήρ ἐστιν, οἱ κλύδωσιν δ’ ὡς ἐπὶ κενὴς ἐξακοῦονται. κατὰ φύσιν μὲν γὰρ ἔχουσα καὶ χρωμένη καλὸς τῇ περισταλτικῇ δυνάμει, κἂν ὀλγον ἢ τὸ περιεχόμενον, ἄπαν αὐτὸ περιλαμβάνουσα χώραν οὐδεμίαν ἀπολείπει κενὴν, ἀρρωστοῦσα δὲ, καθὸτι ἂν ἄδυνατής περιλαβεῖν ἀκριβῶς, ἐνταῦθ’ εὐρυχωρίαν τὼν ἐργαζομένης συγχωρεῖ τοῖς περιεχομένοις ύγροῖς κατὰ τὰς τῶν σχημάτων μεταλλαγὰς ἀλλοτ’ ἀλλαχὸς ἀμεταρρέουσι κλύδωνας ἀποτελεῖν.

Εὐλόγως οὖν, ὅτι μὴ δὲ πέφυσιν ἰκανῶς, οἱ ἐν τῷ δὲ τῷ συμπτώματι γενόμενοι προσδοκῶσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται πέψαι καλῶς ἀρρώστου γαστέρα. τοῖς τοιούτοις δὲ καὶ μέχρι πλείονος ἐν αὐτῇ
sit on the chair, and bids her make every effort to expel the child. Now, this additional work which the patient does of herself is no longer the work of the uterus but of the epigastric muscles, which also help us in defaecation and micturition.

IV

Thus the two faculties are clearly to be seen in the case of the uterus; in the case of the stomach they appear as follows:—Firstly in the condition of gurgling, which physicians are persuaded, and with reason, to be a symptom of weakness of the stomach; for sometimes when the very smallest quantity of food has been ingested this does not occur, owing to the fact that the stomach is contracting accurately upon the food and constricting it at every point; sometimes when the stomach is full the gurglings yet make themselves heard as though it were empty. For if it be in a natural condition, employing its contractile faculty in the ordinary way, then, even if its contents be very small, it grasps the whole of them and does not leave any empty space. When it is weak, however, being unable to lay hold of its contents accurately, it produces a certain amount of vacant space, and allows the liquid contents to flow about in different directions in accordance with its changes of shape, and so to produce gurglings.

Thus those who are troubled with this symptom expect, with good reason, that they will also be unable to digest adequately; proper digestion cannot take place in a weak stomach. In such people also, the mass of food may be plainly seen to remain
Galen

φαίνεται παραμένον τό βάρος, ὡς ἀν καὶ βραδύτερον πέττουσι. καὶ μὴν θαυμάσειν ἂν τις ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τούτων μάλιστα τό πολυχρόνου τής ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ διατριβής οὐ τῶν σιτίων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ πόματος· οὐ γὰρ, ὅτερ ἂν οὐθεὶν τις, ὡς τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς στόμα τὸ κάτω στενὸν ἴκανῶς ὑπάρχον οὐδὲν παρίσησι πρὶν ἀκριβῶς λειωθῆναι, τούτῳ αὐτίον ὄντως ἐστὶ. πολλὰ γοῦν πολλάκις ὁπωρῶν ὡστὰ μέγιστα καταπίνουσι || πάμπολλοι καὶ τις δακτύλιοι χρυσοῦν ἐν τῷ στόματι φυλάττων ἄκων κατέπιε καὶ ἄλλος τις νόμισμα καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλο τι σκληρὸν καὶ δυσκατέργαστον, ἀλλ' ὀμως ἀπαντες οὔτοι βαδίως ἀπεπάτησαν, ἄκατερ, οὔδενδος αὐτοῖς ἀκολουθήσαντο συμπτώματος. εἰ δὲ γ' ἡ στενότης τοῦ πόρου τῆς γαστρὸς αἰτία τοῦ μένειν ἐπὶ πλέον ἢν τοῖς ἀτριπτοῖς σιτίοις, οὐδὲν ἂν τούτων ποτὲ διεχώρησεν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τὰ πόματ' αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ παραμένει οὔτε πλείστον ἴκανὸν ἀπάγειν τῇ ὑπόνοιαν τοῦ πόρου τῆς στενότητος· ὅλως γάρ, εἴπερ ἢν ἐν τῷ κεχυλώσθαι τὸ βάττον ὑπίειαν, τά τε ροφήματ', ἂν οὔτω καὶ τὸ γάλα καὶ ὁ τῆς πτισάνης χυλὸς αὐτίκα διεξῆι πᾶσιν. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡδ' ἔχει τοῖς μὲν γάρ ἀσθενεῖσιν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐμπλεῖ ταῦτα καὶ κλύδωνας ἐργάζεται παραμένοντα καὶ θλίβει καὶ βαρύνει τὴν γαστέρα, τοῖς δ' ἴσχυροῖς οὐ μόνον τούτων οὐδὲν συμβάινει, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ πλήθος ἀρτῶν καὶ κρεῶν ὑποχωρεῖ ταχέως.

1 The pylorus.
an abnormally long time in the stomach, as would be natural if their digestion were slow. Indeed, the chief way in which these people will surprise one is in the length of time that not food alone but even fluids will remain in their stomachs. Now, the actual cause of this is not, as one would imagine, that the lower outlet of the stomach,¹ being fairly narrow, will allow nothing to pass before being reduced to a fine state of division. There are a great many people who frequently swallow large quantities of big fruit-stones; one person, who was holding a gold ring in his mouth, inadvertently swallowed it; another swallowed a coin, and various people have swallowed various hard and indigestible objects; yet all these people easily passed by the bowel what they had swallowed, without there being any subsequent symptoms. Now surely if narrowness of the gastric outlet were the cause of untriturated food remaining for an abnormally long time, none of these articles I have mentioned would ever have escaped. Furthermore, the fact that it is liquids which remain longest in these people’s stomachs is sufficient to put the idea of narrowness of the outlet out of court. For, supposing a rapid descent were dependent upon emulsification,² then soups, milk, and barley-emulsion³ would at once pass along in every case. But as a matter of fact this is not so. For in people who are extremely asthenic it is just these fluids which remain undigested, which accumulate and produce gurglings, and which oppress and overload the stomach, whereas in strong persons not merely do none of these things happen, but even a large quantity of bread or meat passes rapidly down.

¹ Lit. barley-“chyle,” i.e. barley-water.
Οὐ μόνον δ’ ἐκ τοῦ περιτετάσθαι τὴν γαστέρα
καὶ βαρύνεσθαι || καὶ μεταρρεῖν ἄλλοτε εἰς ἄλλα
μέρη μετὰ κλύδωνος τὸ παραμένειν ἐπὶ πλέον ἐν
αὐτῇ πάντως τοῖς οὕτως ἔχουσι τεκμηριάται ἂν
τις ἄλλα κἀκε τῶν ἐμέτων· ἐνιοῦ γὰρ οὐ μετὰ
τρεῖς ὠρας ἢ τέτταρας ἄλλα νυκτῶν ἢδη μέσων
παμπόλλου μεταξὺ χρόνου διελθόντος ἐπὶ ταῖς
προσφοραῖς ἀνήμεσαν ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντα τὰ ἐδης-
δεσμένα.

Καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ξύον ὄστιον ἐμπλήσας ὑγρᾶς
τροφῆς, ὅσπερ ἤμεις πολλάκις ἐπὶ συών ἐπειρά-
θημεν εἰς ἀλεύρων μέθ’ ὤδατος οἶνον κυκεώνα τινα
δόντες αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα μετὰ τρεῖς που καὶ τέτταρας
ὕρας ἀγατεμόντες, εἰ οὕτω καὶ σὺ πράξεις,
εὐρήσεις ἔτι κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα τὰ ἐδηδεσμένα·
πέρας γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τῆς ἐνταῦθα μονῆς οὐχ ἢ
χύλωσις, ἤν καὶ ἔκτος ἐτὶ οὖν μηχανήσασθαι
dυνάτον ἐστιν, ἀλλ’ ἡ πέψις, ἔτερον τι τῆς χυλώ-
σεως οὖσα, καθάπερ αἰματώσις τε καὶ θρέψις,
ὡς γὰρ κάκεινα δέδεικται ποιοτήτων μεταβολῇ
γνωμένα, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡ ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ
πέψις τῶν σιτίων εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἑστὶ τῷ τρεφο-

μένῳ ποιότητα || μεταβολῇ καὶ ὅταν γε πεθῇ
tελέως, ἀνοίγυνται μὲν τηνυκάμα τὸ κάτω στόμα,
διεκτίπτει δ’ αὐτοῦ τὰ σιτία ῥαδίως, εἰ καὶ
πλήθος τι μεθ’ ἐαυτῶν ἔχοντα τῷ χοίρῳ λίθων ἢ
ὀστῶν ἢ γιγάρτων ἢ τινὸς ἄλλου χυλωθῆναι
μὴ δυναμένου. καὶ σος -οὔτ' ἐνεστὶν ἐπὶ ζύον
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And it is not only because the stomach is distended and loaded and because the fluid runs from one part of it to another accompanied by gurglings—it is not only for these reasons that one would judge that there was an unduly long continuance of the food in it, in those people who are so disposed, but also from the vomiting. Thus, there are some who vomit up every particle of what they have eaten, not after three or four hours, but actually in the middle of the night, a lengthy period having elapsed since their meal.

Suppose you fill any animal whatsoever with liquid food—an experiment I have often carried out in pigs, to whom I give a sort of mess of wheaten flour and water, thereafter cutting them open after three or four hours; if you will do this yourself, you will find the food still in the stomach. For it is not chylification which determines the length of its stay here—since this can also be effected outside the stomach; the determining factor is digestion which is a different thing from chylification, as are blood-production and nutrition. For, just as it has been shown that these two processes depend upon a change of qualities, similarly also the digestion of food in the stomach involves a transmutation of it into the quality proper to that which is receiving nourishment. Then, when it is completely digested, the lower outlet opens and the food is quickly ejected through it, even if there should be amongst it abundance of stones, bones, grape-pips, or other things which cannot be reduced to chyle. And you may observe this

1 i.e. not the mere mechanical breaking down of food, but a distinctively vital action of "alteration."
θεάσασθαι στοχασμένο τὸν καιρὸν τῆς κάτω διεύοδον. καὶ μὲν γε καὶ εἰ σφαλείς ποτὲ τοῦ καθ' ροῦ καὶ μηδὲν μὴπω κάτω παρέρχοιτο πεπτομένων ἐτι κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα τῶν σιτίων, οὐδ' οὕτως ἀκαρπος ἢ ἀνατομή σοι γενησεται; θεώσῃ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῶν, ὅπερ ὀλίγω πρόσθεν ἐλέγομεν, ἀκριβῶς μὲν μεμυκότα τὸν πυλωρόν, ἀπάσαν δὲ τὴν γαστέρα περιεσταλμένην τοῖς σιτίοις τρόπον ὁμοιότατον, οἶνοπερ καὶ αἱ μήτραι τοῖς κυνομένοις. οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν οὐδέποτε κενὴν εὑρεῖν χώραν οὔτε κατὰ τὰς υστέρας οὔτε κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν οὔτε κατὰ τὰς κύστεις ἀμφοτέρας οὔτε κατὰ τὴν χοληδόχον οὐνομαζομένην οὔτε τὴν ἑτέραν. ἀλλ' εἰτ' ὀλίγων εἰτ' ἐν περιεχόμενον ἐν αὐταῖς εἰτ' πολύ, μεσταὶ καὶ πλῆρεις αὐτῶν αἱ κοιλίαι φαίνονται περιστελλομένων ἀεὶ τῶν χυτῶν τοῖς περιεχόμενοις, ὅταν γε κατὰ φύσιν ἔχῃ τὸ ξόον. ||

157 Ἔρασίστρατος δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τὴν περιστολήν τῆς γαστρὸς ἀπάντων αἰτίαν ἀποφαίνει καὶ τῆς λειώσεως τῶν σιτίων καὶ τῆς τῶν περιττωμάτων ὑποχωρήσεως καὶ τῆς τῶν κεχυλωμένων ἀναδόσεως.

'Εγὼ μὲν γὰρ μυριάκις ἐπὶ ζῴουτο τοῦ ζώου διελών τὸ περιτόναιον εὑρον ἀεὶ τὰ μὲν ἑντερα πάντα περιστελλόμενα τοῖς ἐνυπάρχουσι, τὴν κοιλίαν δ' οὖν ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν ταῖς ἐδωδαίς ἀνωθὲν τε καὶ κάτωθεν αὐτὰ καὶ πανταχόθεν ἀκρι-

1 Choledochous. 2 More exactly peri-told; cf. p. 97, note 1. 3 Neuburger says of Erasistratus that "dissection had taught him to think in terms of anatomy." It was chiefly
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yourself in an animal, if you will try to hit upon the time at which the descent of food from the stomach takes place. But even if you should fail to discover the time, and nothing was yet passing down, and the food was still undergoing digestion in the stomach, still even then you would find dissection not without its uses. You will observe, as we have just said, that the pylorus is accurately closed, and that the whole stomach is in a state of contraction upon the food very much as the womb contracts upon the foetus. For it is never possible to find a vacant space in the uterus, the stomach, or in either of the two bladders—that is, either in that called bile-receiving or in the other; whether their contents be abundant or scanty, their cavities are seen to be replete and full, owing to the fact that their coats contract constantly upon the contents—so long, at least, as the animal is in a natural condition.

Now Erasistratus for some reason declares that it is the contractions of the stomach which are the cause of everything—that is to say, of the softening of the food, the removal of waste matter, and the absorption of the food when chylified [emulsified].

Now I have personally, on countless occasions, divided the peritoneum of a still living animal and have always found all the intestines contracting peristaltically upon their contents. The condition of the stomach, however, is found less simple; as regards the substances freshly swallowed, it had grasped these accurately both above and below, in fact at every point, and was as devoid of movement the gross movements or structure of organs with which he concerned himself. Where an organ had no obvious function, he dubbed it "useless"; e.g. the spleen (cf. p. 143).

1 i.e. contracting and dilating; no longitudinal movements involved; cf. p. 263, note 2.
βός περιειληφθείαν ἀκίνητον, ὡς δοκεῖν ἢνωθεὶς καὶ περιπεφυκέναι τοῖς σείτοις· ἐν δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τὸν πυλωρόν εὐρίσκον ἀεί μεμυκότα καὶ κεκλείσµένου ἀκριβῶς ὦσπερ τὸ τῶν ύστερῶν στόµα ταῖς ἐγκύµοσιν.

Ἐπὶ μέντοι ταῖς πέρσει συμπεπληρωµέναις ἀνέφκτο μὲν ὁ πυλωρός, ἡ γαστὴρ δὲ περισταλτικῶς ἐκινεῖτο παραπλησίως τοῖς ἐντέροις.

V

"Απαντ' οὖν ἅλληλοις ὁμολογεὶ ταῦτα καὶ τῇ γαστρὶ καὶ ταῖς ύστεραις καὶ ταῖς κύστεσιν εἰναί τινας ἐμφύτους δυνάµεις καθεκτικὰς μὲν τῶν 158 οἴκειων ποιοτήτων, || ἀποκριτικὰς δὲ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων. ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἐλκεῖ τὴν χολὴν εἰς εαυτὴν ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ ἢπατι κύστις, ἐμπροσθεὶς δεδεικταί, ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀποκρίνεται καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν εἰς τὴν γαστέρα, καὶ τούτ' ἐναργῶς φαίνεται. καὶ μὴν εἰ διεδέχετο τὴν ἐλκτικὴν δύναμιν ἢ ἐκκριτικὴν καὶ μὴ μέση τὶς ἅμφοτέρας ἢ καθεκτική, διὰ παντὸς ἔχρην ἀνατεµνοµένων τῶν ξών ἵππον πλῆθος χολῆς εὐρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν κύστιν· οὐ μὴν εὐρίσκεται γε. ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ πληρεστάτη, ποτὲ δὲ κενοτάτη, ποτὲ δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ µεταξὺ διαφορὰς ἔχουσα θεωρεῖται, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ ἕτερα κύστις ἢ τὸ οὐρὸν ὑποδεχοµένη. ταύτης μὲν γε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀνωτοµῆς αἰσθανόµεθα, πρὶν ἀναθίναι τῷ πλῆθει βαρυνθεῖσαν ἢ τῇ δριµύτητι δηχθεῖσαν,
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as though it had grown round and become united with the food. At the same time I found the pylorus persistently closed and accurately shut, like the os uteri on the foetus.

In the cases, however, where digestion had been completed the pylorus had opened, and the stomach was undergoing peristaltic movements, similar to those of the intestines.

Thus all these facts agree that the stomach, uterus, and bladders possess certain inborn faculties which are retentive of their own proper qualities and eliminative of those that are foreign. For it has been already shown that the bladder by the liver draws bile into itself, while it is also quite obvious that it eliminates this daily into the stomach. Now, of course, if the eliminative were to succeed the attractive faculty and there were not a retentive faculty between the two, there would be found, on every occasion that animals were dissected, an equal quantity of bile in the gall-bladder. This however, we do not find. For the bladder is sometimes observed to be very full, sometimes quite empty, while at other times you find in it various intermediate degrees of fulness, just as is the case with the other bladder—that which receives the urine; for even without resorting to anatomy we may observe that the urinary bladder continues to collect urine up to the time that it becomes uncomfortable through the increasing quantity of urine or the irritation caused by its acidity—the presumption
ΓΑΛΕΝ

ἀθροιζούσης ἐτι τὸ οὐδένος, ὡς οὐσίς τινὸς κανταῦθα δυνάμεως καθεκτικής.

Οὔτω δὲ καὶ ἡ γαστήρ ὑπὸ δριμύτητος πολλάκις δηχθεῖσα πρωιαῖτερον τοῦ δέοντος ἀπεπτοῦν ἐτι τὴν τροφὴν ἀποτριβεται. αὖθις δὲ ἀν ποτε τῷ πλῆθει βαρυνθεῖσα ἡ καὶ κατ᾽ ἅμφω συνελθόντα κακῶς διατεθεῖσα διαρροίαίς ἐάλω. καὶ μὲν γε καὶ οἱ ἔμετοι, τῷ πλῆθει βαρυνθείσῃ || 159 αὐτῆς ἡ τὴν ποιότητα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ σιτίων τε καὶ περιπτωμάτων μὴ φερούσης, ἀνάλογον τι ταῖς διαρροίαις πάθημα τῆς ἀνω γαστρὸς ἑστιν. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς κάτω μέρεσιν αὐτῆς ἡ τοιαυτὴ γένηται διάθεσις, ἐρρομένων τῶν κατὰ τὸν στόμαχον, εἰς διαρροίας ἐτελεύτησεν, ὅταν δὲ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸ στόμα, τῶν ἄλλων εὐρωστούντων, εἰς ἔμετοις.

VI

"Ενεστὶ δὲ καὶ τούτῳ πολλάκις ἔναρχος ἰδεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποσίτων ἀναγκαζόμενοι γὰρ ἐσθίειν οὔτε καταπίνειν εὐσθενοῦσιν οὔτ' εἰ καὶ βιάσαμοτο, κατέχουσιν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀνεμοῦσι. καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι δὲ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων πρὸς ὀτιοῦν δυσχεραῖνοντες βιασθέντες ἐνίοτε προσάρασθαι ταχέως ἔξεμοῦσιν, ἢ εἰ κατάσχοιεν βιασάμενοι, ναυτιώδεις τ' εἰσὶ καὶ τῆς γαστρῶς ὑπτίας αἰσθάνονται καὶ σπευδούσης ἀποθέσθαι τὸ λυποῦν.

Οὔτως εἴ οπάντων τῶν φαινομένων, ὅπερ εἴ ἄρχῃς ἐρρέθη, μαρτυρεῖται τὸ δεῖν υπάρχειν τοῖς τοῦ ζύζου μορίοις σχεδὸν ἄπασιν ἐφεσίν μὲν τινα.
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thus being that here, too, there is a retentive faculty.

Similarly, too, the stomach, when, as often happens, it is irritated by acidity, gets rid of the food, although still undigested, earlier than proper; or again, when oppressed by the quantity of its contents, or disordered from the co-existence of both conditions, it is seized with diarrhoea. Vomiting also is an affection of the upper [part of the] stomach analogous to diarrhoea, and it occurs when the stomach is overloaded or is unable to stand the quality of the food or surplus substances which it contains. Thus, when such a condition develops in the lower parts of the stomach, while the parts about the inlet are normal, it ends in diarrhoea, whereas if this condition is in the upper stomach, the lower parts being normal, it ends in vomiting.

VI

This may often be clearly observed in those who are disinclined for food; when obliged to eat, they have not the strength to swallow, and, even if they force themselves to do so, they cannot retain the food, but at once vomit it up. And those especially who have a dislike to some particular kind of food, sometimes take it under compulsion, and then promptly bring it up; or, if they force themselves to keep it down, they are nauseated and feel their stomach turned up, and endeavouring to relieve itself of its discomfort.

Thus, as was said at the beginning, all the observed facts testify that there must exist in almost all parts of the animal a certain inclination towards, or, so to
καὶ οἶον ὅρεξιν τῆς οἰκείας ποιότητος, ἀποστροφὴν 
160 δὲ τινὰ || καὶ οἴον μίσος τι τῆς ἀλλοτρίας. ἄλλος ἐφιέμενα μὲν ἐλκεῖν εὐλογοῦν, ἀποστρεφόμενα δὲ ἐκκρίνειν.

Κἂν τούτων πάλιν ἢ θ' ἐλκυστὴ δύναμις ἀποδείκνυται καθ' ἄπαν ὑπάρχουσα καὶ η ἐπρωστική.

'Αλλ' εἴπερ ἐφεσίς τάς ἐστὶ καὶ Ἕλξις, εἰθ' ἂν τινὶ καὶ ἀπολαύσῃ: οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὀντῶν ἔλκει τι δν' αὐτὸ τὸ ἔλκειν, ἄλλα ἢν ἀπολαύσῃ τοῦ διὰ τῆς ὀλκῆς εὐπορηθέντος. καὶ μὴν ἀπολαύσειν οὐ δύναιται μὴ κατασχόν. κἂν τούτω πάλιν ἢ καθεκτικὴ δύναμις ἀποδείκνυται τὴν γένεσιν ἀναγκαίαν ἔχουσα: σαφῶς γὰρ ἐφίπτει μὲν τῶν οἰκείων ποιοτήτων ἢ γαστήρ, ἀποστρέφεται δὲ τὰς ἀλλοτρίας.

'Αλλ' εἴπερ ἐφίπτει τα καὶ ἔλκει καὶ ἀπολαύει κατέχουσα καὶ περιστελλομένη, εἰθ' ἂν τι καὶ πέρας αὐτῇ τῆς ἀπολαύσεως κατὰ τὸν ὁ καιρὸς ἢν οἰκείων ποιοτητα καὶ οἰκείων

VII

'Αλλ' εἰ καὶ κατέχει καὶ ἀπολαύει, κατα-
χρῆται πρὸς ὁ πέφυκε. πέφυκε δὲ τοῦ προσ-161 ἥκοντος έαυτῇ || κατὰ ποιότητα καὶ οἰκείου

1 Note use of psychological terms in biology. cf. also p. 133, note 3.
2 "In everything." cf. p. 66, note 3.
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speak, an appetite for their own special quality, and
an aversion to, or, as it were, a hatred of the foreign
good. And it is natural that when they feel an
inclination they should attract, and that when they
feel aversion they should expel.

From these facts, then, again, both the attractive
and the propulsive faculties have been demonstrated
to exist in everything.

But if there be an inclination or attraction, there
will also be some benefit derived; for no existing
thing attracts anything else for the mere sake of
attracting, but in order to benefit by what is acquired
by the attraction. And of course it cannot benefit
by it if it cannot retain it. Herein, then, again, the
retentive faculty is shown to have its necessary
origin: for the stomach obviously inclines towards
its own proper qualities and turns away from those
that are foreign to it.

But if it aims at and attracts its food and benefits
by it while retaining and contracting upon it, we
may also expect that there will be some termination
to the benefit received, and that thereafter will come
the time for the exercise of the eliminative faculty.

VII

But if the stomach both retains and benefits by its
food, then it employs it for the end for which it [the
stomach] naturally exists. And it exists to partake
of that which is of a quality befitting and proper to

3 Galen confuses the nutrition of organs with that of the
ultimate living elements or cells; the stomach does not, of
course, feed itself in the way a cell does. cf. Introduction,
p. xxxii.
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GALEN

μεταλαμβάνειν· ὡσθ’ ἐλκεὶ τῶν σετίων ὅσον χρηστότατον ἀτμωδῶς τε καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ καὶ
tούτο τοῖς ἑαυτῆς χιτῶσιν ἐναποτίθεται τε καὶ
προστίθησιν. ὅταν δ’ ἰκανῶς ἐμπλησθῇ, καθά-
περ ἀχθος τι τὴν λουτὴν ἀποτίθεται τροφὴν
ἐσχηκυίαν τι χρηστὸν ἤδη καὶ αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς πρὸς
tὴν γαστέρα κοινωνίας· οὔδε γὰρ ενδέχεται δύο
σώματα δρᾶν καὶ πάσχειν ἐπιτήδεια συνελθόντα
μὴ οὐκ ἦτοι πάσχειν θ’ ἀμα καὶ δρᾶν ἢ θάτερον
μὲν δρᾶν, θάτερον δὲ πάσχειν. ἔαν μὲν γὰρ
ἰσάζῃ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, εξ ἵσου δράσει τε καὶ
πείσεται, ἀν δ’ ὑπερέχῃ πολὺ καὶ κρατήθη θάτερον,
ἐνεργήσει περί το τάσχουν ὡστε δράσει μέγα
μὲν τι καὶ αἰσθητον, αὐτὸ δ’ ἦτοι σμικρόν τι καὶ
οὐκ αἰσθητὸν ἡ παντάπασιν οὔδὲν πείσεται. ἀλλ’
ἐν τούτῳ δὴ καὶ μάλιστα διήνεγκε φαρμάκου
δηλητηρίου τροφῆς· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρατεῖ τῆς ἐν τῷ
σώματι δυνάμεως, ἢ δὲ κρατεῖται.

Οὐκον ενδέχεται τροφὴν μὲν εἰναι τι τῶν ζῴω
προσήκουσαν, οὐ μὲν καὶ κρατεῖσθαι γ’ ὅμοιος

162 πρὸς τῶν τὸ εν τῷ ζῷῳ ποιοτήτων· τὸ κρατεῖσθαι
δ’ ἢν ἀλλοιούσθαι. ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ τὰ μὲν ἰσχυρότερα
tαῖς δυνάμεσιν ἐστὶ μόρια, τὰ δ’ ἀσθενεύστερα,
κρατήσει μὲν πάντα τῆς οἰκείας τῶ ζῷῳ τροφῆς,
οὐχ ὁμοίως δὲ πάντα· κρατήσει δ’ ἄρα καὶ ἡ
γαστήρ καὶ ἀλλοιώσει μὲν τὴν τροφήν, οὐ μὴν
ὁμοίως ἢπατι καὶ φλεψί καὶ ἀρτηρίαις καὶ
καρδίᾳ.

Πόσον οὖν ἐστιν, δ’ ἀλλοιότερον καὶ δὴ θεασώμεθα·
πλέον μὲν ἡ κατὰ τὸ στόμα, μείου δ’ ἡ κατὰ τὸ

1 cf. Asclepiades’s theory regarding the urine, p. 51.
2 The process of application or prosthesis. cf. p. 223, note 3.
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it. Thus it attracts all the most useful parts or the food in a vaporous\(^1\) and finely divided condition, storing this up in its own coats, and applying\(^2\) it to them. And when it is sufficiently full it puts away from it, as one might something troublesome, the rest of the food, this having itself meanwhile obtained some profit from its association with the stomach. For it is impossible for two bodies which are adapted for acting and being acted upon to come together without either both acting or being acted upon, or else one acting and the other being acted upon. For if their forces are equal they will act and be acted upon equally, and if the one be much superior in strength, it will exert its activity upon its passive neighbour; thus, while producing a great and appreciable effect, it will itself be acted upon either little or not at all. But it is herein also that the main difference lies between nourishing food and a deleterious drug; the latter masters the forces of the body, whereas the former is mastered by them.\(^3\)

There cannot, then, be food which is suited for the animal which is not also correspondingly subdued by the qualities existing in the animal. And to be subdued means to undergo alteration.\(^4\) Now, some parts are stronger in power and others weaker; therefore, while all will subdue the nutriment which is proper to the animal, they will not all do so equally. Thus the stomach will subdue and alter its food, but not to the same extent as will the liver, veins, arteries, and heart.

We must therefore observe to what extent it does alter it. The alteration is more than that which

\(^{1}\) Mutual influence of organism and environment.

\(^{2}\) Qualitative change. \textit{cf.} Book I., chap. ii.
ηπάρ τε καὶ τὰς φλέβας. αὐτὴ μὲν γὰρ ἡ ἀλλοίωσις εἰς αἵματος οὐσίαν ἂγει τὴν τροφήν, ἢ δὲ ἐν τῷ στῶματι μεθίστησι μὲν αὐτὴν ἐναργῶς εἰς ἔτερον οἴδος, οὐ μὴν εἰς τέλος γε μετακοσμεῖ. μάθοις δὲ ἂν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐγκαταλειφθέντων ταῖς διαστάσεσι τῶν ὀδόντων σιτίων καὶ κατακειμένων δὲ ὁλὴς υποκτός· οὔτε γὰρ ἄρτος ἀκριβῶς ὁ ἄρτος οὔτε κρέας ἐστὶ τὸ κρέας, ἀλλ' ὅξει μὲν τοιοῦτον, οἴοντερ καὶ τοῦ ξύφου τὸ στῶμα, διαλέλυται δὲ καὶ διατέτηκε καὶ τὰς ἐν τῷ ξύφῳ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀπομεμάκται ποιότητας. ἔνεστι δὲ σοι 163 θεάσασθαι τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἐν τῷ στῶματί πρὸ τῶν σιτίων ἀλλοίωσεως, εἰ πυροῦς μασησάμενος ἐπιθείης ἀπέπτως δοθήσων· ὅξει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τάχιστα μεταβάλλοντάς τε καὶ συμπέττοντας, οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον, ἕταν υδατι φυραθώσιν, ἐργασάσθαι δυναμένους. καὶ μὴ θαυμάσῃς· τὸ γὰρ τοι φλέγμα τοιτὶ τὸ κατὰ τὸ στῶμα καὶ λειχήνων ἑστὶν ἄκος καὶ σκορπίους ἀναίρει παραχρήμα καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἱβόλων θηρίων τὰ μὲν εὐθέως ἀποκτείνει, τὰ δὲ ἐς ύστερον· ἀπαντα γοῦν βλάπτει μεγάλως. ἀλλὰ τὰ μεμασημένα σιτία πρῶτον μὲν τοῦτῳ τῷ φλέγματι βέβρεκται τε καὶ πεφύραται, δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τῷ χρωτὶ τοῦ στόματος ἀπαντα πεπλησίακεν, ὡστε πλέονα μεταβολὴν εἰληφε τῶν ἐν ταῖς κεναῖς χώραις τῶν ὀδόντων ἐσφημιζόμενων.

'Αλλ' ὅσον τὰ μεμασημένα τοῦτων ἐπὶ πλέον ἠλλοίωται, τοσοῦτον ἐκείνων τὰ κατατοθέντα.
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occurs in the mouth, but less than that in the liver and veins. For the latter alteration changes the nutriment into the *substance* of blood, whereas that in the mouth obviously changes it into a new *form*, but certainly does not completely transmute it. This you may discover in the food which is left in the intervals between the teeth, and which remains there all night; the bread is not exactly bread, nor the meat meat, for they have a smell similar to that of the animal's mouth, and have been disintegrated and dissolved, and have had the qualities of the animal's flesh impressed upon them. And you may observe the extent of the alteration which occurs to food in the mouth if you will chew some corn and then apply it to an unripe [undigested] boil: you will see it rapidly transmuting—in fact entirely digesting—the boil, though it cannot do anything of the kind if you mix it with water. And do not let this surprise you; this phlegm [saliva] in the mouth is also a cure for *lichens*; it even rapidly destroys scorpions; while, as regards the animals which emit venom, some it kills at once, and others after an interval; to all of them in any case it does great damage. Now, the masticated food is all, firstly, soaked in and mixed up with this phlegm; and secondly, it is brought into contact with the actual skin of the mouth; thus it undergoes more change than the food which is wedged into the vacant spaces between the teeth.

But just as masticated food is more altered than the latter kind, so is food which has been swallowed more altered than that which has been merely

---

1 Apparently skin-diseases in which a superficial crust (resembling the lichen on a tree-trunk) forms—*e.g.* *psoriasis.*
Galen

μὴ γὰρ οὔδὲ παραβλητῶν ἢ τὸ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς, εἰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν ἐνυόνσαιμεν φλέγμα καὶ χολὴν καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ θερμασίαν καὶ ὀλην τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς γαστρός. εἰ δὲ καὶ συνεπινοήσαις

164 αὐτῇ τὰ παρακείμενα ἵπτι μεγάλῳ πυρὸς ἐστίς πολλὰς, ἐκ δεξιῶν μὲν τὸ ἦπαρ, ἐξι ἀριστερῶν δὲ τὸν σπλήνα, τὴν καρδίαν δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω, σὺν αὐτῇ δὲ καὶ τὰς φρένας αἰωρομένας τε καὶ διὰ παντὸς κινουμένας, ἐφ’ ἀπασὶ δὲ τούτοις σκέπων τὸ ἐπίπλουν, ἐξαισιότητα ποιεῖ τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν γίγνεσθαι τῶν εἰς τὴν γαστέρα καταποθέτων σιτίων.

Πῶς δ’ ἄν ἦδύνατο βάδίως αἰματούσθαι μὴ προπαρασκευασθέντα τῇ τοιαύτῃ μεταβολῇ; δέδεικται γὰρ οὖν καὶ πρόσθεν, ἃς οὔδεν εἰς τὴν ἐναντίαν ἀθρόως μεθίσταται ποιότητα. πῶς οὖν ὁ ἀρτος αἷμα γίγνεται, πῶς δὲ τὸ τεύτλων ἀν κύαμος ἢ τι τῶν ἄλλων, εἰ μὴ πρότερον των ἐτέραν ἀλλοίωσιν ἐδέξατο; πῶς δ’ ἡ κοπρος ἐν τοῖς λεπτοῖς ἐντέροις ἀθρόως γεννηθήσεται, τὰ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις σφοδρότεροι εἰς ἀλλοίωσιν ἐστὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα; πότερα τῶν χυτῶν τὸ πλήθος ἡ τῶν γευτιώντων σπλάγχνων ἢ περίθεσις ἢ τῆς μονῆς ὁ χρόνος ἢ σύμφυτος τοῖς ἐν τοῖς ὀργάνοις θερμασία; καὶ μὴν κατ’ οὖν ποντοῖς πλευνεκτεῖ τὰ ἐντέρα τῆς γαστρός. τί ποτ’ οὖν ἐν μὲν τῇ

165 γαστρὶ νυκτὸς ἢ ὀλης πολλάκις μείναντα τὸν ἀρτον ἐπὶ φυλάττεσθαι βούλονται τὰς ἀρχαίας διασώξουσαν ποιότητας, ἐπειδὰν δ’ ἀπάξ ἐμπέσῃ

1 Note especially pneumonia and innate heat, which practically stand for oxygen and the heat generated in oxidation. cf. p. 41, note 3.

2 Book 1., chap. x.
masticated. Indeed, there is no comparison between these two processes; we have only to consider what the stomach contains—phlegm, bile, pneuma, [innate] heat, and, indeed the whole substance of the stomach. And if one considers along with this the adjacent viscera, like a lot of burning hearths around a great cauldron—to the right the liver, to the left the spleen, the heart above, and along with it the diaphragm (suspended and in a state of constant movement), and the omentum sheltering them all—you may believe what an extraordinary alteration it is which occurs in the food taken into the stomach.

How could it easily become blood if it were not previously prepared by means of a change of this kind? It has already been shown that nothing is altered all at once from one quality to its opposite. How then could bread, beef, beans, or any other food turn into blood if they had not previously undergone some other alteration? And how could the faeces be generated right away in the small intestine? For what is there in this organ more potent in producing alteration than the factors in the stomach? Is it the number of the coats, or the way it is surrounded by neighbouring viscera, or the time that the food remains in it, or some kind of innate heat which it contains? Most assuredly the intestines have the advantage of the stomach in none of these respects. For what possible reason, then, will objectors have it that bread may often remain a whole night in the stomach and still preserve its original qualities, whereas when once it is projected into the

That is to say, faeces are obviously altered food. This alteration cannot have taken place entirely in the small intestine; therefore alteration of food must take place in the stomach.
τοῖς ἑντέροις, εὑθὺς ἡγενεσθαι κόπρον; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ τοσοῦτος χρόνος ἀδύνατος ἀλλοιοῦν, οὐδ’ ὁ βραχὺς ἰκανός· εἰ δ’ οὗτος αὐτάρκης, πῶς οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὁ μακρός; ἃρ’ οὖν ἀλλοιοῦται μὲν ἡ τροφὴ κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν, ἀλλην δὲ τιν’ ἀλλοίωσιν καὶ οὐχ οἶαν ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ἱσχει τοῦ μεταβάλλοντος ὄργανον; ἡ ταύτην μὲν, οὐ μὴν τὴν γ’ οἰκείαν τῷ τοῦ ξύφου σώματι; μακρῷ τοῦτ’ ἀδυνατωτέρον ἦστι. καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἀλλο γ’ ἢν ἡ πέψις ἢ ἀλλοίωσις εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν τοῦ τρεφομένου ποιότητα. εἴπερ οὖν ἡ πέψις τοῦτ’ ἦστι καὶ ἡ τροφή κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα δέδεικται δεχομένῃ ποιότητα τῷ μέλλοντι πρὸς αὐτής θρέψεσθαι ξύφῳ προσήκουσαν, ἰκανῶς ἀποδέδεικται τὸ πέπτεσθαι κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα τὴν τροφήν.

Καὶ γελοῖος μὲν Ἄσκληπιιάδης οὔτ’ ἐν ταῖς ἐργαῖς λέγων ἐμφαίνεσθαι ποτε τὴν ποιότητα τῶν πεφθέντων σιτίων οὔτ’ ἐν τοῖς ἐμέτοις οὔτ’ ἐν ταῖς ἀνατομαίς· αὐτὸ γὰρ δὴ τὸ τοῦ σώματος ἐξόδευν αὐτὰ τῆς κοιλίας ἦστι τὸ πεπέθαμα. ὁ δ’ οὕτως ἦστ’ ἐνυίθης, ὡστ’ ἐπειδὴ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀκοῦει λεγόντων ἐπὶ τὸ χρήστον ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ μεταβάλλειν τὰ σιτία, δοκιμάζει ζητεῖν οὐ τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν ἄλλα τὸ κατὰ γεύσιν χρήστον, ὡσπερ ἢ τοῦ μήλου μηλωδεστέρου—χρὴ γὰρ οὕτως αὐτῷ διαλέγεσθαι—γυγομένου κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν ἢ τοῦ μέλιτος μελιτωδεστέρου.

---

1 cf. p. 39.
2 Asclepiades held that there was no such thing as real
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intestines, it straightway becomes ordure? For, if such a long period of time is incapable of altering it, neither will the short period be sufficient, or, if the latter is enough, surely the longer time will be much more so! Well, then, can it be that, while the nutriment does undergo an alteration in the stomach, this is a different kind of alteration and one which is not dependent on the nature of the organ which alters it? Or if it be an alteration of this latter kind, yet one perhaps which is not proper to the body of the animal? This is still more impossible. Digestion was shown to be nothing else than an alteration to the quality proper to that which is receiving nourishment. Since, then, this is what digestion means and since the nutriment has been shown to take on in the stomach a quality appropriate to the animal which is about to be nourished by it, it has been demonstrated adequately that nutriment does undergo digestion in the stomach. And Asclepiades is absurd when he states that the quality of the digested food never shows itself either in eructations or in the vomited matter, or on dissection. For of course the mere fact that the food smells of the body shows that it has undergone gastric digestion. But this man is so foolish that, when he hears the Ancients saying that the food is converted in the stomach into something "good," he thinks it proper to look out not for what is good in its possible effects, but for what is good to the taste. This is like saying that apples (for so one has to argue with him) become more apple-like [in flavour] in the stomach, or honey more honey-like!

qualitative change; the food was merely broken up into its constituent molecules, and absorbed unaltered. cf. p. 49, note 5.
Πολὺ δ’ εὐθεστερός ἐστὶ καὶ γελοιοτέρος ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος ἢ μὴ νοῦν, ὅπως εἰρηται πρὸς τῶν παλαιῶν ἡ πέψις ἐψήσει παραπλήσιος ὑπάρχειν, ἢ ἐκών σοφιζόμενος ἐαυτόν. ἐψήσει μὲν οὖν, 
φησίν, οὔτως ἐλαφρῶς ἔχουσαν θερμασίαν οὐκ εἰκὸς εἶναι παραπλήσιαν τὴν πέψιν, ὢσπερ ἢ τὴν 
Ἀἵτυν δέον ὑποθεῖναι τῇ γαστρί ἢ ἄλλως αὐτῆς 
ἀλλοιώσαι τὰ σιτία μὴ δυνάμενης ἢ δυνάμενης 
μὲν ἀλλοιών, οὗ κατὰ τὴν ἐμφυτον δὲ θερμασίαν, 
ὕγραν οὖσαν δηλονότι καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ ἐφείν οὐκ 
ὅπταν εἰρημένην.

'Ἐχρήν δ’ αὐτόν, εἴπερ περὶ πραγμάτων ἀντι-
λέγειν ἐβούλετο, πειραθῆναι δεῖξαι μᾶλλον μὲν 
167 καὶ πρῶτον, ὡς οὐδὲ μεταβάλλει τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδ’ 
ἀλλοιουταί κατὰ ποιότητα πρὸς τῆς γαστρὸς τὰ 
σιτία, δεύτερον δ’, εἴπερ μὴ οἴος τ’ ἢν τοῦτο 
πιστῶσασθαι, τὸ τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν αὐτῶν άχρηστον 
εἶναι τῷ ἤρφι: εἰ δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτ’ εἶχε διαβάλλειν, 
ἐξελέγξαι τὴν περὶ τὰς δραστικὰς ἀρχὰς ὑπό-
λησιν καὶ δεῖξαι τὰς ἐνεργειὰς ἐν τοῖς μορίοις οὐ 
διὰ τὴν ἐκ θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ 
ὐγροῦ ποιῶν κράσιν ὑπάρχειν ἄλλα δὲ ἄλλο τι’ 
εἰ δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτ’ ἐτόλμα διαβάλλειν, ἄλλ’ ὅτι γε 
μὴ τὸ θερμὸν ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ φύσεως διοικοῦ-
μένοις τὸ τῶν ἄλλων δραστικώτατον. ἢ εἰ μῆτε 
τοῦτο μῆτε τῶν ἄλλων τι τῶν ἐμπροσθεν εἰχεν 
ἀποδεικνύναι, μὴ ληρεῖν ὅνοματι προσπαλαίοντα

1 i.e. denial of forethought in the Physis.
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Erasistratus, however, is still more foolish and absurd, either through not perceiving in what sense the Ancients said that digestion is similar to the process of boiling, or because he purposely confused himself with sophistries. It is, he says, inconceivable that digestion, involving as it does such trifling warmth, should be related to the boiling process. This is as if we were to suppose that it was necessary to put the fires of Etna under the stomach before it could manage to alter the food; or else that, while it was capable of altering the food, it did not do this by virtue of its innate heat, which of course was moist, so that the word boil was used instead of bake.

What he ought to have done, if it was facts that he wished to dispute about, was to have tried to show, first and foremost, that the food is not transmuted or altered in quality by the stomach at all, and secondly, if he could not be confident of this, he ought to have tried to show that this alteration was not of any advantage to the animal. If, again, he were unable even to make this misrepresentation, he ought to have attempted to confute the postulate concerning the active principles—to show, in fact, that the functions taking place in the various parts do not depend on the way in which the Warm, Cold, Dry, and Moist are mixed, but on some other factor. And if he had not the audacity to misrepresent facts even so far as this, still he should have tried at least to show that the Warm is not the most active of all the principles which play a part in things governed by Nature. But if he was unable to demonstrate this any more than any of the previous propositions, then he ought not to have made himself ridiculous by quarrelling uselessly.
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μάτην, ὡσπερ οὖν σαφῶς Ἄριστοτέλους ἐν τῇ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς κἀν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῶν μετεωρολογικῶν ὁπως ἡ πέψις ἐψήσει παραπλήσιος εἶναι λέγεται, καὶ ὅτι μὴ πρῶτοι μηδὲ κυρίως ὀνομαζόντων, εἰρηκότος.

‘Ἀλλ’, ὡς ἦδη λέσκεται πολλάκις, ἀρχῇ τούτων ἀπάντων ἐστὶ μία τὸ περὶ θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ ύγροῦ διασκέψασθαι, καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ γενέσεως καὶ 168 φθορᾶς, ἀπὸ δεξιὰς ἀπάσας τὰς κατὰ τὰ σώματα μεταβολὰς καὶ ἄλλωσεις ὑπὸ τούτων γίγνεσθαι. ἀλλ’ Ἐρασίστρατος οὔτε τούτοις οὔτ’ ἄλλω τινί τῶν προειρημένων ἀντειπὼν ἐπὶ τούνομα μόνον ἐτράπετο τῆς ἐψήσεως.

VIII

‘Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς πέψεως, εἰ καὶ τὰλλα πάντα παρέλιπεν, τὸ γοῦν ὅτι διαφέρει τῆς ἐκτὸς ἐψήσεως ἡ ἐν τοῖς ξύοις πέψις, ἐπειράθη δεικνύναι, περὶ δὲ τῆς καταπόσεως οὐδ’ ἄχρι τοσοῦτον. τί γάρ φησιν;

“Ὁλκῆ μὲν οὖν τῆς κοίλης σύνεμια φαίνεται εἶναι.”

Καὶ μὴν δύο χιτῶνας ἡ γαστήρ ἔχει πάντως ἐνεκά του γεγονότας καὶ διήκουσιν οὕτοι μέχρι τοῦ στόματος, ὁ μὲν ἐνδον, οἷος ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν γαστήρα, τοιούτος διαμένων, ὁ δ’ έτερος ἐπὶ τὸ
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with a mere name—as though Aristotle had not clearly stated in the fourth book of his "Meteorology," as well as in many other passages, in what way digestion can be said to be allied to boiling, and also that the latter expression is not used in its primitive or strict sense.

But, as has been frequently said already, the one starting-point of all this is a thoroughgoing enquiry into the question of the Warm, Cold, Dry and Moist; this Aristotle carried out in the second of his books "On Genesis and Destruction," where he shows that all the transmutations and alterations throughout the body take place as a result of these principles. Erasistratus, however, advanced nothing against these or anything else that has been said above, but occupied himself merely with the word "boiling."

VIII

Thus, as regards digestion, even though he neglected everything else, he did at least attempt to prove his point—namely, that digestion in animals differs from boiling carried on outside; in regard to the question of deglutition, however, he did not go even so far as this. What are his words?

"The stomach does not appear to exercise any traction." 2

Now the fact is that the stomach possesses two coats, which certainly exist for some purpose; they extend as far as the mouth, the internal one remaining throughout similar to what it is in the stomach, and the other one tending to become of a more fleshy

1 v. p. 9, et passim. 2 cf. p. 97.
It appears to me, from comparison between this and other passages in Galen’s writings (notably Use of Parts, iv., 8), that he means by the “two coats” simply the mucous and the muscular coats. In this case the “straight” or “longitudinal” fibres of the inner coat would be the *rugae*; the “circular” fibres of the inner intestinal coat would be the *valvulae conniventes*.
nature in the gullet. Now simple observation will
testify that these coats have their fibres inserted in
contrary directions. And, although Erasistratus did
not attempt to say for what reason they are like this,
I am going to do so.

The inner coat has its fibres straight, since it exists
for the purpose of traction. The outer coat has
its fibres transverse, for the purpose of peristalsis.
In fact, the movements of each of the mobile organs
of the body depend on the setting of the fibres.
Now please test this assertion first in the muscles
themselves; in these the fibres are most distinct, and
their movements visible owing to their vigour. And
after the muscles, pass to the physical organs, and
you will see that they all move in correspondence
with their fibres. This is why the fibres throughout
the intestines are circular in both coats—they only
contract peristaltically, they do not exercise traction.
The stomach, again, has some of its fibres longitudinal
for the purpose of traction and the others transverse
for the purpose of peristalsis. For just as the
movements in the muscles take place when each of
the fibres becomes tightened and drawn towards its
origin, such also is what happens in the stomach;
when the transverse fibres tighten, the breadth of

---

2 The term here rendered peristalsis is peristolé in Greek;
it is applied only to the intermittent movements of muscles
placed circularly round a lumen or cavity, and comprehends
systolé or contraction and diastolé or dilatation. In its
modern significance, peristalsis, however, also includes the
movements of longitudinal fibres. cf. p. 97, note 1.

3 i.e. those containing non-striped or "involuntary" muscle
fibres; organs governed by the "natural" pneuma; cf.
p. 186, note 3.

4 By this term is meant only what we should call the
"voluntary" muscles.
γνεσθαί το ἐυρός τῆς περιεχομένης ὑπ' αὐτῶν κοιλότητος, τῶν δ' εὐθείων ἐλκομένων τε καὶ εἰς ἑαυτᾶς συναγομένων οὐκ ἐνδέχεται μὴ οὔ συναι-170 ῥεῖσθαι τὸ μῆκος. ἀλλὰ μὴν ἵνα ἐναργῶς γε φαίνεται καταπινόντων συναιρούμενον καὶ τοσοῦτον ὁ λάρυγξ ἀνατρέχων, ὡσον ὁ στόμαχος κατασπά- ται, καὶ ὅταν γε συμπληρωθεῖσθαι τῆς ἐν τῷ καταπίνειν ἐνεργείας ἀφεθῇ τῆς τάσεως ὁ στόμα- χος, ἐναργῶς πάλιν φαίνεται καταφερόμενος ὁ λάρυγξ. ὁ γὰρ ἐνδον χιτῶν τῆς γαστρὸς ὁ τὰς εὐθείας ἱνα ἔχων ο καὶ τὸν στόμαχον ὑπαλείφοιν καὶ τὸ στόμα τοῖς ἐντὸς μέρεσιν ἐπεκτεῖνεται τοῦ λάρυγγος, ὡςτ' οὐκ ἐνδέχεται κατασπώμενον αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῆς κοιλίας μὴ οὔ συνεπιστράθη καὶ τὸν λάρυγγα.

"Ὅτι δ' αἱ περιφερεῖς ἱνα, αἰς περιστέλλεται τὰ τ' ἀλλὰ μόρια καὶ ἡ γαστήρ, οὐ συναιροῦσι τὸ μῆκος, ἀλλὰ συστέλλουσι καὶ στενοῦσι τὴν εὐρύτητα, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν ἐστιν ὁμολογού- μενον Ἐρασιστράτος περιστέλλεσθαι γάρ φησι τοὺς συτίοις τῆς γαστέρα κατὰ τὸν τῆς πέψεως ἀπαντα χρόνον. ἀλλ' εἰ περιστέλλεται μὲν, οὐδὲν δὲ τοῦ μῆκος ἀφαιρεῖται τῆς κοιλίας, οὐκ ἔστι τῆς περισταλτικῆς κινήσεως ἰδιῶς τὸ κατα- σπᾶν κατὼ τὸν στόμαχον. ὅπερ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἐρασίστρατος εἶπε, τοῦτο μόνον αὐτὸ συμ-171 βίονται τὸ τῶν ἀνω συστελλομένων διαστέλ- λεσθαι τὰ κάτω. τοῦτο δ' ὅτι, κἂν εἰς νεκροῦ τὸν στόμαχον ὑδατὸς ἐγχέις, φαίνεται γιγανόμενον, οὐδεὶς ἄγνοει. τὰς γὰρ τῶν ὑλῶν διὰ στενοῦ

1 cf. p. 97.
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the cavity contained by them becomes less; and when the longitudinal fibres contract and draw in upon themselves, the length must necessarily be curtailed. This curtailment of length, indeed, is well seen in the act of swallowing: the larynx is seen to rise upwards to exactly the same degree that the gullet is drawn downwards; while, after the process of swallowing has been completed and the gullet is released from tension, the larynx can be clearly seen to sink down again. This is because the inner coat of the stomach, which has the longitudinal fibres and which also lines the gullet and the mouth, extends to the interior of the larynx, and it is thus impossible for it to be drawn down by the stomach without the larynx being involved in the traction.

Further, it will be found acknowledged in Erasistratus's own writings that the circular fibres (by which the stomach as well as other parts performs its contractions) do not curtail its length, but contract and lessen its breadth. For he says that the stomach contracts peristaltically round the food during the whole period of digestion. But if it contracts, without in any way being diminished in length, this is because downward traction of the gullet is not a property of the movement of circular peristalsis. For what alone happens, as Erasistratus himself said, is that when the upper parts contract the lower ones dilate.¹ And everyone knows that this can be plainly seen happening even in a dead man, if water be poured down his throat; this symptom² results from the passage of matter through a narrow

¹ For "symptom." cf p. 13, and p. 12, note 3. "Transitum namque materiae per angustum corpus id accidens consequitur" (Linacre). Less a "result" or "consequence" than an "accompaniment."
σώματος ὀδοιπορίας ἀκόλουθον ἐστὶ τὸ σύμπτωμα· θαυμαστὸν γὰρ, εἰ διερχομένου τινὸς αὐτὸν ὄγκου μὴ διαστάλησται. οὕκειον τὸ μὲν τῶν ἀνω συστελλομένων διαστέλλεσθαι τὰ κάτω κοινὸν ἐστὶ καὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς σώμασι, δὲ ὅν ὀπωσοῦν τι διεξέρχεται, καὶ τοῖς ζῶσιν, εἰτε περιστέλλοιτο τοῖς διερχομένοις εἴθ’ ἐλκοιτο.

Τὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ μῆκος συναιρέσεως ὑδιὸν τῶν τὰς εὐθείας ἑνῶς ἐχόντων ὅργανων, ὡς ἐπιστάσθωσυνταί τί. ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐδείχθη καταστάσεως ὁ στόμαχος, οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἰλκε τὸν λάρυγγα· δῆλον οὖν, ὡς ἡ γαστήρ ἐλκει τὰ σιτία διὰ τοῦ στομάχου.

Καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὸν ἐμετὸν δὲ τῶν ἐμουμένων ἀχρι τοῦ στόματος φορὰ πάντως μὲν που καὶ αὐτὴ τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀναφερομένων διατεινόμενα μέρη τοῦ στομάχου διεστώτα κέκτηται, τὸν πρὸσω δ’ ὁ τι ἀν ἐκάστοτ’ ἐπιλαμβάνηται, τοῦτ’ ἄρχομενον 172 διαστέλλεται, τὸ δ’ ὡσ’ ὅπισθεν καταλείπει δηλούντι συστελλόμενον, ὅσθ’ ὁμοίαν εἰναι πάντη τὴν διάθεσιν τοῦ στομάχου κατὰ γε τοῦτο τῇ τῶν καταπινόντων· ἀλλὰ τῆς ὁλκής μὴ παροῦσης τὸ μῆκος ὅλον ἴσον ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις συμπτώμασι διαφυλάττεται.

Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ κατατίνιευν ράδον ἐστὶν ἢ ἐμείην, ὅτι κατατίνιεται μὲν ἀμφιὸν τῆς γαστρὸς τῶν χυτῶν ἐνεργοῦντων, τοῦ μὲν ἐντὸς ἐλκοντος, τοῦ δ’ ἐκτὸς περιστελλομένου τε καὶ συνεποθοῦντος, ἐμείηται δὲ θατέρου μόνου τοῦ ἐξωθεὶν ἐνεργοῦντος,

1 i.e. this is a purely mechanical process.
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channel; it would be extraordinary if the channel did not dilate when a mass was passing through it.\(^1\) Obviously then the dilatation of the lower parts along with the contraction of the upper is common both to dead bodies, when anything whatsoever is passing through them, and to living ones, whether they contract peristaltically round their contents or attract them.\(^2\)

Curtailment of length, on the other hand, is peculiar to organs which possess longitudinal fibres for the purpose of attraction. But the gullet was shown to be pulled down; for otherwise it would not have drawn upon the larynx. It is therefore clear that the stomach attracts food by the gullet.

Further, in vomiting, the mere passive conveyance of rejected matter up to the mouth will certainly itself suffice to keep open those parts of the oesophagus which are distended by the returned food; as it occupies each part in front [above], it first dilates this, and of course leaves the part behind [below] contracted. Thus, in this respect at least, the condition of the gullet is precisely similar to what it is in the act of swallowing.\(^3\) But there being no traction, the whole length remains equal in such cases.

And for this reason it is easier to swallow than to vomit, for deglutition results from both coats of the stomach being brought into action, the inner one exerting a pull and the outer one helping by peristalsis and propulsion, whereas emesis occurs from the outer coat alone functioning, without there

\(^2\) i.e. this phenomenon is a proof neither of peristolé nor of attraction. cf. p. 97, note 2.

\(^3\) Contraction and dilatation of course being reversed.
The channa is a kind of sea-perch; "a species of Serranus, either S. scriba or S. cabrilla" (D'Arcy W. Thompson). cf. Aristotle's *Nat. Hist.* (D'Arcy Thompson's edition, Oxford, 1910), IV., xi., 538 a, 20. The *synodont* "is not to be identified with certainty, but is supposed to be *Dentex vul-

being any kind of pull towards the mouth. For, although the swallowing of food is ordinarily preceded by a feeling of desire on the part of the stomach, there is in the case of vomiting no corresponding desire from the mouth-parts for the experience; the two are opposite dispositions of the stomach itself; it yearns after and tends towards what is advantageous and proper to it, it loathes and rids itself of what is foreign. Thus the actual process of swallowing occurs very quickly in those who have a good appetite for such foods as are proper to the stomach; this organ obviously draws them in and down before they are masticated; whereas in the case of those who are forced to take a medicinal draught or who take food as medicine, the swallowing of these articles is accomplished with distress and difficulty.

From what has been said, then, it is clear that the inner coat of the stomach (that containing longitudinal fibres) exists for the purpose of exerting a pull from mouth to stomach, and that it is only in deglution that it is active, whereas the external coat, which contains transverse fibres, has been so constituted in order that it may contract upon its contents and propel them forward; this coat furthermore, functions in vomiting no less than in swallowing. The truth of my statement is also borne out by what happens in the case of the channae and synodontes; the stomachs of these animals are sometimes found in their mouths, as also Aristotle writes in his History garis," that is, an edible Mediterranean perch. "It is not the stomach," adds Prof. Thompson, "but the air-bladder that gets everted and hangs out of the mouth in fishes, especially when they are hauled in from a considerable depth." cf. H. A., VIII., ii., 591 b, 5.
ξώνν ἐγραψεν ἱστορίαις καὶ προστίθησι γε τὴν
αὐτίαν ὑπὸ λαιμαργίας αὐτοῖς τοῦτο συμβαίνειν
φάσκων.

"Εχει γὰρ ὁδε: κατὰ τὰς σφοδρετέρας ὄρεξεις
ἀνω προστρέχει πάσι τοῖς ξώοις ἡ γαστήρ, ὡστε
tiωs τοῦ πάθους αἴσθησιν ἐναρκῇ σχόντες
ἐξέρπειν αὐτοῖς φασί τὴν κοιλίαν, ἑνὶον δὲ μασω-
174 μένων ἐτὶ καὶ μήπω || καλῶς ἐν τῷ στόματι
tὰ σιτία κατεργασαμένων ἐξαρτάζει φανερώς
ἀκόντων. ἐφ' ὅν όν ἄλλων φύσει λαιμάργων
ὑπαρχόντων ἢ τ' εὐρυχωρία τοῦ στόματός ἔστι
dαψίλης ἢ τῇ τῆς γαστρός θέσις ἐγγύς, ὡς ἐπὶ
συνόδοντός τε καὶ χάνυς, οὐδὲν ϑαυμαστὸν, ὅταν
ἰκανῶς πεινάσαντα διώκῃ τι τῶν μικροτέρων
ξώων, εἰτ' ἤδη πλησίον ἢ τοῦ συλλαβεῖν, ἀνα-
τρέχειν ἐπειγούσης τῆς ἐπίθυμίας εἰς τὸ στόμα
tῆς γαστέρα. γενέσθαι δ' ἄλλως ἀμόχανου τοῦτο
μὴ ὁν ὅσπερ διὰ χειρὸς τοῦ στομάχου τῆς
γαστρός ἐπιστρώμενης εἰς ἑαυτὴν τὰ σιτία. καθά-
περ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ προθυμίας ἐνίοτε τῇ χειρὶ
sυνεπεκτείνομεν ὅλους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἑνεκα τοῦ
θάττου ἐπιδράξασθαι τῷ προκειμένου σώματος,
οὕτω καὶ ἡ γαστήρ οἶον χειρὶ τοῦ στομάχω
συνεπεκτείνεται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἐφ' ὅν ξώον ἂμα
τὰ τρία ταυτὶ συνεπεσεν, ἐφεσθήσεται σφοδρὰ τῆς
τροφῆς ὅ τε στομάχος μικρὸς ἢ τ' εὐρυχωρία τοῦ
στόματος δαψίλης, ἐπὶ τοῦτων ὁλίγῃ ροπῆ τῆς
ἐπεκτάσεως εἰς τὸ στόμα τῆν κοιλίαν ὅλην ἀνα-
φέρει.

'Ἡρκεῖ μὲν οὖν ἰσως ἀνδρὶ φυσικῷ παρ' αὐτής
175 μόνης τῆς κατασκευῆς τῶν ὀργάνων τῆν ἐνδειξιν
τῆς ἑνεργείας λαμβάνειν. οὐ γὰρ δὴ μάτην γ'
of Animals; he also adds the cause of this: he says that it is owing to their voracity.

The facts are as follows. In all animals, when the appetite is very intense, the stomach rises up, so that some people who have a clear perception of this condition say that their stomach "creeps out" of them; in others, who are still masticating their food and have not yet worked it up properly in the mouth, the stomach obviously snatches away the food from them against their will. In those animals, therefore, which are naturally voracious, in whom the mouth cavity is of generous proportions, and the stomach situated close to it (as in the case of the synodont and channa), it is in no way surprising that, when they are sufficiently hungry and are pursuing one of the smaller animals, and are just on the point of catching it, the stomach should, under the impulse of desire, spring into the mouth. And this cannot possibly take place in any other way than by the stomach drawing the food to itself by means of the gullet, as though by a hand. In fact, just as we ourselves, in our eagerness to grasp more quickly something lying before us, sometimes stretch out our whole bodies along with our hands, so also the stomach stretches itself forward along with the gullet, which is, as it were, its hand. And thus, in these animals in whom those three factors co-exist—an excessive propensity for food, a small gullet, and ample mouth proportions—in these, any slight tendency to movement forwards brings the whole stomach into the mouth.

Now the constitution of the organs might itself suffice to give a naturalist an indication of their functions. For Nature would never have purpose-
Under the term “neura,” tendons were often included as well as nerves. Similarly in modern Dutch the word zenuw ("sinew") means both a tendon and a nerve; zenuwachtig = “nervous.”
lessly constructed the oesophagus of two coats with contrary dispositions; they must also have each been meant to have a different action. The Erasistratean school, however, are capable of anything rather than of recognizing the effects of Nature. Come, therefore, let us demonstrate to them by animal dissection as well that each of the two coats does exercise the activity which I have stated. Take an animal, then; lay bare the structures surrounding the gullet, without severing any of the nerves, arteries, or veins which are there situated; next divide with vertical incisions, from the lower jaw to the thorax, the outer coat of the oesophagus (that containing transverse fibres); then give the animal food and you will see that it still swallows although the peristaltic function has been abolished. If, again, in another animal, you cut through both coats with transverse incisions, you will observe that this animal also swallows although the inner coat is no longer functioning. From this it is clear that the animal can also swallow by either of the two coats, although not so well as by both. For the following also, in addition to other points, may be distinctly observed in the dissection which I have described—that during deglutition the gullet becomes slightly filled with air which is swallowed along with the food, and that, when the outer coat is contracting, this air is easily forced with the food into the stomach, but that, when there only exists an inner coat, the air impedes the conveyance of

3 Rather than the alternative reading, τὸν ἐσωθεν ἔμφυταν. Galen apparently supposes that the outer coat will not be damaged, as the cuts will pass between its fibres. These cuts would be, presumably, short ones, at various levels, no single one of them involving the whole circumference of the gullet.
σιτίων διατείνον τ’ αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἐμποδίζουν.

᾿Αλλ’ οὕτε τούτων οὐδὲν Ἐρασίστρατος εἶπεν οὔθ’ ὡς ἡ σκολιὰ θέσις τοῦ στομάχου διαβάλλει σαφῶς τὸ δόγμα τῶν νομιζόντων ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνωθεν βολῆς μόνης ποδηγούμενα μέχρι τῆς γαστρὸς ἵναι τὰ καταπινόμενα. μόνον δ’ ὅτι πολλὰ τῶν μακροτραχίλων ζώων ἐπικεκυφότα καταπίνει, καλῶς εἶπεν. ὃ δὴλον, ὅτι τὸ φαινόμενον οὐ τὸ πῶς καταπίνομεν ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πῶς οὐ καταπίνομεν· ὅτι γὰρ μὴ διὰ μόνης τῆς ἀνωθεν βολῆς, ἐκ τούτου δὴλον· οὐ μὴν εἰδ’ ἐλκούσης τῆς κοιλίας εἶτε παράγωντος αὐτὰ τοῦ στομάχου, 177 δὴλον ἡ ἤδη πω. ἀλλ’ ἢμειδ’ γε || πάντας τοὺς λογισμοὺς εἰπόντες τοὺς τ’ ἐκ τῆς κατασκευῆς τῶν ὀργάνων ὀρμωμένους καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλῶν συμπτωμάτων τῶν τε πρὸ τοῦ γυμνωθῆναι τῶν στόμαχον καὶ γυμνωθέντος, ὡς ὀλίγω πρόσθεν ἐλέγομεν, ἰκανῶς ἐνεδειξάμεθα τοῦ μὲν ἐλκεῖν ἐνεκα τὸν ἐντὸς χειτῶνα, τοῦ δ’ ἀπωθεῖν τὸν ἐκτὸς γεγονέναι.

Προσδέμεθα μὲν οὖν ἀποδείξαι τὴν καθεκτικὴν ὑναμῖν ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὀργάνων οὖσαν, ὡσπερ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν λόγῳ τὴν ἐλκτικὴν τε καὶ προσέτι τὴν ἄλλοιστικὴν. ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ἀκολούθης τοῦ λόγου τὰς τέτταρας ἀπεδείξαμεν ὑπαρχούσας τῇ γαστρί, τὴν ἐλκτικὴν μὲν ἐν τῷ καταπίνειν, τὴν καθεκτικὴν δ’ ἐν τῷ πέπτειν, τὴν ἀπωστικὴν δ’ ἐν τοῖς ἐμετοὺς καὶ ταῖς τῶν πεπεμένων σιτίων εἰς τὸ λεπτὸν ἐντερον ὑποχωρίσειν, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν πέψιν ἀλλοίσωσιν ὑπάρχειν.
food, by distending this coat and hindering its action.

But Erasistratus said nothing about this, nor did he point out that the oblique situation of the gullet clearly confutes the teaching of those who hold that it is simply by virtue of the impulse from above that food which is swallowed reaches the stomach. The only correct thing he said was that many of the long-necked animals bend down to swallow. Hence, clearly, the observed fact does not show how we swallow but how we do not swallow. For from this observation it is clear that swallowing is not due merely to the impulse from above; it is yet, however, not clear whether it results from the food being attracted by the stomach, or conducted by the gullet. For our part, however, having enumerated all the different considerations—those based on the constitution of the organs, as well as those based on the other symptoms which, as just mentioned, occur both before and after the gullet has been exposed—we have thus sufficiently proved that the inner coat exists for the purpose of attraction and the outer for the purpose of propulsion.

Now the original task we set before ourselves was to demonstrate that the retentive faculty exists in every one of the organs, just as in the previous book we proved the existence of the attractive, and, over and above this, the alterative faculty. Thus, in the natural course of our argument, we have demonstrated these four faculties existing in the stomach—the attractive faculty in connection with swallowing, the retentive with digestion, the expulsive with vomiting and with the descent of digested food into the small intestine—and digestion itself we have shown to be a process of alteration.
IX

Οὐκον ἐτ’ ἀπορήσομεν οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ σπληνῶς, εἰ ἐλκεῖ μὲν τὸ οἰκεῖον, ἀποκρίνει δὲ τὸ ἄλλοτριον, ἄλλους δὲ καὶ κατέχειν, ὅσον ἄν ἐπιστάσηται, πέφυκεν, οὐδὲ περὶ ἤπατος ἢ φλεβῶς ἢ ἀρτηρίας ἢ καρδίας ἢ τῶν ἂν ἄλλων τινῶν· ἀναγκαίαι γὰρ ἐδείχθησαν αἱ τέταρτες αὐταὶ δυνάμεις ἀπαντῆσαι μορίῳ τῷ μέλλοντι βρέφεσθαι καὶ διὰ τούτ’ αὐτὰς ὑπηρέτιδας εἶναι βρέφεως ἐφαμεν, ὡς γὰρ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποπάτημα τοῖς κυσίν ἤδιστον, οὕτω καὶ τὰ τοῦ ἤπατος περιττώματα τὸ μὲν τῷ σπληνῷ, τὸ δὲ τῷ χοληδόχῳ κύστει, τὸ δὲ τοῖς νεφροῖς οἰκεῖον.

X

Καὶ λέγειν ἐτι περὶ τῆς τούτων γενέσεως οὐκ ἄν ἐθέλομε μεθ’ Ἰπποκράτην καὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ Διοκλέα καὶ Πραξιγόραν καὶ Φιλότιμον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁδείρθεσι περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων εἰπον ἄν, εἰ τις τῶν ἐμπροσθεν ἀκριβῶς ἐξειργάσατο τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν λόγον.

Ἐπεὶ δ’ οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ καλῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποφημάμενοι παρέλιπον ἀγωνίσασθαι τῷ λόγῳ, μηδ’ ὑπονοήσαντες ἐσεσθαι τινὰς εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀναισχύντους σοφιστάς, ὡς ἀντιλέγειν ἐπιχειρήσαι τοῖς ἐναργεσίν, οἱ νεώτεροι δὲ τὸ μὲν τι

1 cf. p. 205.
Concerning the spleen, also, we shall therefore have no further doubts as to whether it attracts what is proper to it, rejects what is foreign, and has a natural power of altering and retaining all that it attracts; nor shall we be in any doubt as to the liver, veins, arteries, heart, or any other organ. For these four faculties have been shown to be necessary for every part which is to be nourished; this is why we have called these faculties the *handmaids of nutrition*. For just as human faeces are most pleasing to dogs, so the residual matters from the liver are, some of them, proper to the spleen; others to the gall-bladder, and others to the kidneys.

I should not have cared to say anything further as to the origin of these [surplus substances] after Hippocrates, Plato, Aristotle, Diocles, Praxagoras, and Philotimus, nor indeed should I even have said anything about the *faculties*, if any of our predecessors had worked out this subject thoroughly.

While, however, the statements which the Ancients made on these points were correct, they yet omitted to defend their arguments with logical proofs; of course they never suspected that there could be sophists so shameless as to try to contradict obvious facts. More recent physicians, again, have been

---

2 Thus Galen elsewhere calls the spleen a mere *emunctory* (*ἐκμαγεῖον*) of the liver. *cf.* p. 214, note 1.
νικηθέντες ύπο τῶν σοφισμάτων ἐπείσθησαν αὐτοῖς, τὸ δὲ τι καὶ ἀντιλέγειν ἐπιχειρήσαντες ἀποδεῖν μοι πολὺ τῆς τῶν παλαιῶν ἔδοξαν δυνάμενοι, ὥστε ἂν ἐκεῖνων αὐτῶν, εἴπερ ἐτ' ἢν τις, ἀγωνίσασθαι μοι δοκεῖ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνατρέποντας τῆς τέχνης τὰ κάλλιστα, καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως ἐπειράθην συνθεῖναι τοὺς λόγους.

"Οτι δ' ἡ ούδεν ἡ παντάπασιν ἀνύσω τι σμικρόν, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν πάμπολλα γὰρ εὐρύσκῳ τελέως μὲν ἀποδεδειγμένα τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οὔτε δὲ συνετὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν νῦν δὲ ἁμαθίαν ἀλλ' οὖδ' ἐπιχειρούμενα γιγνώσκεσθαι διὰ ῥαθυμίαν, οὔτ', εἰ καὶ γνωσθεὶς τινὶ, δικαίως ἔξεταζόμενα.

Χρῆ γὰρ τὸν μέλλοντα γνώσεσθαι τι τῶν πολλῶν ἄμεινον εὐθὺς μὲν καὶ τῇ φύσει καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διδασκαλίᾳ πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων διενεχόμενον ἐπείδὰν δὲ γένηται μειράκιον, ἀληθείας τινὰ σχεῖν ἐρωτικὴν μανίαν, ὥστε ἐνθούσιων καὶ μήθ' ἡμέρας μῆτε νυκτὸς διαλείπεισι σπεύδουτα τε καὶ συντεταμένοι ἔκμαθεῖν, ὅσα τοῖς ἐνδοξοτάτοις εἴρηται τῶν παλαιῶν ἐπείδὰν δ' ἐκμάθῃ, κρίνειν αὐτὰ καὶ βασανίζειν χρόνῳ παμπόλλῳ καὶ σκοπεῖν, πόσα μὲν ὀμολογεῖ τοῖς ἐναργῶς φαινομένοις, 180 πόσα δὲ διαφέρεται, || καὶ οὕτω τὰ μὲν αἱρέσθαι, τὰ δ' ἀποστρέφεσθαι. τὸ μὲν δὴ τοιοῦτο πάνυ σφόδρα χρησίμους ἠλπικὰ τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἐσε-
partly conquered by the sophistries of these fellows and have given credence to them; whilst others who attempted to argue with them appear to me to lack to a great extent the power of the Ancients. For this reason I have attempted to put together my arguments in the way in which it seems to me the Ancients, had any of them been still alive, would have done, in opposition to those who would overturn the finest doctrines of our art.

I am not, however, unaware that I shall achieve either nothing at all or else very little. For I find that a great many things which have been conclusively demonstrated by the Ancients are unintelligible to the bulk of the Moderns owing to their ignorance—nay, that, by reason of their laziness, they will not even make an attempt to comprehend them; and even if any of them have understood them, they have not given them impartial examination.

The fact is that he whose purpose is to know anything better than the multitude do must far surpass all others both as regards his nature and his early training. And when he reaches early adolescence he must become possessed with an ardent love for truth, like one inspired; neither day nor night may he cease to urge and strain himself in order to learn thoroughly all that has been said by the most illustrious of the Ancients. And when he has learnt this, then for a prolonged period he must test and prove it, observing what part of it is in agreement, and what in disagreement with obvious fact; thus he will choose this and turn away from that. To such an one my hope has been that my treatise would prove of the very greatest assistance....
σθαί λόγους· εἴεν δ' ἀν ὅλιγοι παντάπασιν οὐτοι·
τοίς δ' ἄλλοις οὕτω γενήσεται τὸ γράμμα περιτ-
τόν, ὡς εἰ καὶ μῦθον ὄνω τις λέγου.

XI

Συμπεραντέον οὖν ἠμῖν τὸν λόγον ἐνεκα τῶν
τῆς ἀληθείας ἐφιεμένων ὡσα λείπει κατ' αὐτὸν
ἐτὶ προσθείσιν. ὡς γὰρ ἡ γαστήρ ἐλκει μὲν
ἐναργῆς καὶ καταστὰ τὰ σιτία τοῖς σφόδρα
πεινώδεσι, πρὶν ἀκριβῶς ἐν τῷ στόματι λειω-
θῆναι, δυσχεραίνει δὲ καὶ ἀπωθεῖται τοῖς ἀποσί-
tοις τε καὶ πρὸς ἀνάγκην ἐσθίουσιν, οὕτω καὶ
τῶν ἄλλων ὅργανων ἐκαστον ἀμφότερα ἔχει τὰς
δυνάμεις, τὴν τῶν οἰκείων ἔλκτικὴν καὶ τὴν
τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἀποκριτικὴν. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, κἂν
ἐξ ἐνὸς ἡ χυτῶν ὁργανὸν τι συνεστώς, ἀστερ
καὶ αἱ κύστεις ἀμφότεραι καὶ αἱ μήτραι καὶ αἱ
φλέβες, ἀμφότερα τῶν ἱνῶν ἔχει τὰ γένη, τῶν
εὐθείῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἐγκαρσίων.

181 Καὶ μὲν γε καὶ τρίτον τι ἡ γένος ἱνῶν ἐστι
<τῶν> λοξῶν, ἐλαττον πολὺ τῷ πλήθει τῶν
προειρημένων δύο γενόν. εὐρίσκεται δ' ἐν μὲν
τοῖς ἐκ δυοῦ χυτῶν συνεστηκόσιν ὁργανοῖς
ἐν θατέρῳ μόνῳ ταῖς εὐθείαις ἵσιν ἀναμεμηγενοῦν,
ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀμα τοῖς ἄλλοις δύο γένεσιν.
συνεπιλαμβάνοντι δ' αὐταὶ μέγιστον τῇ τῆς καθ-
εκτικῆς ὀνομασθέσις δυνάμεως ἐνεργεία. δεῖται
γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ πανταχόθεν ἐσφίγχθαι
καὶ περιτετάζθαι τοῖς ἐνυπάρχουσι τὸ μόριον, ἢ

1 cf. p. 269.
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Still, such people may be expected to be quite few in number, while, as for the others, this book will be as superfluous to them as a tale told to an ass.

XI

For the sake, then, of those who are aiming at truth, we must complete this treatise by adding what is still wanting in it. Now, in people who are very hungry, the stomach obviously attracts or draws down the food before it has been thoroughly softened in the mouth, whilst in those who have no appetite or who are being forced to eat, the stomach is displeased and rejects the food.¹ And in a similar way each of the other organs possesses both faculties—that of attracting what is proper to it, and that of rejecting what is foreign. Thus, even if there be any organ which consists of only one coat (such as the two bladders,² the uterus, and the veins), it yet possesses both kinds of fibres, the longitudinal and the transverse.

But further, there are fibres of a third kind—the oblique—which are much fewer in number than the two kinds already spoken of. In the organs consisting of two coats this kind of fibre is found in the one coat only, mixed with the longitudinal fibres; but in the organs composed of one coat it is found along with the other two kinds. Now, these are of the greatest help to the action of the faculty which we have named retentive. For during this period the part needs to be tightly contracted and stretched over its contents at every point—the

¹ The urinary bladders of pigs (such as Galen dissected) are thin, and appear to have only one coat.
μὲν γαστὴρ ἐν τῷ τῆς πέψεως, οἵ μὴτραί δ’ ἐν 
τῷ τῆς κυήσεως χρόνῳ παντὶ.

Ταῦτ’ ἀρα καὶ ὁ τῆς φλεβὸς χυτῶν εἰς ὧν ἐκ
πολυνειδῶν ἵνων ἐγένετο καὶ τῶν τῆς ἄρτηριας ὁ
μὲν ἐξωθεὶ ἐκ τῶν στρογγυλῶν, ὁ δ’ ἐσωθεὶ ἐκ
μὲν τῶν εὐθειῶν πλείστων, ὄλγων δὲ τινῶν σὺν
αὐταῖς καὶ τῶν λοξῶν, ὥστε τὰς μὲν φλέβας ταῖς
μητραῖς καὶ ταῖς κύστεσιν ἐσοκέναι κατὰ γε τῆν
τῶν ἵνων σύνθεσιν, εἰ καὶ τῷ πάχει λειτουρται,
tὰς δ’ ἄρτηρια τῇ γαστρί. μόνα δὲ πάντων ὄρ-
γάνων ἐκ δυνόν ὑ’ ἁμα καὶ ἀμφιτέρων ἡγκαρσίας
ἐχοντων τὰς ἴνας ἐγένετο τὰ ἐντερα. τὸ δ’ ὅτι
182βέλτιον ἢν || τῶν τ’ ἀλλων ἐκάστῳ τοιούτῳ τὴν
φύσιν ὑπάρχειν, οἴστερ πατנכוןντ᾽ ἐστιν, τοῖς τ’
ἐντέροις ἐκ δυνόν ὡμοίων χυτῶν συγκείσθαι, τῆς
περὶ χρείας μορίων πραγματείας ἐστίν. οὕκουν
νῦν χρῆ ποθεῖν ἀκούειν περὶ τῶν τοιούτων, ὡσπερ
οὐδὲ διὰ τί περὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν χυτῶν
ἐκαστῷ τῶν ὄργανων διαπεφώνηται τοῖς ἀνατο-
μικοῖς ἀνδράσιν. ὑπὲρ μὲν γὰρ τούτων αὐτάρκως
ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς ἀνατομικῆς διαφωνίας εἰρήται
περὶ δὲ τοῦ διότι τοιούτων ἐκαστῶν ἐγένετο τῶν
ὄργανων, ἐν τοῖς περὶ χρείας μορίων εἰρήσεται.

XII

Now δ’ οὐδέτερον τούτων πρόκειται λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τὰς φυσικὰς δυνάμεις μόνας ἀποδεικνύειν ἐν ἐκαστῷ τῶν ὄργανων τέτταρας ὑπαρχούσας. ἐπὶ 
tούτ’ οὖν πάλιν ἐπανελθόντες ἀναμνήσωμέν τε

1 cf. p. 243
2 My suggestion is that Galen refers to (1) the mucous
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stomach during the whole period of digestion,¹ and the uterus during that of gestation.

Thus too, the coat of a vein, being single, consists of various kinds of fibres; whilst the outer coat of an artery consists of circular fibres, and its inner coat mostly of longitudinal fibres, but with a few oblique ones also amongst them. Veins thus resemble the uterus or the bladder as regards the arrangement of their fibres, even though they are deficient in thickness; similarly arteries resemble the stomach. Alone of all organs the intestines consist of two coats of which both have their fibres transverse.² Now the proof that it was for the best that all the organs should be naturally such as they are (that, for instance, the intestines should be composed of two coats) belongs to the subject of the use of parts³; thus we must not now desire to hear about matters of this kind nor why the anatomists are at variance regarding the number of coats in each organ. For these questions have been sufficiently discussed in the treatise “On Disagreement in Anatomy.” And the problem as to why each organ has such and such a character will be discussed in the treatise “On the Use of Parts.”

XII

It is not, however, our business to discuss either of these questions here, but to consider duly the natural faculties, which, to the number of four, exist in each organ. Returning then, to this point, let us coat, with its valvulae conniventes, and (2) the muscular coat, of which the chief layer is made up of circular fibres. cf. p. 262, note 1. ² Or utility.
τῶν ἐμπροσθεν εἰρημένων ἐπιθῶμεν τε κεφαλῆς ἢδη τῷ λόγῳ παντὶ τὸ λέιπον ἑτὶ προσθέντες. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἐν τῷ ἔως μορίων ἔλκειν εἰς ἐαυτὸ τῶν οἰκείων χυμῶν ἀποδέδεικται καὶ πρὸς τη σχέδου αὐτή τῶν φυσικῶν ἐστὶ δυνάμεων.

183 ἐφεξῆς ἢ ἐκεῖνο γνωστέου, ὡς οὐ πρὸ τερον ἀποτρίβεται τῇ ἐλχθείσαι <τροφῆν> ὦτοι σύμπταιν ἡ καὶ τι περίττομα αὐτῆς, πρὶν ἂν εἰς ἐναντία μεταπέσῃ διάθεσιν ἡ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄργανον ἡ καὶ τῶν περιεχόμενων ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πλείστα. ἡ μὲν οὖν γαστήρ, ἐπειδὰν μὲν ἱκανῶς ἐμπλησθή τῶν συτίων καὶ τὸ χρηστότατον αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς ἐαυτῆς χυτῶν ἐναπόθηται βδάλλουσα, τηνικαύτη ἢ θη τὸ λυπὸν ἀποτρίβεται καθάπερ ἄχθος ἀλλότριων· αἱ κύστεις δ’, ἐπειδὰν ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἐλχθέντων ἡ τῷ πλήθει διατείνου ἡ τῇ ποιότητι δάκνου ἀναρὸν γένηται.

Τῷ δ’ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ καὶ αἱ μὴ τραυ ἱτοι γάρ, ἐπειδὰν μηκέτι φέρωσι διατεινόμεναι, τὸ λυποῦν ἀποθέσθαι σπεύδοντι ἡ τῇ ποιότητι δακνόμεναι τῶν ἐκχυθέντων εἰς αὐτὰς ύγρῶν. ἐκάτερον δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων γίγνεται μὲν καὶ βιαῖως ἐστίν ὠτε καὶ ἀμβλώκουσι τηνικαύτα, γίγνεται δ’ ὡς τὰ πολλὰ καὶ προσηκόντως, ὀπερ οὐκ ἀμβλώσκειν ἀλλ’ ἀποκυύσκειν τε καὶ τίκτειν ὄνομάζεται. τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἀμβλωθρείδιοις φαρμάκοις ἢ τισιν ἄλλοις

184 παθήμασι διαφθείροντι τὸ ἐμβρυον ἢ τινας τῶν ὑμένων αὐτοῦ βιγγύουσιν αἰ ἀμβλώσεις ἐπονται, οὕτω δὲ κατείδαν ἀναθόωσι ποθ’ αἱ μὴ τραυ κακῶς ἔχουσαι τῇ διατάσει, ταῖς δὲ τῶν ἐμβρυών αὐτῶν κινήσει ταις σφοδροτάταις οἱ τόκοι, καθάπερ καὶ τοῦθ’ Ἐποκράτει καλῶς εἰρηνεί. κοινὸν δ’
recall what has already been said, and set a crown to the whole subject by adding what is still wanting. For when every part of the animal has been shewn to draw into itself the juice which is proper to it (this being practically the first of the natural faculties), the next point to realise is that the part does not get rid either of this attracted nutriment as a whole, or even of any superfluous portion of it, until either the organ itself, or the major part of its contents also have their condition reversed. Thus, when the stomach is sufficiently filled with the food and has absorbed and stored away the most useful part of it in its own coats, it then rejects the rest like an alien burden. The same happens to the bladders, when the matter attracted into them begins to give trouble either because it distends them through its quantity or irritates them by its quality.

And this also happens in the case of the uterus; for it is either because it can no longer bear to be stretched that it strives to relieve itself of its annoyance, or else because it is irritated by the quality of the fluids poured out into it. Now both of these conditions sometimes occur with actual violence, and then miscarriage takes place. But for the most part they happen in a normal way, this being then called not miscarriage but delivery or parturition. Now abortifacient drugs or certain other conditions which destroy the embryo or rupture certain of its membranes are followed by abortion, and similarly also when the uterus is in pain from being in a bad state of tension; and, as has been well said by Hippocrates, excessive movement on the part of the embryo itself brings on labour. Now
ἀπασῶν τῶν διαθέσεων ἡ ἀνία καὶ ταύτης αὐτῶν τριττὸν ἡ ὁγκος περιττός ἢ τι βάρος ἡ δῆξις: ὁγκος μὲν, ἐπειδὰν μηκέτι φέρωσι διατεινόμεναι, βάρος δ’, ἐπειδὰν ὑπὲρ τὴν βόμην αὐτῶν ἢ τὸ περιεχόμενον, δῆξις δ’, ἐπειδὰν ἦτοι τὰ πρότερον ἐν τοῖς ὑμέσιν ὑγρα στεγόμενα ῥαγέντων αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτὰς ἐκχυθῆ τὰς μῆτρας ἢ καὶ σύμπαν ἀποφθαρέν τὸ κύμα σηπόμενον τε καὶ διαλυόμενον εἰς μοχθηροὺς ἵχωρας οὕτως ἐρεθίζῃ τε καὶ δάκνη τὸν χυτῶν τῶν ὠστερῶν.

'Ανάλογον οὖν ἐν ἀπασί τοῖς ὀργάνοις ἐκαστὰ τῶν τ’ ἔργων αὐτῶν τῶν φυσικῶν καὶ μέντοι τῶν παθημάτων τε καὶ νοσημάτων φαίνεται γνηγόμενα, τὰ μὲν ἑναργῶς καὶ σαφῶς οὕτως, ὡς ἀποδείξεως δείσθαι μηδέν, τὰ δ’ ἢττον μὲν ἑναρ-γώς, οὐ μὴν ἄγνωστα γε παντάπασι τοῖς ἐθέλουσι προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν.

'Επὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς γαστρῆς αἱ τῇ δῆξεις ἑναργεῖς, διότι πλεῖστης αἰσθήσεως μετέχει, τά τ’ ἄλλα παθήματα τά τε ναυτίαι ἐμποιοῦντα καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι καρδιωγμοὶ σαφῶς ενδεικνυνται τὴν ἀποκριτικὴν τε καὶ ἀπωστικὴν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων δύναμιν, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῶν ὠστερῶν τε καὶ τῆς κύστεως τῆς τὸ οὕρον ὑποδεχομένης· ἑναργῶς γὰρ οὖν καὶ αὐτῇ φαίνεται μέχρι τοσοῦτον τὸ ὑγρὸν ὑποδεχομένη τε καὶ ἀθροίζουσα, ἄχρι ἂν ἤτοι πρὸς τὸν πλήθους αὐτοῦ διατεινομένη μηκέτι φέρῃ τὴν ἀνίαν ἢ πρὸς τῆς ποιότητος δακνομένης χρονίζου γὰρ ἐκαστὸν τῶν περιττωμάτων ἐν τῷ σῶματι σήμεται δηλοῦτο, τὸ μὲν ἐλάττων, τὸ δὲ πλείον χρόνως, καὶ οὕτω δακνώδες τε καὶ δριμὺ καὶ ἀνιαρὸν τοῖς περιέχονσι γίγνεται· οὐ μὴν 286
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Pain is common to all these conditions, and of this there are three possible causes—either excessive bulk, or weight, or irritation; bulk when the uterus can no longer support the stretching, weight when the contents surpass its strength, and irritation when the fluids which had previously been pent up in the membranes, flow out, on the rupture of these, into the uterus itself, or else when the whole foetus perishes, putrefies, and is resolved into pernicious ichors, and so irritates and bites the coat of the uterus.

In all organs, then, both their natural effects and their disorders and maladies plainly take place on analogous lines,¹ some so clearly and manifestly as to need no demonstration, and others less plainly, although not entirely unrecognizable to those who are willing to pay attention.

Thus, to take the case of the stomach: the irritation is evident here because this organ possesses most sensibility, and among its other affections those producing nausea and the so-called heartburn clearly demonstrate the eliminative faculty which expels foreign matter. So also in the case of the uterus and the urinary bladder; this latter also may be plainly observed to receive and accumulate fluid until it is so stretched by the amount of this as to be incapable of enduring the pain; or it may be the quality of the urine which irritates it; for every superfluous substance which lingers in the body must obviously putrefy, some in a shorter, and some in a longer time, and thus it becomes pungent, acrid, and burdensome to the organ which contains it. This

¹ Relationship between physiology and pathology again emphasized. cf. p. 188, note 2.
ἐπὶ γε τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ ἢπατι κύστεως ὁμοίως ἔχει· ὃ δῆλον, ὅτι νεύρων ἢκιστα μετέχει. χρὴ δὲ κάνταυθα τὸν γε φυσικὸν ἀνδρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον ἔξευρίσκειν. εἰ γὰρ ἐλκείν τε τῶν οἰκείων ἀπεδείχθη χυμόν, ὃς φαίνεσθαι πολλάκις μεστὴν, ἀποκρίθηνειν τε τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων οὐκ εἰς μακράν, ἀναγκαῖον ἐστιν αὐτὴν ἢ διὰ τὸ πλήθος βαρυνομένην ἢ τῆς ποιότητος μεταβαλλούσης ἐπὶ τὸ διακώδες τε καὶ δριμὺ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως ἐφιέσθαι. οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὰ μὲν σιτία τῆς ἄρχαίαν ὑπαλλάττει ποιότητα ταχέως οὕτως, ὡστε ἐπειδὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῖς λεπτοῖς ἐντέροις, εὐθὺς εἶναι κόπρον, ἡ χολὴ δὲ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ οὐρον, ἐπειδὰν ἀπαξ ἐκπέσῃ τῶν φλεβῶν, ἐξαλλάττει τὴν ποιότητα, τάχιστα μεταβάλλοντα καὶ σηπόμενα. καὶ μὴν εἴπερ ἐπὶ τε τῶν κατὰ τὰς ὑστέρας καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ τὰ ἑντέρα καὶ προσέτι τῆν τὸ οὐρον ύποδεχομένην κύστιν ἐναργώς φαινεῖται διάτασις τῆς ἢ δὴ ἔξις ἢ ἄχθος ἐπηγείρον ἐκαστον τῶν ὀργάνων εἰς ἀπόκρισιν, οὐδὲν χαλεπὸν καὶ τῆς χοληδόχου κύστεως ταυτὸ τοῦτ᾽ ἐννοεῖν ἐπὶ τε τῶν ἅλλων ἀπάντων ὀργάνων, ἐξ ὧν δηλονοτι καὶ αἱ ἀρτηρίαι καὶ αἱ φλέβες εἰσίν.

XIII

Οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὸ διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πόρου τὴν θ’ ὀλκὴν γίγνεσθαι καὶ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἐν διαφέρουσαι χρόνοις οὐδὲν ἐτὶ χαλεπὸν ἔξευρεῖν, εἰ γε καὶ τῆς γαστρὸς ὁ στόμαχος οὐ μόνον ἐδέσματα
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does not apply, however, in the case of the bladder alongside the liver, whence it is clear that it possesses fewer nerves than do the other organs. Here too, however, at least the physiologist ¹ must discover an analogy. For since it was shown that the gall-bladder attracts its own special juice, so as to be often found full, and that it discharges it soon after, this desire to discharge must be either due to the fact that it is burdened by the quantity or that the bile has changed in quality to pungent and acrid. For while food does not change its original quality so fast that it is already ordure as soon as it falls into the small intestine, on the other hand the bile even more readily than the urine becomes altered in quality as soon as ever it leaves the veins, and rapidly undergoes change and putrefaction. Now, if there be clear evidence in relation to the uterus, stomach, and intestines, as well as to the urinary bladder, that there is either some distention, irritation, or burden inciting each of these organs to elimination, there is no difficulty in imagining this in the case of the gall-bladder also, as well as in the other organs,—to which obviously the arteries and veins also belong.

XIII

Nor is there any further difficulty in ascertaining that it is through the same channel that both attraction and discharge take place at different times. For obviously the inlet to the stomach does not merely

¹ Or physicist—the investigator of the Physis or Nature. cf. p. 196, note 2. Note here the use of analogical reasoning. cf. p. 113, note 2.
Galen's idea is that if reversal of the direction of flow
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conduct food and drink into this organ, but in the condition of nausea it performs the opposite service. Further, the neck of the bladder which is beside the liver, albeit single, both fills and empties the bladder. Similarly the canal of the uterus affords an entrance to the semen and an exit to the foetus.

But in this latter case, again, whilst the eliminative faculty is evident, the attractive faculty is not so obvious to most people. It is, however, the cervix which Hippocrates blames for inertia of the uterus when he says:—"Its orifice has no power of attracting semen."¹

Erasistratus, however, and Asclepiades reached such heights of wisdom that they deprived not merely the stomach and the womb of this faculty but also the bladder by the liver, and the kidneys as well. I have, however, pointed out in the first book that it is impossible to assign any other cause for the secretion of urine or bile.²

Now, when we find that the uterus, the stomach and the bladder by the liver carry out attraction and expulsion through one and the same duct, we need no longer feel surprised that Nature should also frequently discharge waste-substances into the stomach through the veins. Still less need we be astonished if a certain amount of the food should, during long fasts, be drawn back from the liver into the stomach through the same veins³ by which it was yielded up to the liver during absorption of nutriment.⁴ To disbelieve such things can occur in the primae viae (in vomiting), it may also be expected to occur in the secundae viae or absorptive channels.⁴ For this "delivery," "up-yield," or anadosis, v. p. 13. note 5.
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όμοιον ἐστι δηποῦ τῷ μηκέτι πιστεύειν μηδ’ ὅτι τὰ καθαίροντα φάρμακα διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν στομάτων ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος εἰς τὴν γαστέρα τοὺς οἰκείους ἐπισπάται χυμοῦς, δι’ ὅν ἐμπροσθεὶς ἡ ἀνάδοσις ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ἔτερα μὲν ξητεῖν ἀναδόσεως, ἔτερα δὲ καθάρσεως στόματα. καὶ μὴν εἶπερ ἐν καὶ ταῦτῳ στόμα διτταῖς ὑπηρετεῖ δυνάμειν, ἐν διαφόροις χρόνοις εἰς τὰναντία τὴν ὁλίγην ποιομέναιν, ἐμπροσθεῖν μὲν τῇ κατὰ τὸ ἡπαρ, ἐν δὲ τῷ τῆς καθάρσεως καρφῷ τῇ τοῦ φαρμάκου, τὸ θαμαστὸν ἐστὶ διττὴν ὑπηρεσίαιν τε καὶ χρείαιν εἶναι ταῖς φλεψὶ ταις ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τεταγμέναις ἡπατός τε καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν, ὡς’, ὡστε μὲν ἐν τούτοις ἄφθονος εἰγὴ περιεχομένῃ τροφῇ, διὰ τῶν εἰρήνων εἰς ἡπαρ ἀναφέρεσθαι φλεβῶν, ὡστε δ’ εἰγὴ κενὰ καὶ δεόμενα τρέφεσθαι, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν αὕθις ἐξ ἡπατός ἐλκεσθαι;

Πᾶν γὰρ ἐκ παντὸς ἐλκειν φαίνεται καὶ παντὶ μεταδίδοναι καὶ μία τις εἶναι σύρροια καὶ σύμπνοια πάντων, καθαύπτε καὶ τοῦθ’ ὁ θειότατος Ἰπποκράτης εἶπεν. ἐλκεὶ μὲν οὖν τὸ ἱσχυρότερον, ἐκκενοῦται δὲ τὸ ἀσθενέστερον.

'Ἰσχυρότερον δὲ καὶ ἀσθενέστερον ἔτερον ἐτέρου μόριον ἢ ἀπλῶς καὶ φύσει καὶ κοινῆ πᾶσιν ἐστὶν ἡ ἱδίως τὸδε τινὶ γίγνεται. φύσει μὲν καὶ κοινῆ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώπωις θ’ ἀμα καὶ ζῴοις ἢ μὲν καρδία τοῦ ἡπατος, τὸ δ’ ἡπαρ τῶν ἐντέρων τε καὶ τῆς γαστρός, αἱ δ’ ἀρτηρίαι τῶν φλεβῶν ἐλκύσαι τε τὸ χρήσιμον ἕαυταῖς ἀποκρίνατε τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον

---

1 The mesenteric veins.
would of course be like refusing to believe that purgative drugs draw their appropriate humours from all over the body by the same stomata through which absorption previously takes place, and to look for separate stomata for absorption and purgation respectively. As a matter of fact one and the same stoma subserves two distinct faculties, and these exercise their pull at different times in opposite directions—first it subserves the pull of the liver and, during catharsis, that of the drug. What is there surprising, then, in the fact that the veins situated between the liver and the region of the stomach fulfil a double service or purpose? Thus, when there is abundance of nutriment contained in the food-canal, it is carried up to the liver by the veins mentioned; and when the canal is empty and in need of nutriment, this is again attracted from the liver by the same veins.

For everything appears to attract from and to go shares with everything else, and, as the most divine Hippocrates has said, there would seem to be a consensus in the movements of fluids and vapours. Thus the stronger draws and the weaker is evacuated.

Now, one part is weaker or stronger than another either absolutely, by nature, and in all cases, or else it becomes so in such and such a particular instance. Thus, by nature and in all men alike, the heart is stronger than the liver at attracting what is serviceable to it and rejecting what is not so; similarly the liver is stronger than the intestines and stomach, and

---

2 Linacre renders: "Una omnium confluxio ac conspiratio"; and he adds the marginal note "Totum corpus nostrum est conspirabile et confluxile per meatus communes." cf. p. 48.
ισχυρότεραι. καθ’ ἕκαστον δ’ ἴμων ἰδίως ἐν μὲν τῷ καυρῷ καὶ ἡ ἑπαρ ἵσχυρότερον ἀλκείν, ἡ γαστήρ δ’ ἐν τῷ. πολλῆς μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ περιεχομένης τροφῆς καὶ σφοδρῶς ὅρεγομένου τε καὶ χρώσωντος τοῦ ἡπατος, πάντως ἵσχυρότερον ἑλκεῖ τὸ σπλάγχανον ἐμπαλιν δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἡπατος 190 ἐμπεπλησμένου τε καὶ διὰ τεταμένου, τῆς γαστρός δ’ ὅρεγομένης καὶ κενῆς ὑπαρχοῦσης ἡ τῆς ὀλκῆς ἵσχυς εἰς ἐκείνην μεθίσταται.

'Ως γὰρ, εἰ καν ταῖς χερσί τινα συτία κατ-έχοντες ἀλλήλων ἀρπάζοιμεν, εἰ μὲν ὅμοια εἰςμὲν δεόμενοι, περιγγυνεσθαι τοῦ ἵσχυρότερον εἰκός, εἰ δ’ οὕτως μὲν ἐμπεπλησμένος εἰς καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἀμελῶς κατέχουν τὰ περττὰ ἡ καὶ τινὶ μετα-δούναι πολὺν, δ’ ἀσθενέστερος ὅρεγον ἀμενῶς, οὐδὲν ἀν εἰς κόλυμα τοῦ μὴ πάντα λαβεῖν αὐτόν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ γαστήρ ἑκ τοῦ ἡπατος ἐπιστατεῖ δραίως, όταν αὐτῇ μὲν ἰκανὸς ὅρεγηται τροφῆς, ἐμπεπλησμένον δ’ ἡ τὸ σπλάγχανον. καὶ τοῦ γε μὴ πεινὴν ἐνίοτε τὸ ζώον ἡ περιουσία τῆς ἐν ἡπατε τροφῆς αὐτία: κρείττονα γὰρ ἐχουσα καὶ ἑτοιμότεραν ἡ γαστήρ τροφῆν οὐδὲν δεῖται τῆς ἔξωθεν· εἰ δὲ γε ποτὲ δέουσι μὲν, ἀποροίτε ὃ, πληροῦται περιπτωμάτων. ἵχωρες δὲ τινὲς εἰσὶ ταῦτα χολώδεις τε καὶ φλεματώδεις καὶ ὀρρώδεις, οὐς μονοὺς ἐλκούσῃ μεθίσησιν αὐτῇ τὸ ἡπαρ, ὅταν ποτὲ καὶ αὐτῇ δέηται τροφῆς.

"Οσπερ ὦν ἐξ ἀλλήλων ἐλκεῖ τὰ μόρια || 191 τροφῆν, οὕτω καὶ ἀποτίθεται ποτ’ εἰς ἀλληλα 294
the arteries than the veins. In each of us personally, however, the liver has stronger drawing power at one time, and the stomach at another. For when there is much nutriment contained in the alimentary canal and the appetite and craving of the liver is violent, then the viscus \(^1\) exerts far the strongest traction. Again, when the liver is full and distended and the stomach empty and in need, then the force of the traction shifts to the latter.

Suppose we had some food in our hands and were snatching it from one another; if we were equally in want, the stronger would be likely to prevail, but if he had satisfied his appetite, and was holding what was over carelessly, or was anxious to share it with somebody, and if the weaker was excessively desirous of it, there would be nothing to prevent the latter from getting it all. In a similar manner the stomach easily attracts nutriment from the liver when it [the stomach] has a sufficiently strong craving for it, and the appetite of the viscus is satisfied. And sometimes the surplusage of nutriment in the liver is a reason why the animal is not hungry; for when the stomach has better and more available food it requires nothing from extraneous sources, but if ever it is in need and is at a loss how to supply the need, it becomes filled with waste-matters; these are certain biliary, phlegmatic [mucous] and serous fluids, and are the only substances that the liver yields in response to the traction of the stomach, on the occasions when the latter too is in want of nutriment.

Now, just as the parts draw food from each other, so also they sometimes deposit their excess substances

\(^1\) The alimentary canal, as not being edible, is not considered a splanchnon or viscus.
τὸ περιττὸν καὶ ὀσπερ ἐλκάντων ἐπλεονέκτει τὸ ἴσχυρότερον, οὕτω καὶ ἀποτιθεμένων καὶ τῶν γε καλουμένων ρευμάτων ἢδε ἡ πρόφασις, ἐκαστὸν γὰρ τῶν μορίων ἔχει τινὰ τόνον σύμφυτον, ὃ διωθεῖται τὸ περιττὸν. ὅταν οὖν ἐν εἷς αὐτῶν ἀρρωστότερον γενήσται κατὰ δὴ τινὰ διάθεσιν, ἐξ ἀπάντων εἰς ἐκείνον συρρεῖν ἀνάγκη τὰ περιττώματα. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἴσχυρότατον ἐναποτίθεται τοῖς πλησίον ἁπασιν, ἐκείνων δὲ αὐτὰ πάλιν ἐκαστὸν εἰς ἐτέρ’ ἀττα τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων, εἰτ’ αὖθις ἐκείνων ἐκαστὸν εἰς ἄλλα καὶ τοῦτ’ ἐπὶ πλείστον γίγνεται, μέχρι περ ἄν εἰς ἀπάντων ἐλαυνόμενον τὸ περίπτωμα καθ’ ἐν τὶ μείνῃ τῶν ἀσθενεστάτων ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ οὐκέτ’ εἰς ἄλλο δύναται μεταρρέειν, ὡς ἀν μῆτε δεχομένου τινὸς αὐτὸ τῶν ἴσχυρότερων μῆτ’ ἀπώσασθαι δυναμένου τοῦ πεπονθότος.

Ἄλλα περὶ μὲν τῶν παθῶν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ τῆς ἱάσεως αὖθις ἡμῶν ἐπιδεικνύντων ἰκανά καὶ ἐκείνων ἔσται λαβεῖν μαρτύρια τῶν ἐν τῷ δὲ τὸ 192 λόγῳ παντὶ ἢ δεδειγμένων ὁρθῶς. δ’ ἐν τῷ παρόντι δεῖξαι προύκειτο, πάλιν ἀναλάβωμεν, ὡς οὔτεθεν θαυμαστὸν εἰς ἡπατος ἣκειν τινὰ τροφὴν ἐντέροις τε καὶ γαστρὶ διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν φλεβῶν, δι’ ἄν ἐμπροσθεν εἰς ἐκείνων εἰς ἡπαρ ἀνεδίδοτο καὶ πολλοὶς ἄθροις τε καὶ τελέως ἀποστάσιν ἰσχυρῶν γυμνασίων ἢ τι κῶλον ἀποκοπείσων αὑματος διὰ τῶν ἐντέρων γίγνεται κένωσις ἐκ τινῶν περιόδων, ὡς ποῖ καὶ Ἰπποκράτης ἐλεγεν, οὐδὲν μὲν ἄλλο λυποῦσα, καθαίρουσα δ’ ὄξεως τὸ πάν σῶμα καὶ τὰς πλησιμοποιοῦσι ἔκκενοῦσα, διὰ τῶν
in each other, and just as the stronger prevailed when the two were exercising traction, so it is also when they are depositing; this is the cause of the so-called fluxions,¹ for every part has a definite inborn tension, by virtue of which it expels its superfluities, and, therefore, when one of these parts,—owing, of course, to some special condition—becomes weaker, there will necessarily be a confluence into it of the superfluities from all the other parts. The strongest part deposits its surplus matter in all the parts near it; these again in other parts which are weaker; these next into yet others; and this goes on for a long time, until the superfluit, being driven from one part into another, comes to rest in one of the weakest of all; it cannot flow from this into another part, because none of the stronger ones will receive it, while the affected part is unable to drive it away.

When, however, we come to deal again with the origin and cure of disease, it will be possible to find there also abundant proofs of all that we have correctly indicated in this book. For the present, however, let us resume again the task that lay before us, i.e. to show that there is nothing surprising in nutriment coming from the liver to the intestines and stomach by way of the very veins through which it had previously been yielded up from these organs into the liver. And in many people who have suddenly and completely given up active exercise, or who have had a limb cut off, there occurs at certain periods an evacuation of blood by way of the intestines—as Hippocrates has also pointed out somewhere. This causes no further trouble but sharply purges the whole body and evacuates the plethora;

¹ Lit. *rheuma*; hence our term *rheumatism*.
αὐτῶν δὴ που φλεβῶν τῆς φορᾶς τῶν περιττῶν ἐπι-
tελουμένης, δι’ ὧν ἐμπροσθεν ἡ ἀνάδοσις ἐγήγετο.
Πολλάκις δ’ ἐν νόσοις ἡ φύσις διὰ μὲν τῶν
αὐτῶν δήπον φλεβῶν τὸ πᾶν ἐκκαθαίρει ζῷου, οὐ
μὴν αἴματώδης ὡς ἡ κένωσις αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ
tὸν λυτοῦντα γίγνεται χυμόν. οὖτω δὲ κἂν ταῖς
χολέραις ἐκκενοῦται τὸ πᾶν σῶμα διὰ τῶν εἰς
ἐντερά τε καὶ γαστέρα καθηκουσῶν φλεβῶν.
Τὸ δ’ οἴεσθαι μίαν εἶναι ταῖς ὀλίσθεν 
193 τελέως ἀγνοοῦντος ἐστὶ τὰς φυσικὰς ἃ δυνάμεις
τὰς τ’ ἀλλὰς καὶ τὴν ἐκκριτικὴν ἐναντίαν οὐσιὶν
τῇ ἐλκτικῇ ταῖς γὰρ ἐναντίαις δυνάμεσιν ἐναντίας
κινήσεις τε καὶ φοράς τῶν ὄλων ἀναγκαῖον
ἀκολουθεῖν. ἐκαστὸν γὰρ τῶν μορίων, ὅταν
ἐλκύσῃ τὸν οἰκεῖον χυμόν, ἐπειτα κατάσχη καὶ
ἀπολαῦσῃ, τὸ περιττὸν ἀπαν ἀποθέσθαι σπεῦδει,
καθότε μᾶλιστα δύναται τάχιστα θ’ ἁμα καὶ
κάλλιστα, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ περιττοῦ ῥοπὴν.
"Ὅθεν ἡ γαστήρ τὰ μὲν ἐπιπολάζοντα τῶν
περιττώμάτων ἐμέτοιχος ἐκκαθαίρει, τὰ δ’ υφιστά-
μενα διαρροίας. καὶ τὸ γε ναυτιῶδες γίγνεσθαι
tὸ ζῷον τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ὀρμήσαι τὴν γαστέρα κενω-
θήναι δι’ ἐμέτον. οὖτω δὲ δὴ τι βίαιον καὶ
σφοδρὸν ἡ ἐκκριτικὴ δύναμις ἔχει, ὡστ’ ἐν τοῖς
eἰλεοὶς, ὅταν ἀποκλεισθῇ τελέως ἡ κάτω διέξοδος,
ἐμεῖται κόρπος. καὶ τοι πρὶν διελθεῖν τὸ τε λεπ-
tῶν ἐντερον ἀπαν καὶ τὴν νῆστιν καὶ τὸν πυλώρον
καὶ τὴν γαστέρα καὶ τὸν οἰσοφάγον οὐχ οἶον τε
dιὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐκπεσεῖν οὐδεὶ τοιούτω περιτ-
tώματι. τί δὴ θαυμαστόν, εἰ κἂν τῆς ἐσχάτης

1 Here Galen apparently indicates that vital functions are

298
the passage of the superfluities is effected, of course, through the same veins by which absorption took place.

Frequently also in disease Nature purges the animal through these same veins—although in this case the discharge is not sanguineous, but corresponds to the humour which is at fault. Thus in *cholera* the entire body is evacuated by way of the veins leading to the intestines and stomach.

To imagine that matter of different kinds is carried in one direction only would characterise a man who was entirely ignorant of all the natural faculties, and particularly of the eliminative faculty, which is the opposite of the attractive. For opposite movements of matter, active and passive, must necessarily follow opposite faculties; that is to say, every part, after it has attracted its special nutrient juice and has retained and taken the benefit of it hastens to get rid of all the surplusage as quickly and effectively as possible, and this it does in accordance with the mechanical tendency of this surplus matter.¹

Hence the stomach clears away by vomiting those superfluities which come to the surface of its contents,² whilst the sediment it clears away by diarrhœa. And when the animal becomes sick, this means that the stomach is striving to be evacuated by vomiting. And the expulsive faculty has in it so violent and forcible an element that in cases of *ileus* [volvulus], when the lower exit is completely closed, vomiting of faeces occurs; yet such surplus matter could not be emitted from the mouth without having first traversed the whole of the small intestine, the jejunum, the pylorus, the stomach, and the oesophagus. What is there to wonder at, then, if something at least partly explicable in terms of mechanical law. cf. Introduction, p. xxviii. ² cf. pp. 211, 247.


194 τε καὶ τῆς γαστρός ἀφικνοῦτο τι || μεταλαμβανόμενον, ὡς καὶ τοῦθ᾽ Ἡπποκράτις ἦμαις ἔδίδαξεν, οὐ πνεῦμα μόνον ἡ περίττωμα φάσκων ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τροφὴν αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἐπιφανείας ἀνθίζει ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν, ἢθεν ἀνηνέχθη, καταφέρεσθαι. ἐλάχισται γὰρ ὡσπολ κινήσεων τὴν ἐκκριτικὴν ταῦτην οἰκίζουσι δύναμιν, ὡς ἂν διὰ τῶν ἐγκαρσίων μὲν ἰνῶν γεγυμένην, ὥκυτατα δὲ διαδιδομένην ἀπὸ τῆς κινησάσθη ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ τὰ καταντικρύ πέρατα. οὕκουν ἀπεικός οὐδ᾽ ἀδύνατον ἄθελε ποτὲ ψύξει τὸ πρὸς τῷ δέρματι μόριον ἐξαίφνης πιληθὲν ἃμα μὲν ἄρρωστότερον αὐτὸ γενόμενον, ἃμα δ᾽ οἶνον ἄχθος τι μᾶλλον ἢ παρασκευήν θρέψεως ἔχου τὴν ἐμπροσθεν ἀλτύπως αὐτῷ παρεσπαρμένην ύγρότητα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπωθεῖσθαι σπεύδον, ἃμα δὲ τῆς ἐξω φορᾶς ἀποκεκλεισμένης τῇ πυκνώσει, πρὸς τὴν λοιπὴν ἐπιστραφῆναι καὶ οὕτω βιασαμένου εἰς τὸ παρακείμενον αὐτῶ μόριον ἀθρόως ἀπώσασθαι τὸ περίττον, ἐκεῖνο δ᾽ αὐτὸ πάλιν εἰς τὸ μετ᾽ αὐτὸ, || 195 καὶ τοῦτο μὴ παύσασθαι γεγυμένου, ἀχρὶ ἂν ἡ μετάληψις ἐπὶ τὰ ἐντὸς πέρατα τῶν φλεβῶν τελευτήσῃ.

Ἀϊ μὲν δὴ τοιαύτης κινήσεις θαττῶν ἀποπαύονται, αἱ δ᾽ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδοθεν διερεθίζοντων, ὡς ἐν τῷ τοῖς καθαίρουσι φαρμάκοις καὶ ταῖς χολέραις ἵσχυροτεραί τε πολὺ καὶ μονιμώτεραι γίγνονται καὶ διαμένονσιν, ἐστ᾽ ἂν καὶ ἡ περὶ τοὺς στόματα τῶν ἀγγείων διάθεσις, ἢ τὸ πλησίον

1 See p. 298, note 1.
should also be transferred from the extreme skin-surface and so reach the intestines and stomach? This also was pointed out to us by Hippocrates, who maintained that not merely pneuma or excess-matter, but actual nutriment is brought down from the outer surface to the original place from which it was taken up. For the slightest mechanical movements determine this expulsive faculty, which apparently acts through the transverse fibres, and which is very rapidly transmitted from the source of motion to the opposite extremities. It is, therefore, neither unlikely nor impossible that, when the part adjoining the skin becomes suddenly oppressed by an unwonted cold, it should at once be weakened and should find that the liquid previously deposited beside it without discomfort had now become more of a burden than a source of nutrition, and should therefore strive to put it away. Finally, seeing that the passage outwards was shut off by the condensation of tissue, it would turn to the remaining exit and would thus forcibly expel all the waste-matter at once into the adjacent part; this would do the same to the part following it; and the process would not cease until the transference finally terminated at the inner ends of the veins.

Now, movements like these come to an end fairly soon, but those resulting from internal irritants (e.g., in the administration of purgative drugs or in cholera) become much stronger and more lasting; they persist as long as the condition of things about the mouths of the veins continues, that is, so long as

2 The ends of the veins in the alimentary canal from which absorption or anadosis had originally taken place.

3 Diathesis.
ΓΑΛΕΝ

'Ελκουσα, παραμένη, αὕτη μὲν γὰρ τὸ συνεχὲς ἐκκενοὶ μόριον, ἐκεῖνο δ' αὐτῷ τὸ μετ' αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦτ' ὦ παρέσται μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ἐπιφανείας, ὡστε διαδιδόντων τῶν ἐφεξῆς αἰεὶ μορίων ἐτέρων ἐτέρους τὸ πρῶτον πάθος ὡκύτατα δικαίωτα ἡμερίδευται μέχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων. οὕτως οὖν ἔχει κάπι τῶν εἰλεδών. αὐτῷ μὲν γὰρ τὸ φλεγμαίνου ἐντεροῦν οὔτε τοῦ βάρους οὔτε τῆς δρωμύτητος ἀνέχεται τῶν περιττομάτων καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἐκκρίνειν αὐτὰ σπεύδει καὶ ἀπώθεισθαι πορρωτάτω. κωλυόμενον δὲ κατο ποιεῖται τὴν δύσως, όταν ἐνταυθοὶ ποτε τῷ σφοδρότατον ἢ τῆς φλεγμονῆς, εἰς τὰ πλησιάζοντα τῶν υπερκειμένων ἐντερῶν ἀποδεῖται. καὶ οὕτως ἡ ήδη 196 κατὰ || τὸ συνεχὲς τὴν ῥοπήν τῆς ἐκκριτικῆς δυνάμεως ἀνω ποιησμένης ἄχρι τοῦ στόματος ἐπανέρχεται τὰ περιττώματα.

Ταύτα μὲν οὖν δὴ καὶ τοῖς τῶν νοσημάτων λογισμοῖς ἐπὶ πλέον εἰρήσεται. τὸ δ' ἐκ παντὸς εἰς πᾶν φέρεσθαι τι καὶ μεταλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ μίαν ἀπάντων εἶναι σύμπνοιάν τε καὶ σύρροιαν, ὡς Ἰπποκράτης ἔλεγεν, ἡδὴ μοι δοκό δεδείχθαι σαφῶς καὶ μηκέτ' ἂν τινα, μηδ' εἰ βραδύς αὐτῶν οὖς ἐνείη, περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀπορῆσαι μηδενός, οἴον ὅπως ἡ γαστήρ ἢ τὰ ἐντερα τρέφεται καὶ τίνα τρόπον ἐκ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἐπιφανείας εἰσώ τι δικαίωται. πάντων γὰρ τῶν μορίων ἐλκείν μὲν τὸ προσήκον τε καὶ φίλου, ἀποκρίνειν δὲ τὸ βαρύνον ἢ δάκνον ἐχόντων δύναμιν οὐδὲν θαυμαστοῦ ἐναντία συνεχῶς γύρνεσθαι κινήσεις ἐν
these continue to attract what is adjacent. For this condition\(^1\) causes evacuation of the contiguous part, and that again of the part next to it, and this never stops until the extreme surface is reached; thus, as each part keeps passing on matter to its neighbour, the original affection\(^2\) very quickly arrives at the extreme termination. Now this is also the case in *ileus*; the inflamed intestine is unable to support either the weight or the acridity of the waste substances and so does its best to excrete them, in fact to drive them as far away as possible. And, being prevented from effecting an expulsion downwards when the severest part of the inflammation is there, it expels the matter into the adjoining part of the intestines situated above. Thus the tendency of the eliminative faculty is step by step upwards, until the superfluities reach the mouth.

Now this will be also spoken of at greater length in my treatise on disease. For the present, however, I think I have shewn clearly that there is a universal conveyance or transference from one thing into another, and that, as Hippocrates used to say, there exists in everything a consensus in the movement of air and fluids. And I do not think that anyone, however slow his intellect, will now be at a loss to understand any of these points,—how, for instance, the stomach or intestines get nourished, or in what manner anything makes its way inwards from the outer surface of the body. Seeing that all parts have the faculty of attracting what is suitable or well-disposed and of eliminating what is troublesome or irritating, it is not surprising that opposite movements should occur in them consecutively—as may

\(^1\) *Diathesis.* \(^2\) *Pathos.*
αὐτοῖς, ὃσπερ ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς καρδίας ὁρᾶται σαφῶς καὶ τῶν ἁρτηριῶν ἀπασὸν καὶ τοῦ θώρακος καὶ τοῦ πνεύμονος. ἐπὶ μὲν γε τούτων ἀπάντων μόνον οὐ καθ’ ἐκάστην καίρον ῥοπὴν τὰς ἐναντίας κινήσεις θ’ ἀμα τῶν ὄργανων καὶ φορὰς τῶν

197 ὑλῶν || ἐναργῶς ἔστιν ἰδεῖν γιγνομένας. εἰτ’ ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς τραχείας ἁρτηρίας οὐκ ἀπορεῖ ἐναλλὰξ ποτὲ μὲν εἰσὶ παραγούσης εἰς τὸν πνεύμωνα τὸ πνεῦμα, ποτὲ δ’ ἔξω, καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς βίνας πόρων καὶ ὅλου τοῦ στόματος ὡσαύτως οὐδ’ εἰναι σοι δοκεῖ θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲ παράδοξον, εἰ, δι’ οὐ μικρῷ πρόσθεν εἰσὶν παρεκομιζετο τὸ πνεῦμα, διὰ τούτου νῦν ἐκπέμπεται, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐξ ἡπατος εἰς έντερα τε καὶ γαστέρα καθηκονίσων φλεβῶν ἀπορεῖς καὶ σοι θαυμαστὸν εἰναι φαίνεται, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀναδίδοσθαι θ’ ἀμα τὴν τροφὴν εἰς ἡπαρ ἐλκεσθαί τ’ ἐξ ἐκείνου πάλιν εἰς γαστέρα; διόρισαι δὴ τὸ ἀμα τούτο ποτέρως λέγεις. εἰ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων, οὐδ’ ἤμεις τούτο γέ φαμεν. ὃσπερ γὰρ εἰσπνέομεν ἐν ἐτέρῳ χρόνῳ καὶ αὐθίς πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ ἀντεκπνέομεν, οὕτω καὶ τροφὴν ἐν ἐτέρῳ μὲν χρόνῳ τὸ ἡπαρ ἐκ τῆς γαστρός, ἐν ἐτέρῳ δ’ ἡ γαστήρ ἐκ τοῦ ἡπατος ἐπισπᾶται. εἰ δ’ ὅτι καθ’ ἐν καὶ ταῦτό ξηρὸν ἐν ὄργανον ἐναντίας φορὰς ὑλῶν ὑπηρετεῖ, τούτῳ σοι βούλεται δηλοῦν τὸ ἀμα καὶ τούτῳ σε ταράτ-

198 τει, τὴν τ’ || εἰσπνοήν ἵδε καὶ τὴν ἐκπνοήν. πάντως πον καὶ αὐται διὰ μὲν τῶν αὐτῶν ὄργανων γίγνονται, τρόπῳ δὲ κινήσεώς τε καὶ φορᾶς τῶν ὑλῶν διαφέρουσιν.

1 He means, not only under the stress of special circumstances, but also normally.
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be clearly seen in the case of the heart, in the various arteries, in the thorax, and lungs. In all these\textsuperscript{1} the active movements of the organs and therewith the passive movements of [their contained] matters may be seen taking place almost every second in opposite directions. Now, you are not astonished when the trachea-artery\textsuperscript{2} alternately draws air into the lungs and gives it out, and when the nostrils and the whole mouth act similarly; nor do you think it strange or paradoxical that the air is dismissed through the very channel by which it was admitted just before. Do you, then, feel a difficulty in the case of the veins which pass down from the liver into the stomach and intestines, and do you think it strange that nutriment should at once be yielded up to the liver and drawn back from it into the stomach by the same veins? You must define what you mean by this expression "at once." If you mean "at the same time" this is not what we ourselves say; for just as we take in a breath at one moment and give it out again at another, so at one time the liver draws nutriment from the stomach, and at another the stomach from the liver. But if your expression "at once" means that in one and the same animal a single organ subserves the transport of matter in opposite directions, and if it is this which disturbs you, consider inspiration and expiration. For of course these also take place through the same organs, albeit they differ in their manner of movement, and in the way in which the matter is conveyed through them.

\textsuperscript{2} Lit. "rough artery." The air-passages as well as the arteries proper were supposed by the Greeks to carry air (pneuma); diastole of arteries was, like expansion of the chest, a movement for drawing in air. cf. p. 317, note 1.
'Ο πνεύμων μὲν οὖν καὶ ὁ θώραξ καὶ ἀρτηρίαι αἱ πρακτεῖαι καὶ αἱ λείαι καὶ καρδία καὶ στόμα καὶ ῥίνες ἐν ἐλαχίσταις χρόνοι μορίαις εἰς ἑναντίαις κινήσεις αὐτά τε μεταβάλλει καὶ τὰς ὑλὰς μεθίστησιν. αἱ δὲ εξ ἦπατος εἰς ἐντερα καὶ γαστήρα καθήκουσαν φλέβες οὐκ ἐν οὖτω βραχέσι χρόνον μορίοις ἀλλ’ ἐν πολλαῖς ἠμέραις ἀπαξ ἐνίοτε τῇ ἐναντίαις κινοῦνται κίνησιν.

"Εχει γὰρ ὁδὸ τὸ σύμπαν. ἐκαστὸν τῶν ὀργάνων εἰς ἑαυτὸ τὴν πλησιάζουσαν ἐπιστάται τροφὴν ἐκβοσκόμενον αὐτῆς ἀπασαν τὴν χρηστὴν νοτίδα, μέχρις ἄν ἰκανὸς κορεσθῇ, καὶ ταύτην, ὡς καὶ προσθεν ἐδεικνύμεν, ἐναποτίθεται ἑαυτῇ καὶ μετὰ ταύτα προσφύει τε καὶ ὅμοιοι, τούτου ἐστί τρέφεται. διόρισται γὰρ ἰκανὸς ἐμπρόσθες ἐπετό ἡ τῆς θρέψεως εἰς ἀνάγκης αὐτῆς προηγούμενον ἢ πρόσφυσις ὑπάρχειν, ἐκεῖνης δὲ 199 ἐστι πρῶτον ἢ πρόσθεσις. ὡσπερ οὖν ἢ τοις ξώοις αὐτοῖς ὄρος ἐστὶ τῆς ἐδοχῆς τὸ πληρώσαι τὴν γαστήρα, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐκάστῳ τῶν μορίων ὄρος ἐστὶ τῆς προσθέσεως ἢ πλήρωσις τῆς ὀικείας ὑγρότητος. ἐπεὶ τούτων ἀπαν μόριον τῇ γαστρὶ ὀμοίως ὀρέγηται τρέφεσθαι, καὶ περιπτύσσεται τῇ τροφῇ καὶ οὕτω σφήγῃ πανταχόθεν αὐτὴν ὡς ἡ γαστήρ. ἐπεταὶ δὲ εἰς ἀνάγκης τοῦ ἡμαρίμενοι καθὰ πρόσθεν ἐρρηθῃ, τὸ πέπτεσθαι τοῖς ὁμοίως, τῆς γαστρὸς ὦν διὰ τὸ περισττελλομένης αὐτοῖς, ἦν ἐπιτήδεια τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐργάσηται μορίοις. οὕτω γὰρ ἂν ὀυκέτι φυσικὸν

---

1 cf. p. 39, chap. xi.
2 Lit. orēxia.
ON THE NATURAL FACULTIES, III. xiii

Now the lungs, the thorax, the arteries rough and smooth, the heart, the mouth, and the nostrils reverse their movements at very short intervals and change the direction of the matters they contain. On the other hand, the veins which pass down from the liver to the intestines and stomach reverse the direction of their movements not at such short intervals, but sometimes once in many days.

The whole matter, in fact, is as follows:—Each of the organs draws into itself the nutriment alongside it, and devours all the useful fluid in it, until it is thoroughly satisfied; this nutriment, as I have already shown, it stores up in itself, afterwards making it adhere and then assimilating it—that is, it becomes nourished by it. For it has been demonstrated with sufficient clearness already that there is something which necessarily precedes actual nutrition, namely adhesion, and that before this again comes presentation. Thus as in the case of the animals themselves the end of eating is that the stomach should be filled, similarly in the case of each of the parts, the end of presentation is the filling of this part with its appropriate liquid. Since, therefore, every part has, like the stomach, a craving to be nourished, it too envelops its nutriment and clasps it all round as the stomach does. And this [action of the stomach], as has been already said, is necessarily followed by the digestion of the food, although it is not to make it suitable for the other parts that the stomach contracts upon it; if it did so, it would no longer be a physiological organ, but an animal possessing reason.

Lit. a "physical" organ; that is, a mere instrument or organon of the Physis,—not one of the Psyche or conscious personality. cf. semen, p. 132, note 1.
ὁργανον ἀλλὰ ζιζόν τι γληνοῦτο λογισμόν τε καὶ νοῦν ἔχων, ὡς αἱρεῖσαι τὸ βέλτιον.

'Ἀλλ' αὕτη μὲν περιστέλλεται τῷ τὸ πᾶν σῶμα δύναμιν ἑλκτικὴν τινα καὶ ἀπολαυστικὴν κεκτήσας τῶν οἰκείων ποιοτήτων, ὡς ἐμπροσθεὶν ἐδείκνυσον συμβαίνει δ' ἐν τούτῳ τοῖς σιτίοις ἁλλοιουσθαί. καὶ μέντοι καὶ πληρωθέσα τῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν ύγρότητος και κορεσθείσα βάρος ἥγεται τὸ λουπὸν αὐτα. τὸ περιττὸν οὖν εὐθὺς ἀπο- 200 τρίβεται τε καὶ ὠθεί κάτω πρὸς ὑπεροχνίαν αὐτή τρεπομένη, τὴν πρόσφυσιν. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ διερχομένη τὸ ἐντερον ἀπαν ἡ τροφὶ διὰ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸ καθηκόντων ἀγγείων ἀναρτά- ἔται, πλείστη μὲν εἰς τὰς φλέβας, ὀλύγη δὲ τις εἰς τὰς ἀρτηρίας, ὡς μικρὸν ύστερον ὑποδείξομεν. ἐν τούτῳ δ' αὖ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἐντέρων χυτῶσι προστίθεται.

Καὶ μοι τεμών ἡδῆ τῷ λογισμῷ την τῆς τροφῆς οἰκονομίαν ἁπάσαν εἰς τρεῖς μοίρας χρόνων, ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ νοεί μένουσαν θ' ἀμα κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτὴν καὶ πεπτομένην καὶ προστιθεμένην εἰς κόρον τῇ γαστρὶ καὶ τι καὶ τῷ ἡπατὶ παρ' αὐτῆς ἀναφερομένουν.

'Εν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ διερχομένῃ τὰ τῇ ἐντερα καὶ προστιθεμένῃ εἰς κόρον αὐτοῖς τα τούτως καὶ τῷ ἡπατί καὶ τῷ βραχύ μέρος αὐτῆς πάντῃ τοῦ σώματος φερόμενον. ἐν δὲ δὴ τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ τὸ προστεθέν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ χρόνῳ προσφύσθησαν νὸει τῇ γαστρὶ.

Κατὰ δὲ τὴν τρίτην μοίραν τοῦ χρόνου τρέ-

---

1 cf. p. 317, note 2; p. 319, chap. xv.
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and intelligence, with the power of choosing the better [of two alternatives].

But while the stomach contracts for the reason that the whole body possesses a power of attracting and of utilising appropriate qualities, as has already been explained, it also happens that, in this process, the food undergoes alteration; further, when filled and saturated with the fluid pabulum from the food, it thereafter looks on the food as a burden; thus it at once gets rid of the excess—that is to say, drives it downwards—itself turning to another task, namely that of causing adhesion. And during this time, while the nutriment is passing along the whole length of the intestine, it is caught up by the vessels which pass into the intestine; as we shall shortly demonstrate,¹ most of it is seized by the veins, but a little also by the arteries; at this stage also it becomes presented to the coats of the intestines.

Now imagine the whole economy of nutrition divided into three periods. Suppose that in the first period the nutriment remains in the stomach and is digested and presented to the stomach until satiety is reached, also that some of it is taken up from the stomach to the liver.²

During the second period it passes along the intestines and becomes presented both to them and to the liver—again until the stage of satiety—while a small part of it is carried all over the body.² During this period, also imagine that what was presented to the stomach in the first period becomes now adherent to it.

During the third period the stomach has reached

¹ Note that absorption takes place from the stomach as well as the intestines. cf. p. 118, note 1.
That is, among the ultimate tissues or cells.
the stage of receiving nourishment; it now entirely assimilates everything that had become adherent to it: at the same time in the intestines and liver there takes place adhesion of what had been before presented, while dispersal [anadosis] is taking place to all parts of the body,\(^1\) as also presentation. Now, if the animal takes food immediately after these [three stages] then, during the time that the stomach is again digesting and getting the benefit of this by presenting all the useful part of it to its own coats, the intestines will be engaged in final assimilation of the juices which have adhered to them, and so also will the liver: while in the various parts of the body there will be taking place adhesion of the portions of nutriment presented. And if the stomach is forced to remain without food during this time, it will draw its nutriment from the veins in the mesentery and liver; for it will not do so from the actual body of the liver (by body of the liver I mean first and foremost its flesh proper, and after this all the vessels contained in it), for it is irrational to suppose that one part would draw away from another part the juice already contained in it, especially when adhesion and final assimilation of that juice were already taking place; the juice, however, that is in the cavity of the veins will be abstracted by the part which is stronger and more in need.

It is in this way, therefore, that the stomach, when it is in need of nourishment and the animal has nothing to eat, seizes it from the veins in the liver. Also in the case of the spleen we have shown in a former passage\(^2\) how it draws all material from

\(^1\) Pp. 205–9.
κατεργάζεσθαι τε καὶ μεταβάλλειν ἔτι τὸ χρηστότερον, οὐδὲν οὐδὲν ἐνταῦθα θαυμαστὸν ἐλκεσθαι τι κἀκ τοῦ σπλήνους εἰς ἐκαστὸν τῶν κοινωνόυντων αὐτῷ κατὰ τὰς φλέβας ὀργάνων, οἴον εἰς ἐπίπλοου καὶ μεσεντέριον καὶ λεπτὸν ἔντερου καὶ κῶλον καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν γαστέρα· κατὰ δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τρόπουν ἔξερευγεσθαι μὲν εἰς τὴν γαστέρα τὸ περίττωμα καθ’ ἐτερον χρόνον, αὐτὸν δὲ αὖθις εκ τῆς γαστρὸς ἐλκειν τι τῆς οἰκείας τροφῆς ἐν ἐτέρῳ καιρῷ.

Καθὸλου δὲ εἰπεῖν, δὲ καὶ πρόσθεν ἡδὴ λέξεκται, πὰν ἐκ παντὸς ἐλκειν τε καὶ πέμπειν ἐγχορεῖ κατὰ διαφέροντας χρόνους, ὁμοιοτάτου ἡγιομένου τοῦ συμβαίνοντος, ὡς εἰ καὶ ζῶα νοήσαις πολλὰ τροφῆν ἄφθονον ἐν κοινῷ κατακεκμῆνην, εἰς ὅσον βούλεται, προσφέρομενα. καθ’ δὲ γὰρ ἡδὴ πέπανται χρόνον ἑτερα, κατὰ τούτων εἰκὸς ἐσθίειν 203 ἑτερα, καὶ μέλλειν γε τὰ μὲν || παύεσθαι, τὰ δ’ ἀρχεσθαι, καὶ τινα μὲν συνυσθίοντα, τὰ δ’ ἀνὰ μέρος ἐσθίοντα καὶ ναὶ μὰ Δία γε τὸ ἑτερον ἀρτάζειν θατέρου πολλάκις, εἰ τὸ μὲν ἑτερον ἐπιδέοιτο, τῷ δ’ ἄφθονως παρακέοιτο. καὶ οὕτως οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν οὔτ’ ἐκ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἐπιφανείας εἰς τῷ πάλιν ὑποστρέφειν οὔτε διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγγείων ἢ ἤπατος τε καὶ σπλήνος εἰς κοιλίαν ἀνενεχθήναι τι, δι’ ὅν ἐκ ταύτης εἰς ἐκείνα πρότερον ἀνηνέχθη.

Κατὰ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἀρτηρίας ἰκανῶς ἐναργεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὡσπερ καὶ κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν τε καὶ τὸν θώρακα καὶ τὸν πνεύμονα. τούτων γὰρ ὑπάντων διαστελλομένων τε καὶ συντελλομένων ἐναλλαξ ἀναγκαῖον, ἢ ὡς εἰλκύσθη τι πρότερον, εἰς ταῦθ’ 312
the liver that tends to be thick, and by working it up converts it into more useful matter. There is nothing surprising, therefore, if, in the present instance also, some of this should be drawn from the spleen into such organs as communicate with it by veins, e.g. the omentum, mesentery, small intestine, colon, and the stomach itself. Nor is it surprising that the spleen should disgorge its surplus matters into the stomach at one time, while at another time it should draw some of its appropriate nutriment from the stomach.

For, as has already been said, speaking generally, everything has the power at different times of attracting from and of adding to everything else. What happens is just as if you might imagine a number of animals helping themselves at will to a plentiful common stock of food; some will naturally be eating when others have stopped, some will be on the point of stopping when others are beginning, some eating together, and others in succession. Yes, by Zeus! and one will often be plundering another, if he be in need while the other has an abundant supply ready to hand. Thus it is in no way surprising that matter should make its way back from the outer surface of the body to the interior, or should be carried from the liver and spleen into the stomach by the same vessels by which it was carried in the reverse direction.

In the case of the arteries¹ this is clear enough, as also in the case of heart, thorax, and lungs; for, since all of these dilate and contract alternately, it must needs be that matter is subsequently discharged back into the parts from which it was

¹ By this term, of course, the air-passages are also meant; cf. p. 305.
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υστερον ἐκπέμπεσθαι. καὶ ταύτην ἄρα τὴν ἀνάγκην ἡ φύσις προγεγομένουσα τοίς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ στόμασι τῶν ἀγγείων ύμένας ἐπέφυσε κωλυσοντας εἰς τούπισω ἡ φέρεσθαι τὰς ύλας. ἀλλὰ ὅπως μὲν τοῦτο γίγνεται καὶ καθ’ ὄντινα τρόπον, ἐν τοῖς περὶ χρείας μορίων εἰρήνεται δεικτικῶτον ἡμῶν τὰ τ’ ἄλλα καὶ ὡς ἄδυνατον οὕτως ἀκριβῶς κλείσθαι τὰ στόματα τῶν ἀγγείων, ὡς καὶ μηδὲν παλινδρομεῖν. εἰς μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀρτηρίαν τὴν φλεβώδη, καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτ’ ἐν ἐκείνους δειλθήσεται, πολὺ πλέον ἢ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων στομάτων εἰς τούπισω πάλιν ἀναγκαίον ἐπανέρχεσθαι. τὸ δ’ εἰς τὰ παρόντα χρήσιμον, ὡς οὔκ εὐδέχεται τι τῶν αἰσθητῆς καὶ μεγάλης ἐχόντων εὐρύτητα μὴ οὔκ ἦτοι διαστελλόμενον ἔλκειν εἷς ἀπάντων τῶν πλησίων ἢ ἐκκλίβειν ἄθικες εἰς ταῦτα συν- στελλόμενον ἐκ τε τῶν ἡδὴ προειρημένων ἐν τοῖς τῷ λόγῳ σαφές ἂν εἰθ’ καὶ δὲν Ἕρασίστρατος τε καὶ ἡμείς ἐτέρωθι περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸ κενοῦμενον ἀκολουθήσας ἐδείξαμεν.

XIV

‘Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ὡς ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῶν ἀρτηρίων ἐστὶ τις δύναμις ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐπιρρέουσα, καθ’ ἢν διαστέλλονται τε καὶ συνείλλονται, διέκειται δι’ ἐτέρων.

Εἰτέρ πον συνθείης ἅμως τὸ τε ταύτην εἶναι τὴν κίνησιν αὐτάις τὸ τε πᾶν τὸ διαστέλλομενον

1 cf. p. 34, note 1. 2 cf. p. 121, note 4.
3 Pulmonary vein, or rather, left auricle. Galen means a reflux through the mitral orifice; the left auricle was looked
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previously drawn. Now Nature foresaw this necessity,¹ and provided the cardiac openings of the vessels with membranous attachments,² to prevent their contents from being carried backwards. How and in what manner this takes place will be stated in my work "On the Use of Parts," where among other things I show that it is impossible for the openings of the vessels to be closed so accurately that nothing at all can run back. Thus it is inevitable that the reflux into the venous artery³ (as will also be made clear in the work mentioned) should be much greater than through the other openings. But what it is important for our present purpose to recognise is that everything possessing a large and appreciable cavity must, when it dilates, abstract matter from all its neighbours, and, when it contracts, must squeeze matter back into them. This should all be clear from what has already been said in this treatise and from what Erasistratus and I myself have demonstrated elsewhere respecting the tendency of a vacuum to become refilled.⁴

XIV

And further, it has been shown in other treatises that all the arteries possess a power which derives from the heart, and by virtue of which they dilate and contract.

Put together, therefore, the two facts—that the arteries have this motion, and that everything, when on rather as the termination of the pulmonary veins than as a part of the heart. cf. p. 323, note 4. He speaks here of a kind of "physiological" mitral incompetence.

¹ Horror vacui.
ΓΑΛΕΝ

ἐλκειν ἐκ τῶν πλησίων εἰς ἑαυτό, θαυμαστῶν οὐδέν σοι φανεῖται τὰς ἀρτηρίας, ὅσα μὲν εἰς τὸ δέρμα περάνυσιν αὐτῶν, ἐπισπᾶσθαι τὸν ἐξωθεν ἅερα διαστελλομένας, ὅσα δὲ κατὰ τι πρὸς τὰς ἐκλείσθαι τὴν ὀλκήν. ἐν γὰρ τῇ πρὸς τὸ κενοῦμενον ἀκολουθία τὸ κοὐφότατον τε καὶ λεπτότατον ἐπεται πρῶτον τοῦ βαρυτέρου τε καὶ παχυτέρου· κοὐφότατον δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ λεπτότατον ἀπάντων τῶν κατὰ τὸ σώμα πρῶτον μὲν τὸ πνεῦμα, δεύτερον δὲ ὁ ἀτμός, ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ τρίτων, ὅσον ἄν ἀκριβῶς ἦ κατειργασμένον τε καὶ λεπτυσμένον αἶμα.

Ταῦτ' οὖν εἰς ἑαυτάς ἐξεισιν αἰ ἀρτηρίαι πανταχόθεν, αἰ μὲν εἰς τὸ δέρμα καθήκουσαι τὸν ἐξωθεν ἅερα· πλησίων τε γὰρ αὐτάς ὁμοσά ἐστι καὶ κοὐφότατος ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα· τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἀνωτότας καὶ ἡ κατὰ ράχιν, ἡδὲ δὲ καὶ ὅσα τούτων ἐγγὺς εἰς αὐτῆς μάλιστα τῆς καρδίας· ὅσα δὲ καὶ τῆς καρδίας πορρωτέρω καὶ τοῦ δέρματος, ἐλκειν ταῦτας ἀναγκαῖον ἐκ τῶν φλεβῶν τὸ κοὐφότατον τοῦ αἵματος· ὅστε καὶ τῶν εἰς τὴν γαστέρα τε καὶ τὰ ἐντερα καθήκουσῶν ἀρτηριῶν τῆν ὀλκήν ἐν τῷ διαστελλομένῳ γίγνεσθαι παρὰ τε τῆς καρδίας αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν παρακειμένων αὐτῆς φλεβῶν παμπόλλων οὐσῶν. οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἐκ γε τῶν ἐντερῶν καὶ τῆς κοιλίας τροφῆν οὕτω παχεῖαν τε καὶ βαρεῖαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἔχοντων δύνανται τι μεταλαμβάνειν, οὐ τι καὶ ἀξιον λόγου, φθάνουσαι πληροῦσθαι τοῖς κονφοτέροις. οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ καθεῖς
it dilates, draws neighbouring matter into itself—and you will find nothing strange in the fact that those arteries which reach the skin draw in the outer air when they dilate, while those which anastomose at any point with the veins attract the thinnest and most vaporous part of the blood which these contain, and as for those arteries which are near the heart, it is on the heart itself that they exert their traction. For, by virtue of the tendency by which a vacuum becomes refilled, the lightest and thinnest part obeys the tendency before that which is heavier and thicker. Now the lightest and thinnest of anything in the body is firstly pneuma, secondly vapour, and in the third place that part of the blood which has been accurately elaborated and refined.

These, then, are what the arteries draw into themselves on every side; those arteries which reach the skin draw in the outer air (this being near them and one of the lightest of things); as to the other arteries, those which pass up from the heart into the neck, and that which lies along the spine, as also such arteries as are near these—draw mostly from the heart itself; and those which are further from the heart and skin necessarily draw the lightest part of the blood out of the veins. So also the traction exercised by the diastole of the arteries which go to the stomach and intestines takes place at the expense of the heart itself and the numerous veins in its neighbourhood; for these arteries cannot get anything worth speaking of from the thick heavy nutriment contained in the intestines and stomach, since they first become filled with lighter elements. For if you let down a tube into a vessel

---

1 cf. p. 305, note 2
Galen's text in Greek, with a modern English translation following.

**XV**

Ὁύκονοι χρή θανυμάζειν, εἰ παντελῶς ὀλύγον ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας, ὅσον ἂν ἀκριβῶς ἰ διατηρησμένον, εἰς τὰς ἀρτηρίας παραγίγνεται φθανούσας πληροῦσθαι τῶν κοιματέρων, ἀλλὰ ἐκείνο γεννώσκειν, ὡς δυ' ἐστὸν ὀλκῆς εἰδῆ, τὸ μὲν τῇ πρὸς τὸ κενοῦμενον ἀκολουθία, τὸ δ' οἰκείοτητι ποιότητος γεγιόμενον: ἐτέρως μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὰς φύσας ὁ ἄηρ, ἐτέρως δ᾽ ὁ σίδηρος ὑπὸ τῆς ἡρακλείας ἐπισταται λίθου· καὶ ὡς ἦ μὲν πρὸς τὸ κενοὐμενον ἀκολουθία || τὸ κοιματέρων ἐλκεῖ πρότερον, ἢ δὲ κατὰ τὴν τῆς ποιότητος οἰκείοτητα πολλάκις, εἰ οὕτως ἔτυχε, τὸ βαρύτερον, ἀν τῇ φύσει συγγενέστερον ὑπάρχῃ. καὶ τούνων καὶ ταῖς ἀρτηρίαις τε καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὡς μὲν κοιλίως τε καὶ διαστελλόμενοι δυναμένοις ὀργάνοις, ἢ ὁ κοιματέρων ἀκολουθεῖ πρότερον, ὡς δὲ τρέφεσθαι δειμένοις, εἰς αὐτοὺς τοὺς χιτῶνας, οὐ δὴ τὰ σώματα τῶν ὀργάνων εἰσίν, ἔλκεται τὸ οἰκείον. ὅσον ἂν οὖν εἰς τὴν κοιλίτητα διαστελλομένων αὐτῶν αἵματος μεταληφθῇ, τούτου τὸ οἰκειότατον

1 The “mechanical” principle of horror vacui contrasted with the “physical” or semi-physiological principle of specific attraction. Appropriateness here might almost be rendered affinity or kinship. cf. note 2, infra.
full of water and sand, and suck the air out of the tube with your mouth, the sand cannot come up to you before the water, for in accordance with the principle of the refilling of a vacuum the lighter matter is always the first to succeed to the evacuation.

XV

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that only a very little [nutrient matter] such, namely, as has been accurately elaborated—gets from the stomach into the arteries, since these first become filled with lighter matter. We must understand that there are two kinds of attraction, that by which a vacuum becomes refilled and that caused by appropriateness of quality;\(^1\) air is drawn into bellows in one way, and iron by the lodestone in another. And we must also understand that the traction which results from evacuation acts primarily on what is light, whilst that from appropriateness of quality acts frequently, it may be, on what is heavier (if this should be naturally more nearly related\(^2\)). Therefore, in the case of the heart and the arteries, it is in so far as they are hollow organs, capable of diastole, that they always attract the lighter matter first, while, in so far as they require nourishment, it is actually into their coats (which are the real bodies of these organs) that the appropriate matter is drawn.\(^3\) Of the blood, then, which is taken into their cavities when they dilate, that part which is most proper to them and


\(^3\) The coats exercise the vital traction, the cavities the merely mechanical. cf. p. 165, note 2.
These fossae were probably the recesses between the columnae carneae.

ON THE NATURAL FACULTIES, III. xv

most able to afford nourishment is attracted by their actual coats.

Now, apart from what has been said,\(^1\) the following is sufficient proof that something is taken over from the veins into the arteries. If you will kill an animal by cutting through a number of its large arteries, you will find the veins becoming empty along with the arteries: now, this could never occur if there were not anastomoses between them. Similarly, also, in the heart itself, the thinnest portion of the blood is drawn from the right ventricle into the left, owing to there being perforations in the septum between them: these can be seen for a great part [of their length]; they are like a kind of fossae [pits] with wide mouths, and they get constantly narrower; it is not possible, however, actually to observe their extreme terminations, owing both to the smallness of these and to the fact that when the animal is dead all the parts are chilled and shrunken.\(^2\) Here, too, however, our argument,\(^3\) starting from the principle that nothing is done by Nature in vain, discovers these anastomoses between the ventricles of the heart; for it could not be at random and by chance that there occurred fossae ending thus in narrow terminations.

And secondly [the presence of these anastomoses has been assumed] from the fact that, of the two orifices in the right ventricle, the one conducting blood in and the other out, the former\(^4\) is much the larger. For, the fact that the insertion of the vena cava into the heart\(^5\) is larger than the

\(^1\) He means the tricuspid orifice. cf. p. 121, note 4.

\(^2\) The right auricle was looked on less as a part of the heart than as an expansion or “insertion” of the vena cava.
GALEN

éκπεμπομένου τῷ πνεῦμονι, μεῖζων ἔστιν ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς κοίλης εἰς αὐτήν ἔμφυσις τῆς ἐμφυομένης εἰς τὸν πνεῦμονα φλεβὸς. οὐδὲ ὡς ἔδαπανθήθη τι τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ σώματος τῆς καρδίας θρέψιν. ἦταρα γάρ ἐστὶ φλέψ ἡ εἰς ἐκεῖνο κατασχιζομένη μὴτε τὴν γένεσιν ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῆς μὴτε τὴν τοῦ αἵματος ἔχουσα μετάληψιν. εἰ δὲ καὶ δαπανᾶται τι, ἀλλ' οὐ τοσὸτόν γε μεῖων ἔστιν ἡ εἰς τὸν πνεῦμονα φλέψ ἁγουσα τῆς εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἐμφυομένης, ὅσου εἰκὸς εἰς τὴν τροφὴν ἀνηλῶσαι τῆς καρδίας, ἀλλὰ πλέον πολλῷ. δὴ διόν οὖν, ὡς εἰς τὴν ἀριστεράν τι μεταλαμβάνεται κοιλίαν.

Καὶ γὰρ οὖν καὶ τῶν κατ' ἐκείνην ἀγγείων δυὸν ὤντων ἔλαττον ἐστὶ πολλῷ το ἐκ τοῦ πνεύμονος εἰς αὐτὴν εἰσάγων τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἐκφυομένης ἀρτηρίας τῆς μεγάλης, ἀφ' ἢς αἱ κατὰ τὸ σώμα σύμπασαι πεφύκασιν, ὡς ἂν μὴ μόνον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύμονος πνεῦμα μεταλαμβανούσης αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς κοιλίας αἵμα διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀναστομώσεων.

"Ὅτι δ' ἀμείων ἦν τοὺς τοῦ σώματος μορίους τοὺς μὲν ύπὸ καθαροῦ καὶ λεπτοῦ καὶ ἀτρόμοδους αἵματος τρέφεσθαι, τοὺς δ' ύπὸ παχεοῦ καὶ θολεροῦ καὶ ὡς οὔτ' ἐνταῦθα τι παρεώραται τῇ φύσει, τῆς || περὶ χρείας μορίων πραγματείας ἔστιν, ὡς' οὖν χρη νῦν ύπὲρ τούτων ἐτι λέγειν,

1 This "vein" (really the pulmonary artery) was supposed to be the channel by which the lungs received nutriment from the right heart. cf. p. 121, note 3.
2 The coronary vein.
3 Galen's conclusion, of course, is, so far, correct, but he has substituted an imaginary direct communication between the ventricles for the actual and more roundabout pulmonary
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vein which is inserted into the lungs suggests that not all the blood which the vena cava gives to the heart is driven away again from the heart to the lungs. Nor can it be said that any of the blood is expended in the nourishment of the actual body of the heart, since there is another vein which breaks up in it and which does not take its origin nor get its share of blood from the heart itself. And even if a certain amount is so expended, still the vein leading to the lungs is not to such a slight extent smaller than that inserted into the heart as to make it likely that the blood is used as nutriment for the heart: the disparity is much too great for such an explanation. It is, therefore, clear that something is taken over into the left ventricle.

Moreover, of the two vessels connected with it, that which brings pneuma into it from the lungs is much smaller than the great outgrowing artery from which the arteries all over the body originate; this would suggest that it not merely gets pneuma from the lungs, but that it also gets blood from the right ventricle through the anastomoses mentioned.

Now it belongs to the treatise "On the Use of Parts" to show that it was best that some parts of the body should be nourished by pure, thin, and vaporous blood, and others by thick, turbid blood, and that in this matter also Nature has overlooked nothing. Thus it is not desirable that these matters should be further discussed. Having mentioned, circulation, of whose existence he apparently had no idea. His views were eventually corrected by the Renascence anatomists. Cf. Introduction, pp. xxii.-xxiii.

* He means the left auricle, considered as the termination of the pulmonary "arteries"; cf. p. 314, note 3.

* The aorta, its orifice being circular, appears bigger than the slit-like mitral orifice.
ላል ὑπομνήσαντας, ὡς δύο ἐστὸν ὀλκῆς εἰδη, τῷν μὲν εὐρείας ὁδὸς ἐν τῷ διαστέλλεσθαι τῇ πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθίᾳ τὴν ἐλξῖν ποιομένων, τῶν δὲ οἰκείοτητι ποιότητος, ἐφεξῆς λέγειν, ὡς τὰ μὲν πρότερα καὶ πόρρωθεν ἐλκεῖν τὶ δύναται, τὰ δὲ δεύτερα ἐκ τῶν ἐγγυτάτω μόνων. αὐλίσκουν μὲν γὰρ ὅτι μήκιστον εἰς ὕδωρ ἐνεστὶ καθένα ῥάδιως ἀναστὰν εἰς τὸ στόμα δὴ αὐτοῦ τὸ ύγρόν· ὦ μὴν εἰ ὦ ἐπὶ πλέον ἀπαγάγοις τῆς ἤρακλείας λίθου τὸν σίδηρον ἢ τοὺς πυρῶν τοῦ κεραμίου— καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοιοῦτον τι πρόσθεν ἐλέγετο παράδειγμα—δύνατ' ἀν ἔτι γενέσθαι τις ὀλκή.

Σαφέστατα δ' ἂν αὐτὸ μάθοις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς κήποις ὄχετῶν· ἐκ τούτων γὰρ εἰς μὲν τὰ παρακέιμενα καὶ πλησίον ἀπαντα διαδίδοται τις ἱκμάς, εἰς δὲ τὰ πορρωτέρα προσελθεῖν οὐκέτι δύναται, καὶ διὰ τούτο ἀναγκάζονται πολλοῖς ὄχετοῖς μικροῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου τετμημένου εἰς εκαστὸν μέρος τοῦ κήπου τὴν ἐπίρρυσιν τοῦ ὤδατος ἐπὶ-211 τεχνάσθαι· καὶ τηλικαρτά γε τὰ μεταξὺ δια-

στήματα τούτων τῶν μικρῶν ὄχετῶν ποιοῦσιν, ἤλικα μάλιστα νομίζουσιν ἀρκεῖν εἰς τὸ ἱκάνον ἀπολαύειν ἐλκοντα τῆς ἐκατέρωθεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιρ-

ρεύσεις ὑγρότητος. οὔτως οὖν ἔχει καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἥψων σώμασιν. ὄχετοὶ πολλοὶ κατὰ πάντα τὰ μέλη διεστραμμένοι παράγουσιν αὐτοῖς ἀίμα καθά-

περ ἐν κήποις ύδρείαν τινά. καὶ τούτων τῶν ὄχετῶν τὰ μεταξὺ διαστήματα θαυμαστῶς ὕπο τῆς φύσεως εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς διατέτακται πρὸς τὸ μήτ' ἐνδεώς χορηγεῖσθαι τοῖς μεταξὺ μορίοις ἐλκοσκων εἰς ἀυτὰ τὸ ἀίμα μῆτε κατακλυζέσθαι
however, that there are two kinds of attraction, certain bodies exerting attraction along wide channels during diastole (by virtue of the principle by which a vacuum becomes refilled) and others exerting it by virtue of their appropriateness of quality, we must next remark that the former bodies can attract even from a distance, while the latter can only do so from among things which are quite close to them; the very longest tube let down into water can easily draw up the liquid into the mouth, but if you withdraw iron to a distance from the lodestone or corn from the jar (an instance of this kind has in fact been already given\(^1\)) no further attraction can take place.

This you can observe most clearly in connection with garden conduits. For a certain amount of moisture is distributed from these into every part lying close at hand but it cannot reach those lying further off: therefore one has to arrange the flow of water into all parts of the garden by cutting a number of small channels leading from the large one. The intervening spaces between these small channels are made of such a size as will, presumably, best allow them [the spaces] to satisfy their needs by drawing from the liquid which flows to them from every side. So also is it in the bodies of animals. Numerous conduits distributed through the various limbs bring them pure blood, much like the garden water-supply, and, further, the intervals between these conduits have been wonderfully arranged by Nature from the outset so that the intervening parts should be plentifully provided for when absorbing blood, and that they should never

\(^1\) p. 87.
ποτ' αὐτὰ πλήθει περιτής ὑγρότητος ἀκαίρως ἐπιρρεούσῃ.

'Ὁ γὰρ δὴ τρόπος τῆς θρέψεως αὐτῶν τούτω τις ἐστι. τοῦ συνεχοῦς έαυτὸ σώματος, οἴοντερ τὸ ἀπλοῦν ἀγγείον Ἐρασίστρατος ὑποτίθεται, τὰ μὲν ἐπιπολής μέρη πρώτα τῆς ὀμιλούσης ἀπολαύει τροφῆς· ἐκ δὲ τούτων αὐ metalaμβάνει κατά τὸ συνεχές ἐξκοντα τὰ τούτων ἐξῆς, εἰτ' εὖ ἐκείνων αὐθίς ἑτερα καὶ τοῦτ' οὐ παύεται γιγνόμενον, ἀρχίς ἄν εἰς ἀπαντ' αὐτοῦ διαδόθη τὰ μόρια τῆς τρεφούσης οὐσίας ἡ ποιότης. ὡσα δὲ 212 τῶν μορίων ἐπὶ πλέον || ἀλλοιουμένου δεῖται τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτὰ θρέψεων χυμοῦ, τούτων ὀστέρ τι ταμιείου ἡ φύσις παρεσκευασέν ἦτοι κοιλίας ἡ σήραγγας ἡ τι ταῖς σήραγγιν ἀνάλογον. αἱ μὲν γὰρ σάρκες αἱ τε τῶν σπλάγχνων ἀπάντων αἱ τε τῶν μυῶν εὖ αἱματος αὐτοῦ τρέφονται βραχείαν ἀλλοίωσιν δεξαμένου. τὰ δ' ὅστα παμπύλλης ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ δεῖται τῆς μεταβολῆς, ἵνα τραφῇ, καὶ ἐστὶν οἴοντερ τὸ αἷμα ταῖς σαρξί, τοιούτος ὁ μυελὸς τοῖς ὀστοῖς ἐν μὲν τοῖς μικροῖς τε καὶ ἀκοιλίοις κατὰ τὰς σήραγγας αὐτῶν διεσπαρμένος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μείζονι τε καὶ κοιλίας ἐχουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ἠθροισμένοι.

'Ως γὰρ καὶ διὰ τοῦ πρῶτου γράμματος ἐδείκνυτο, τοῖς μὲν ὀμοίαν ἐχουσι τὴν· οὐσίαν εἰς ἀλληλα μεταβάλλειν ἐγχωρεῖ, τοῖς δὲ πάμπολυ διεστῶσιν ἀμήχανου ἀλληλοῦ ὀμοιωθῆναι χωρίς τῶν ἐν μέσῳ μεταβολῶν· τοιούτον τι καὶ τοῖς

1 Or we may render it "corpuscle"; Galen practically means the cell. cf. p. 153, note 2.
be deluged by a quantity of superfluous fluid running in at unsuitable times.

For the way in which they obtain nourishment is somewhat as follows. In the body which is continuous throughout, such as Erasistratus supposes his simple vessel to be, it is the superficial parts which are the first to make use of the nutriment with which they are brought into contact; then the parts coming next draw their share from these by virtue of their contiguity; and again others from these; and this does not stop until the quality of the nutrient substance has been distributed among all parts of the corpuscle in question. And for such parts as need the humour which is destined to nourish them to be altered still further, Nature has provided a kind of storehouse, either in the form of a central cavity or else as separate caverns, or something analogous to caverns. Thus the flesh of the viscera and of the muscles is nourished from the blood directly, this having undergone merely a slight alteration; the bones, however, in order to be nourished, require very great change, and what blood is to flesh marrow is to bone; in the case of the small bones, which do not possess central cavities, this marrow is distributed in their caverns, whereas in the larger bones which do contain central cavities the marrow is all concentrated in these.

For, as was pointed out in the first book, things having a similar substance can easily change into one another, whereas it is impossible for those which are very different to be assimilated to one another without intermediate stages. Such a one in respect to

---

2 cf. the term "cavernous tissue."
3 If. x.
χόνδροις ἐστὶ τὸ περικεχυμένον μυξῶδες καὶ τοῖς συνδέσμοις καὶ τοῖς ύμέσι καὶ τοῖς νεύροις τὸ παρεσπαρμένον ἐν αὐτοῖς ύγρὸν γλίσχρον. ἐκα-213 στον γὰρ || τούτων ἐξ ἰνῶν σύγκειται πολλῶν, αὕτερ ὀμοιομερεῖς τ' εἰσὶ καὶ ὄντως αἷσθητὰ στοιχεῖα. κατὰ δὲ τὰς μεταξὺ χάρας αὐτῶν ὁ ὀικειότατος εἰς θρέψιν παρέσπαρται χυμός, ὅν εἴλκυσαν μὲν ἐκ τῶν φλεβῶν τοῦ αἵματος, ὡσον οἴόν τ' ἣν ἐκλεξάμεναι τὸν ἐπιτηδεύτατον, ἐξ-ομοιοῦσι δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ καὶ μεταβάλλουσιν εἰς τὴν ἐαυτῶν οὐσίαν.

"Απαντ' οὖν ταῦτα καὶ ἀλλήλοις ὀμολογεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν ἀποδεδειγμένοις ἰκανῶς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ οὕ χρῆ μηκύνειν ἐτὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ γὰρ τῶν εἰρημένων ἐνεστῶν ἐκάστῳ τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀπαντά καθ' ὄντως γίγνεται τρόπον ἐξευρίσκειν ἐτοίμως, ὡσπερ καὶ διὰ τὰ πολλὰς κωθωνιζόμενοι πάμ-πολυ τάχιστα μὲν ἀναδίδοται τὸ ποθέν, οὐρεῖται δ' ὅλων δεῖν ἄπαν ἄντως οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον. καὶ γὰρ κάνταυθα τῇ τῇ τῆς ποιότητος οἰκειότητι καὶ τῇ τῆς ὑγρότητος λεπτότητι καὶ τῇ τῶν ἀγγείων τε καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰ στομάτων εὑρύθητι καὶ τῇ τῆς ἐλκτικῆς δυνάμεως εὐρωστία τὸ τάχος συνντελεῖται τῆς ἀναδόσεως, τῶν μὲν πλησίον τῆς κοιλίας τεταγμένον μορίων οἰκειότητι ποιότη-214 τος || ἐαυτῶν ἐνεκα ἐλκόντων τὸ πόμα, τῶν δ'
cartilage is the myxoid substance which surrounds it, and in respect to ligaments, membranes, and nerves the viscous liquid dispersed inside them; for each of these consists of numerous fibres, which are homogeneous\(^1\)—in fact, actual sensible elements; and in the intervals between these fibres is dispersed the humour most suited for nutrition; this they have drawn from the blood in the veins, choosing the most appropriate possible, and now they are assimilating it step by step and changing it into their own substance.

All these considerations, then, agree with one another, and bear sufficient witness to the truth of what has been already demonstrated; there is thus no need to prolong the discussion further. For, from what has been said, anyone can readily discover in what way all the particular [vital activities] come about. For instance, we could in this way ascertain why it is that in the case of many people who are partaking freely of wine, the fluid which they have drunk is rapidly absorbed\(^2\) through the body and almost the whole of it is passed by the kidneys within a very short time. For here, too, the rapidity with which the fluid is absorbed depends on appropriateness of quality, on the thinness of the fluid, on the width of the vessels and their mouths, and on the efficiency of the attractive faculty. The parts situated near the alimentary canal, by virtue of their appropriateness of quality, draw in the imbibed food for their own purposes, then the parts next to them

---

\(^1\) Lit. \textit{homoeomerous}, i.e. "the same all through," of similar structure throughout, the \textit{elements} of living matter. cf. p. 20, note 3, and cf. also the "cell" of Erasistratus, p. 153.

\(^2\) "Delivered," "dispersed"; cf. p. 13, note 5.
ἐξῆς τούτως ἔξαρπαξόντων καὶ αὐτῶν εἰς ἑαυτὰ κάπετα τῶν ἐφέξης πάλιν ἐκ τούτων μεταλαμβανόντων, ἀχρίς ἂν εἰς τὴν κοιλίην ἀφίκηται φλέβα, τοῦντεύθεν δ' ἦδη τῶν νεφρῶν τὸ οἴκειον ἐπισπωμένων. ὥστ' οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν οἶνον μὲν ὑδατος ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι θάττον οἰκείότητι ποιότητος, αὐτῶν δὲ τὸν οἶνον τὸν μὲν λευκόν καὶ καθαρὸν ἐτοίμως ἀναδίδοσθαι διὰ λεπτότητα, τῶν δ' αὖ μέλανα καὶ θολερῶν ἵσχεσθαι τε κατὰ τὴν ὀδὸν καὶ βραδύνειν ὑπὸ πάχους.

Εἴθε δ' ἂν ταῦτα καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρτηριῶν ἐμπροσθεῖν εἰρημένων οὐ σμικρὰ μαρτύρια. πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὅσον οἰκεῖον τε καὶ λεπτὸν αἶμα τοῦ μὴ τοιούτου ῥάον ἐπεται τοῖς ἐλκοῦσιν. ἀτμῶν οὖν ἐλκοῦσαι καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ λεπτὸν αἶμα κατὰ τὰς διαστάσεις αἱ ἀρτηρίαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ τὰ ἐντερά περιεχομένων χυμῶν ἢ οὐδ' ὅλως ἢ παντάπασιν ἐπισπώνται βραχύ.
in their turn snatch it away, then those next again take it from these, until it reaches the vena cava, whence finally the kidneys attract that part of it which is proper to them. Thus it is in no way surprising that wine is taken up more rapidly than water, owing to its appropriateness of quality, and, further, that the white clear kind of wine is absorbed more rapidly owing to its thinness, while black turbid wine is checked on the way and retarded because of its thickness.

These facts, also, will afford abundant proof of what has already been said about the arteries; everywhere, in fact, such blood as is both specifically appropriate and at the same time thin in consistency answers more readily to their traction than does blood which is not so; this is why the arteries which, in their diastole, absorb vapour, pneuma, and thin blood attract either none at all or very little of the juices contained in the stomach and intestines.
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Childbirth, 231, 285
Children's game, 28
Chill, 171, 203 (v. also Cold)
Cholagogues (drugs that draw off bile), 65
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Chorion (membrane enclosing unborn child), 229
Chrysippus, 9
Chyle (emulsified contents of stomach), (v. Emulsification)
Cirrhosis (induration) of liver, 171
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Cold, action of, on skin, 301
Cold-in-the-head, 215 (v. also Chill)
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Colour, 5
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Dysentery, 205
Dyspepsia (v. Indigestion)
Education, 279
Effect (product, work done), 13
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Feces (ordure from bowel), 255
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Fish, voraciousness of, 269
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INDEX AND GLOSSARY

Genesis (development of embryo), 19
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Gravity (explaining secretion of urine), 107
Greediness, 271
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Gullet, 263
—— use of, by stomach, 271
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Haemorrhoids (v. Piles)
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Hippocrates, 9, et passim
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Ileus volvulus (obstruction of bowels), 299, 303
Illusions, sensory, 7
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—— movements of, 243
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Jejunum (part of small intestine), 299
Kidneys, 49, 89
Labour (v. Childbirth)
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Leprosy, 41
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Lichen (a skin-disease), 253
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—— transverse fissure of, 147
—— induration of, 171
—— give-and-take between it and stomach, 291
Lodestone, 71
Love, 47
Lumen (internal cavity of a vessel), 119
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Magnetism, 71
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Medicine, taking of, 269 (v. also Drugs)
Melancholic (v. Atrabiliary)
Membranes, fetal, 231, 285 (v. also Chorion)
Menander, 105
Menodotus, 81
Menstrual blood, 131, 171
Metabolism, diseases of, 41
Midwife, 235
Miscarriage (v. Abortion)
Molecules (of Asclepiades), 63
Morphological hypothesis of bile-secretion, 125, 147
Motion, active and passive, 57
Mouth, lining of, 261
—— digestion in, 253
Mucus, 203, 215
Muscles, voluntary, 263
"Nature," 2; its "Art," 57
Nature-lore (v. Physiology)
Nausea, 287
"Nerve," 151, 272
Nutriment, 41
Nutrition, 31, 149
Obstetric chair, 235
Obstruction of bowels, 299, 303
Oesophagus (v. Gullet)
Omentum (an apron-like fold of fat, overlying the intestine), 143, 255, 313
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Organism, unity of, 61
Organs, nutrition of, 307
Os uteri (mouth of womb), 229
Ovum, human, 135
Oxidation, 211
Oxygen (v. Pneuma)

Pain, 287
Parturition, 231
Pathology, relation to Physiology, 189, 287
Peasants, 87
Perch (v. Fish)
Peripatetic (Aristotelian) School, 139
Peristalsis (contraction and dilatation), 97, 243, 263
Peritoneum, 53
Phidias, 129
Philistion, 173
Philotimus, 183
Phlegm, 67, 201, 215
Phlegmatic temperament, 193
"Physiology," 139
Piles, 171
Plant-life, 8
Plato, 173, 203, 215
Plutarch (congestion), 119
Pneuma (as a vital principle), 153; (as oxygen), 187
Poisons, action of, 251
Porch, the (Stoic School), 145
"Pores" (v. Channels)
Portal vein, 147
Potter's earth, 213
Practitioner, 197
Praxagoras, 51
Praxiteles, 129
"Preformationist" doctrine of Anaxagoras
Presentation (prosthesis) of nutriment to tissues, 39
Prevention and Cure, 169
Principles, the four fundamental (v. Qualitics)
Prodicus, 201
Prolapse of uterus, 235
Propulsive faculty, 231
Prosphysis (v. Adhesion)
Prosthesis (v. Presentation)
Psyche, 3, 153
Psychology, repudiation of, by Atomist School, 45
Pulmonary artery, 121
Pylorus (outlet of stomach), 239
Pylorus, regurgitation through, 289
Pyrrhonists (typical sceptics), 197
Qualities, the four fundamental, 9, 183, 259
—— derivative, 21
Relativity, 17
Renal veins, 107
Respiration, 175, 305
Retentive faculty, 225
Rhetoric, 97
Safflower (drug), 67
Sallva, action of, 253
Scammony (drug), 67
Schools, two contrasted, in Medicine, 45
Scientist, 197
Scorpions, 253
Sculpture, 129
Sectarianism, 55
Sects, medical (v. Schools)
Self-control, 47
Self-education, 279
Semen, 131, 233
Sensation, 47
Septum, perforated, between ventricles of heart, 321
Serum (watery part of blood or milk), 91, 213
Shaping (development of organs), 19
Sieves, 91
Skin-diseases, 253 (v. also Leprosy and Lichens)
Slaves, 103
Sociability, 47
Sophistry, 219, 279
Sophists, 7
Soul, 45
Specific selection of nutriment by tissues (v. Attraction, physiological)
Spermatic ducts, 57
Spirit (v. Pneuma)
Spleen, function and diseases of, 205
—— "uselessness" of, 143
—— as an emunctory of the liver, 277
Statues, 129
Sting-ray (fish), bite of, 85
Stoics, 15, 145
Stomach, function of, 197, 237, 251, 255
—— coats of, 261
Stomach, independent habits of, 271
— give-and-take between it and liver, 291
Stone in bladder, 51
Strength, relative, of different organs, 293
Substance, 9
Superfluities (waste-substances), 35, 291
Swallowing (v. Deglutition)
Symptoms, 13
Synapse, 147
Teeth, 253
Temperament (crasis, mixture of elementary principles), 15, 139, 193
Temperance, 47
Theophrastus, 139
Thorns, drugs for extracting, 83
Tissues, development of, 21
— their action in producing humours, 179, 195
Trachea (windpipe), 305
Transference (passive motion), 7
Transpiration, 153
Treatment, principles of, 199
Tricuspid orifice of heart, 321
Tubes, rigid, 119, 317, 325
Unity of organism, 61
Ureters, 23, 51
Urine, 51
"Useless" organs (Erasistratus), 143
Uterus (womb), 227
Vacuum, tendency to refill (v. Horror vacui)
Valves of heart, 121, 315
Vaporisation (v. Evaporation)
Vegetable diet, 35, 179
Vegetative life, 3
Veins, structure of, 283
— "arterial" (v. Pulmonary artery)
— coronary, 323
— hepatic, 147
— mesenteric, 293, 305
— portal, 147
— renal, 107, 143
— vena cava (chief vein of body), 91
— collapse of, 119
Ventricles of heart, communication between, 321
Vipers, 85
Vitalist School in Medicine, 45
Vivisection, 59, 241, 273
Voluntary motion, 3
Volvulus (intestinal obstruction) 299, 303
Vomiting, 241, 247, 267
— faecal, 299
Waste-products (v. Superfluities)
Whey (v. Serum)
Wine, 209, 329
Womb (v. Uterus)
Wounds, 185
Wrestling, 125
Zeno, of Citium, 3
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