

τὴν λογικὴν, ἢ ὅσῃν ἑκάτερά δύναμιν ἔχῃ σαφῶς
εὑρεθῇ. καὶ νῦν ἡμῖν πρόκειται περὶ τῆς λογικῆς
εὑρέσεως εἰπεῖν.

160K

ἀρ' οὖν ἔχομεν ἢ τινα μέθοδον ἢ χρώμενοι τῶν εἰρη-
μένων ἕκαστον εὑρίσσομεν; ἀνελεῖν λέγω τὸ περιττὸν
τῷ γένει καὶ μεταβεῖναι τὸ τὴν οἰκείαν χώραν ὑπερ-
λαχός, ἐνώσαι τε τῆς συνεχείας λελυμένον. ἢ τὴν
ἐμπειρικὴν ὑπ' αὐτὰ παρακαλέσομεν; ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ
πάνυ πέπεισμαι μέθοδον ὑπάρχειν τινὰ τῆς τῶν
ζητουμένων εὑρέσεως, ἧς ἀρχὴν εἶναι τὴν ἐκ τῶν
νοσημάτων ἑκάστου προσπίπτοντα σκοπόν. ἢ γὰρ
τῆς συνεχείας λύσις τὴν ἔνωσιν ἐπιζητεῖ. κατὰ μὲν
ὅστων κατάγμα λεγομένη, κατὰ δὲ τὸ σαρκώδες μέ-
ρος ἔλκος, ὥσπερ γε καὶ τὸ τραῦμα καὶ τὸ ῥήγμα καὶ
τὸ σπᾶσμα, τὸ μὲν ἐν σαρκώδει μορίῳ διὰ τοῦ τρα-
θῆναι γεγονός, τὸ δὲ ῥήγμα καὶ τὸ σπᾶσμα χωρὶς τοῦ
τραθῆναι, σαρκώδους μὲν ἐν τῷ ῥήγματι μορίου τῆς
συνχείας λυθέντος, νευρώδους δὲ ἐν τῷ σπᾶσματι.
τούτων ἀπάντων ὁ μὲν σκοπὸς ἔνωσις. εἴτε δ' οἷόν τε
τυχεῖν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἅπαν, εἴτ' οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ πολλαχόθι,
τοῦτ' αὐτὸ πρῶτον ἤδη τεχνίτου γινώσκειν. ἰδιώτης
γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν οὐθ' ὅτι τῶν φρενῶν τὸ νευρώδες οὐθ'

¹ The term *σκοπός* is sometimes rendered "indicator" rather than the more usual "aim" or "objective," depending on context. Linacre was aware of the difficulty, translating *σκοπός* as *indicatio* here with a marginal note to the effect that it is different from *ἐνδειξις*, which is clearly a technical term for Galen.

² Another somewhat problematical term is *ἔλκος*, which is

the rational, so that whatever power each one has may be clearly revealed. And the task before us now is to speak of rational discovery.

Do we, then, have some method, using which we will discover each of the aforementioned things? I say it is to take away what is in excess in the class, change the place of what is altered in respect to its proper place, and unite what has suffered dissolution of continuity. Or shall we invoke the empirical [method] for these? I, too, am very much persuaded that there is a certain method for the discovery of the things sought, the beginning of which is the indicator¹ that comes from each of the diseases. For the dissolution of continuity requires union. In a bone [this dissolution] is called a fracture, while in a fleshy part it is called a wound (*helkos*),² just as in fact it is also called a wound (*trauma*), rupture or tear. It is a wound when the wounding occurs in a fleshy part, whereas rupture or tearing occurs apart from wounding, the former when there is dissolution of continuity in the rending of a fleshy part, and the latter when it arises in rupture of a sinewy part.³ What is indicated (the goal) for all these things is union. Whether it is possible for this to happen everywhere, or is not possible in many places, is now primarily a matter for the expert to know. No layman knows that neither the sinewy part of the diaphragm, nor the small intestines

160K

considered at some length in the Introduction, section 6. In this book it clearly corresponds to "wound" in modern terms. Context determines the choice between "wound" and "ulcer."

³ A third term with variable meaning is *neuron* and its cognates (as above). The options are "nerve" and "sinew," the choice again depending on context.

161K ὅτι τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν ἐντέρων | οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ δέξασθαι τὸν σκοπόν, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ περὶ πόσθης, οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ λεπτοῦ τῶν γνάθων οἶδεν· ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ τερηδὼν ὅστω δύναται θεραπευθῆναι, καθάπερ ἐν σαρκὶ διάβρωσις· οὐδ' εἰ τὸ κάταγμα συμφύθηναι, καθάπερ τὸ τραῦμα, κατὰ ταῦτα δὲ οὐδ' εἰ πωρωθῆναι δύναται γινώσκει· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ καταγμάτων ὁ ἰδιώτης οὐδὲν οἶδεν, εἴτε χρὴ τὴν πώρωσιν ἀναμένειν, εἴτ' ἄλλως ἰᾶσθαι. πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον οὐδὲ εἰ καρδίας τρωθείσης ἢ πνεύμονος ἢ γαστροῦς ἢ ἥπατος ἐλπίζειν χρὴ τὴν ἱασιν· οὐδ' ὅλως οὐδὲν οὐκέτι περαιτέρω τοῦ πρώτου σκοποῦ γινώσκει τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οὐδεὶς.

τοῦτ' οὖν αὐτὸ πρῶτον ἤδη τῆς τέχνης ἔργον, ἥτοι τυχεῖν ἐλπίζειν τοῦ τέλους ἢ ἀπογινώσκειν τοῦ τυχεῖν· διττὴ δ' ἡ γνώσις αὐτοῦ καὶ τρίτην οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ γεινέσθαι· διὰ μὲν τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἢ ἑτέρα, μακροῦ δηλονότι χρόνου δεομένη· διὰ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος φύσεως ἢ ἑτέρα· καὶ γὰρ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκάστων τῶν μορίων ἐπισκέψεται καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὴν χρείαν καὶ τὴν θέσιν, ἐξ ὧν ὁρμωμένη τό τ' ἀδύνατον ἰαθῆναι προγνώσεται καὶ τοῦ | δυνατοῦ δέξασθαι τὴν ἱασιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν βοθημάτων εὐρέσεως ἐπισκέψεται.

2. Πρόδηλον δ' ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπλουστάτων ἄρξῃται. τί δ' ἀπλούστερον ἔλκους ἐπιπολῆς ἐν σαρκώδει μορίῳ; τοῦτ' οὖν εἰ μὲν ἀπλῶς ἔλκος εἴη, σκοπὸς αὐτοῦ τῆς ἰάσεως ἔνωσις· εἰ δὲ σὺν κοιλότητι, διττὸς μὲν ὁ σκοπός, ὅτι καὶ ἡ διάθεσις διττὴ· συνεχείας μὲν

can "accept" what is indicated, and he certainly does not know about either the prepuce or the thin part of the cheeks. Besides, he does not know if caries of the bone can be treated, and the same with an erosion in flesh, or whether a fracture knits, or a wound heals. Similarly, he does not know if a callus can be made hard. In like manner, too, the layman does not know, concerning fractures in the head, whether it is necessary to await callus formation or to effect a cure in another way. Much more, however, does he not know if he should hope for a cure when the heart has been wounded, or the lung, stomach or liver; nor, in general, does any layman know anything beyond the primary objective.

This, then, is now the very first task of the craft—to know whether there is hope of achieving the desired outcome or not. This knowledge has two components; it is not possible for there to be a third. One is knowledge from experience, which clearly requires a long time. The other is knowledge from the nature of the matter itself, which takes into account the substance of each of the parts, and their function, use, and position. Proceeding from these factors, not only will there be prior knowledge of what cannot be cured and of what can respond to the cure, but also there will be consideration of the discovery of remedies.

2. It is clear that [we should] begin from the most simple [diseases]. What is simpler than a superficial wound in a fleshy part? If this wound is simple, the objective of its cure is union. If it has a cavity, the objective is twofold in that the condition is also twofold—the wound is a dissolu-

λύσις τὸ ἔλκος, ἀπώλεια δὲ οὐσίας τινὸς οἰκείας τῷ
ζῳῇ ἢ κοιλότης. εὐρίσκεται δὲ κἀνταῦθα πολλάκις ὁ
ἕτερος τῶν σκοπῶν ἀδύνατος· οἷον εἰ μὴ μόνον ἢ
σάρξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον ὅσπου ἀπολωλὸς
εἴη· πληρωθῆναι γὰρ ἀκριβῶς ἢ τοιαύτη κοιλότης οὐ
δύναται, ἀλλ' ἐπολῶσθαι μὲν, ὅπερ ἦν ἔλκος ἱασις,
ἀνίατος δὲ ἢ κοιλότης καταλειφθήσεται. τοῦτ' οὖν
αὐθις αὐτὸ πάντως μὲν ἦτοι διὰ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἢ διὰ
τοῦ λόγου χρὴ γινώσκειν· ὁ Θεσσαλὸς δὲ οὔτε τούτοις
χρήται καὶ τρίτον οὐδὲν προστίθισιν, εἰτ' οὐκ αἰδεῖ-
ται ληρῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τούτου· τὸ κοῖλον δ' ἔλκος ἐν
σαρκώδει μορίῳ χωρὶς τοῦ πεπονθέναι τι τῶν ὑποκει-
μένων ὅπως ἰασάμεθα λεγέτω παρελθὼν ὁ Θεσσα-
λειος | ἱατρός. Ἐμβαλόντες, φησί, τὸ σαρκωτικὸν
163K φάρμακον· εὖ γε τῆς εὐχερείας, ἵσως δ' ἀναισθησίας
εἰπεῖν ἦν ἄμεινον, εἰ σαρκωτικὸν εἰπὼν ἀπηλλάχθαι
δοκεῖ τοῦ ζητουμένου· εἰ γὰρ ἤδη τὸ σαρκωτικὸν
ἐπιστάμεθα, τί ζητοῦμεν ἔτι; λέγε μοι τὸ σαρκωτικὸν
ὃ τί ποτ' ἐστίν, ᾧ μέλλεις χρῆσθαι; λιβανωτόν, οἶμαι,
φήσεις, ἔριν ἢ ἀριστολοχίαν ἢ ὀρόβιον ἄλευρον ἢ
πάνακα· τῶν γὰρ ξηρῶν φαρμάκων πρῶτον μνημο-
νεύσω. ταῦτ' οὖν εἰπέ μοι πόθεν εὔρες; Ἐκ τῆς πείρας,
φησί. τί δὴ οὖν ἔτι προσέθηκας σύ; τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὅτι
χρὴ πληροῦν τὸ κοῖλον οἶδε δήπου καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης. τὸ δ'
ἐξ ὧν καὶ δι' ὧν φαρμάκων, ἐδίδαξεν ἢ πείρα.

Θεσσαλὸς δ' οὐθ' ὡς Ἐμπειρικὸς οἶδε τὸ φάρμακον
οὐθ' ὡς Λογικός. ὡς Ἐμπειρικὸς μὲν, ὅτι μὴ βούλεται·
ὡς Λογικὸς δέ, ὅτι μὴ δύναται· ἐπεὶ ὅτι γε ὡς Ἐμ-

tion of continuity, while the cavity is a destruction of some
substance proper to the organism. In this situation, it is
often found that one of the objectives is impossible; for
example, if not only the flesh is destroyed but also the
underlying bone. A cavity of this kind cannot be filled up
perfectly but it can be scarred over, which is a cure of the
wound, although the cavity will be left behind incurable.
This itself is something which, in general, we must know
either through experience or through reason. Thessalus,
however, does not use [either of] these means, nor does he
add a third. And he is not embarrassed by his humbug, but
allows it. Let the Thessaleian doctor come forward and say
how we will cure a hollow wound in a fleshy part when
there is no involvement of anything underlying. "By apply-
ing an enfleshing (sarcotic) medication," he says. Well, it
would be better to speak of his recklessness, or perhaps
of his stupidity if, having mentioned "enfleshing," he
thinks he is absolved from the search. If we already know
what is enfleshing, why would we look any further? Tell
me, at some point, what this "sarcotic" is that you intend to
use? Frankincense, I think you will say, or iris, or aristo-
lochia, or meal from bitter vetch, or panax—for I shall
mention first the dry medications. Tell me, from what
source did you discover these? "From experience," he
says. What more is there for you to still add? Even the lay-
man, presumably, also knows that we must fill the cavity.
However, experience teaches us from what and by which
medications.

Thessalus does not, however, know the medication as
the Empiric knows it or as the Dogmatic knows it. He does
not know it as the Empiric knows it because he does not
wish to, and he does not know it as the Dogmatic knows it

πειρικὸς οἶδεν, ἀκριβῶς ἐγὼ τοῦτο γινώσκω. δυοῖν γὰρ ὄντοι ἀπάσης εὐρέσεως ὀργάνων, ἐμπειρίας καὶ λόγου, ὃ τὸ μὲν εὐρημένον ἐπιστάμενος, εἰπεῖν δ' οὐκ ἔχων αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον, εὐδελὸς ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς ἐμπειρίας εὐρηκῶς. ἵνα ἰ τοῖνυν εἰδῇ πόσον ἀμαρτάνει, μικρὸν ἢ συχάσας ἀκροατῆς ἡμῶν γενέσθω· βούλομαι γάρ τινα διαλεχθῆναι τῷ μονῇ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν πρεσβεύοντι.

δίκαιον γὰρ οἶμαι κακεῖνον εἰπεῖν ὅπως εἶρε τοῦτι τὸ σαρκωτικὸν φάρμακον τὸ ξηρόν, ὃ δὴ κεφαλικὸν ὀνομάζουσι· σύγκειται δὲ ἐξ ἵρεως καὶ ἀριστολοχίας ὀρόβου τε καὶ λιβανωτοῦ καὶ μάννης. ἔστι καὶ ἕτερόν τι ᾧ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις καὶ φλοιὸς πάνακος ἐπεμβάλλεται· καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἕτερόν ἐστιν ᾧ καὶ καδμεία πεπλυμένη προσεπεμβάλλεται. λεγέτω τοῖνυν ὑπὲρ τούτων ὅπως εὐρέθη. Καὶ τί μοί, φησι, ζητεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐρέσεως αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῖς εὐρημένοις ὀρθῶς χρῆσθαι· ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν εὐθὺς κατ' ἀρχὰς ἀποφαίνονται, κατὰ σύμβασιν δέ, καλοῦσι γὰρ οὕτως αὐτοὶ καὶ τῷ ῥήματι τούτῳ, ποτὲ μὲν ἐξ ὀνειράτων ἐνδέχεσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα εὐρησθῆαι φασιν, ἔστι δ' ὅτε κατὰ δῆ τινα τύχην ἐκχυθῆναι τὸ ἕτερον εἰς τὸ ἕτερον, εἰτά τινα τῷ μικτῷ τολμῆσαι χρῆσασθαι, τῆς τόλμης δ' οὐ λέγειν τὴν ἐλπίδα. ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν πρόδηλος λῆρος.

ὁ δὲ τρίτος αὐτοῖς τρόπος τῆς εὐρέσεώς ἐστιν

⁴ On this medication, see Galen, *De compositione medicamentorum per genera* 2.3, XIII.541K ff.

because he is unable to, since what the Empiric knows is precisely what I know. There are two "instruments" for every discovery—experience and reason. Someone who knows what has been discovered but is not able to state the reason for it has clearly made his discovery from experience. Accordingly, that he might know how much he errs, let him be my silent listener for a short while, as I wish certain matters to be discussed with someone who privileges experience alone.

In my view it is only right for that person also to say how he discovered that this particular enfleshing medication, which is dry and which they actually call cephalicum,⁴ is compounded from iris, aristolochia, bitter vetch, frankincense, and manna. And there is also another thing, in addition to those mentioned, which is put in—the bark of panax. And furthermore, there is yet another thing added to it which is washed cadmia. Accordingly, let him say how they were discovered. "But why," he will say, "is it necessary for me to speak about the search for the discovery of these constituents, but not about how to use correctly those that have been discovered?" These particular things, therefore, are apparent straightaway at the outset, but they appear "by coincidence," for these men speak of them like this and with this term. They say it is sometimes possible for such things to be discovered from dreams, and sometimes again that by some chance one thing merges into another. So then [they say] that someone has the courage to make use of the mixture, but they don't speak of the expectation of that courage. These particular claims are transparent humbug.

The third way of discovery for them is really inferential.

165K ὄντως ἐπιλογιστικός· ἐκάστου | γὰρ ἐκείνων ἀπλῶν
 ἰδίᾳ τις πεπειραμένος ὡς σαρκωτικῶν, κᾶπειθ' εὐ-
 ρίσκων ἐνίοτε μὴ σαρκούντα, προσεπελογίσαστο μὴ
 πάσῃ φύσει πᾶν ἀρμόττειν. εἰ γὰρ ὃν οὐκ ἐσάρκωσεν
 ἢ ἀριστολογία, τούτου ὁ λιβανωτὸς ἐσάρκωσεν, ᾧ δ' ὁ
 λιβανωτὸς οὐχ ἤρμωτε, τούτῳ τῆς ἱρεως προσαχθεί-
 σης ἀπήντησε τὸ δέον, εὖλογον, οἶμαι, μὴ πάντας ὑπὸ
 πάντων ὁμοίως διατίθεσθαι. τούτου δ' ἅπαξ εἰς ἐπι-
 λογισμὸν ἐλθόντος ἄμεινον ἔδοξεν ὡς οἷόν τε πλείστα
 τῶν ὁμοειδῶν εἰς ταῦτόν ἀναμίζειν, ἵν' ἐκάστη φύσις
 σώματος εὐπορῇ τοῦ προσήκουτος. καὶ μὴν, ὃ ἑταῖρε,
 ἐν τῇ συμπλοκῇ τῶν εἰδῶν οὐ φυλάττονται τῶν οἰ-
 κείων οὐσιῶν αἱ ἐνέργειαι, ὡς ἐπὶ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου εἶδους
 τῷ ὠφελεῖν εἰς νόσον ἢ ὑπερ χρῆς θεραπεύειν εὐπορεῖν
 τοῦ προσήκουτος. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦτοι τὴν φύσιν ἡδύναντο
 τοῦ σώματος ἐξευρεῖν ἢ τοῦ προσφερομένου φαρ-
 μάκου τὴν δύναμιν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἴσως ἐδέχθηεν αὐτοῖς τῆς
 τοιαύτης ποικιλίας, ἐν ἐκάστοτε φάρμακον ἐφ' ἐνὶ
 σώματι τὸ συμφέρον εὐρίσκειν δυναμένοις. ἐπεὶ δ'
 ἀγνοοῦσιν ἐκάτερον, κακῶς ἀναμιγνύουσιν ἅπαντα,
 166K πολλαῖς φύσεσιν ἀρμόττον ἐπιτεχνήσασθαι | βουλό-
 μενοι ἐν φάρμακον.

τούτου τὸν τρόπον τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν φαρμάκων
 ἐγὼ πείθομαι τοῖς πρώτοις τῶν ἱατρῶν ἐπιμενεῖσθαι

For if someone has tried out each of those simple medica- 165K
 tions individually as sarcotics, then, when he discovers that
 sometimes one is not enfleshing, he has provided further
 proof that not everything is suitable for every nature. For if
 frankincense created flesh in a particular person when
 aristolochia did not, or if in someone for whom frankin-
 cense was not suitable what was needed followed when iris
 was applied, it would be a reasonable inference, I think,
 that not all people are affected in the same way by all
 things. Once [the doctor] has come to this inference, it
 would seem better, as far as possible, to mix most of the like
 forms in the same medication so that each bodily nature
 has an abundance of what is appropriate. And yet, my
 friend, in the combination of the forms, the actions of the
 specific substances are not preserved such that, in the case
 of each single kind of body, there is an abundance of what
 is beneficial for the disease we must treat.⁵ For if they
 were able to discover either the nature of the body or the
 potency of the medication being applied, perhaps there
 would be nothing lacking for them among such diversity,
 as they would be able to discover one medication which is
 useful when applied in one body on each occasion. But
 since they don't know either thing (i.e. the nature of the
 body or the potency of the medication), they mix every- 166K
 thing badly when they wish to devise a single medication
 suitable to many natures.

I believe this manner of synthesis of medications was
 invented by the first doctors and I accept it as an ancient

⁵ Linacre has a marginal note on this sentence that part is
 missing from some manuscripts. His Latin version has been trans-
 lated; see Linacre (1546), p. 122.

καὶ ὡς ἀρχαῖον εὔρεμα προσίεμαι. τοσοῦτόν γε μὴν ἀποδεῖν ἡγοῦμαι τῆς ὄντως μεθόδου θεραπευτικῆς, ὅσον εὐλογώτερός ἐστι τῶν ἐγχεομένων εἰς ἄλληλα κοσκίνων. εἰ γὰρ μὴ λογίζεται πρῶτον μὲν ὡς μόνῃς τῆς ἐξ ὁμοειδῶν φαρμάκων συνθέσεως, οὐ μὴν τῆς γ' ἐξ ἐναντίων εἴρηκε τὴν μέθοδον. ἔπειθ' ὡς ἐν τῷ πλήθει τῆς μίξεως ἐν μὲν, εἰ τύχοι, τὸ τῷ πάσχοντι προσήκόν ἐστι φάρμακον, ἐγχαρῆ δὲ καὶ μηδέν, ἐπτα δ' ἢ ὀκτὼ τῶν οὐκ οἰκείων ὥστε πλείοσιν ἀριθμοῖς βλάψαι τὸ τοιοῦτον ἢ ὠφελῆσαι· ταῦτ' εἰ μὴ λογίζεται, πλέον αὐτὸν ἀγνοεῖν ἢ γινώσκειν τοῦ πράγματος εἴποιμ' ἄν.

167K

ἔλαιον γοῦν ἐγχεόμενον ἔλκει κοίλῳ πάντων ἐναντιώτατον φάρμακον· εἰ γὰρ ἐθελήσεις οὕτω θεραπεύειν, αὐτὴ γνώσεις τῇ πείρᾳ ῥυπαρὸν καὶ βρυῶδες ἀποτελούμενον τὸ ἔλκος. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡ ὥρα τοῦ ἔτους θερμῇ τύχοι καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἴη κακοχυμώτερος, ἢ φύσει ἢ ῥευματικώτερος ἢ καὶ περὶ τὴν διαίταν τι πλημμελοῖη, κίνδυνος τούτῳ σαπῆναι τὸ μόριον ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἔλκος ἐγένετο. κίνδυνος δὲ καὶ εἰ κηρῷ μόνῳ χρῶο, καὶ εἰ τήκων ἐλαίῳ· ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν διασήψει σοι τὸ ἔλκος· εἰ δὲ ἰὸν λειώσας ἐμπλάττης, οὐ διασήψει μὲν οὗτός γε οὐδαμῶς, ὁδύνῃ δ' ἐργάσεται καὶ δῆξιν οὐ σμικράν, ἀνάβρωσιν τε καὶ φλεγμονήν· εἰ δὲ ἐπιπλέον χρήσαιο, καὶ σπασμόν. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν οὔτε τὸ ἔλαιον οὔτε ὁ ἰὸς οὔτε ὁ κηρὸς ἔλκος κοῖλον σαρκῶσαι δύνανται, δῆλον ὡς οὐδὲ μίξει ποτ' αὐτὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπειρίας οὐδεῖς·

discovery. Yet in fact I think it is deficient as a true method of treatment to the extent that it is more applicable to the situation when sieves pour their contents into one another. For if he does not take into account first that which is only from the synthesis of like medications, he has not, in fact, spoken of the method of synthesis from opposites. So, in the many components of the mixture, it may happen that there is one medication appropriate to the patient, although it is also possible there is none, or that there are seven or eight that are not appropriate. So such a medication with a greater number [of components] will harm rather than help and, if he does not take these things into account, I would say he is more ignorant than knowledgeable about the matter.

At any rate, oil, when it is poured on a hollow wound, is the most inimical medication of all [to healing] for, if you do wish to treat in this way, you will know from experience itself that the wound is made filthy and foul-smelling. And if it happens to be a hot time of the year, or if the person is rather *kakochymous*, or more subject to flux by nature, or also if there is something wrong with the regimen, there is for this man a danger of putrefaction involving the part in which the wound exists. There is also a danger if you use either wax alone, or wax dissolved in oil; these particular things will putrefy the wound for you. If, however, you apply triturated verdigris, this will in no way putrefy, although it will bring about pain and no little biting, erosion and inflammation. If you use still more, it will bring about convulsions as well. Since, therefore, neither oil, verdigris nor wax is able to enliven a hollow wound, it is clear that none of those [men] who work on the basis of experience will ever mix them.

167K

ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μίξω γέ τῳ δέοντι μέτρῳ καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα μυρία φάρμακα τῶν βλαπτόντων ἰδίως ἔλκος κοῖλον. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ταῖς αὐταῖς δυνάμεσι βλάπτουσιν, ἀλλ' ὑπεναντίαις, ἄμετρα δῆπουθέν ἐστιν ὡς πρὸς ἔλκους κοῖλου πλήρῳσιν. ἀλλ' ὅπως ἐκ δυοῖν ἀμέτρων κράσεων ἐν ἀποτελεῖται σύμμετρον, ἐν τοῖς περὶ φαρμάκων συνθέσεως ἐμάθομεν λογισμοῖς. οὐκ οὐκ ἔτι χαλεπὸν ἐξ ἐλαίου καὶ κηροῦ καὶ ἰοῦ συνθεῖναι φάρμακον σαρκωτικόν· εἰ γὰρ εἰδείης ὡς ἡ ξηραίνεσθαι μετρίως δεῖται τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔλκος, οὐ ξηραίνει δ' οὔτε ὁ κηρὸς οὔτ' ἔλαιον, εἰδείης ἂν ὡς οὔτε ἐκάτερον οὔτ' ἄμφω πληρώσουσιν ἔλκος κοῖλον· οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ὁ ἰὸς μόνος, ἀμέτρως γὰρ ξηραίνει. μίξας οὖν ἅπαντα συμμέτρως ξηρὸν ἐργάσασθαι δυνήσῃ φάρμακον· ὅπου σον δ' ἐκάστου χρή τὸ μέτρον εἶναι δέδεται μὲν ἤδη μοι καὶ τοῖς περὶ φαρμάκων συνθέσεως ὑπομνήμασιν, δειχθήσεται δὲ καὶ νῦν, εἰ δεηθείη, τοῦ λόγου προϊόντος. ἀποπέμψαι γάρ με χρή πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐφεξῆς λόγων τὸν ἀμέθοδον ἐκέλευον Θεσσαλόν, ἐνδείξάμενον αὐτῷ πόσον ἀμαρτάνει τοῦ δέοντος. φρονίμως γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ τὰ νῦν εἰρημένα σαφῶς ἐνδείκνυται τὴν θεραπευτικὴν μέθοδον ὁποῖαν τινα εἶναι χρή. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐ πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους ὁ λόγος· ὥστε ἀναγκαῖον ἔτι διαλεχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐνθὲνδε ποθέν ἀρξάμενον.

But I will mix, in the required amount, both these and countless other medications that are individually harmful to a hollow wound. If [the medications] are harmful not by the same potencies but by those that are opposite, presumably they are disproportionate for the filling of a hollow wound. But we did learn in the discussions about the composition of medications how a mixture from two immoderate medications makes one moderate medication. So there is no longer any problem about compounding a sarcotic medication from oil, wax and verdigris. If you know that such a wound or ulcer needs to be moderately dried, and that neither wax nor oil dries, you would know that neither each one singly nor both together would fill up a hollow wound or ulcer. And neither would verdigris alone, for it dries excessively. But then, when you mix all these, you are able to make a moderately drying medication. What the amount of each must be, I have already shown in the treatises on the synthesis of medications,⁶ and will show again now if needs be as the argument proceeds. For it is first necessary for me to dismiss that "methodless" Thessalus from the discussions to follow, once I have shown him how far he strays from what is right. And to the sensible man those things now spoken of demonstrate clearly what sort of thing the therapeutic method must be. But the argument is not directed to such people, so it is still necessary here for the origin to be discussed with them.

⁶ We have been unable to locate the recipe for the preparation of this compound medication in either *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos* (XII.378–1007K and XIII.1–361K) or *per genera* (XIII.362–1058K). For the preparation of verdigris, see Dioscorides, V.91.

169K ἅπαντα κοιλότης παρὰ φύσιν ἐνδείκνυται τὴν πλήρωσιν ὥστε καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ σαρκώδει μορίῳ αὕτη δὲ ἡ πλήρωσις σκοπὸς τῆς τῶν ἰαμάτων εὐρέσεως γίγνεται. ἵνα δ' εὐρεθῇ τὰ πληρώσαντα καὶ ἰ λόγον δεόμεθα συχνοῦ καὶ πολλῶν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐνδείξεων, καὶ μεθόδου λογικῆς ἀκριβοῦς· ἐθεάσω γοῦν πολλάκις ἔλκη δυσίατα μὴ δυναμένους θεραπεῦσαι μήτε τοὺς τὴν ἐμπειρίαν πρεσβεύοντας ἰατροὺς τούτους δὴ τοὺς πολυφαρμάκους, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τοὺς τὸν ἀναλογισμὸν ἐπαγγελλομένους ἅπαντας.

οἱ γὰρ Θεσσάλειοι Μεθοδικοὶ μὲν τοῦνομα, ταῖς δ' ἀληθείαις Ἀμέθοδοι, καθάπερ τινὲς ὄνοι λύρας οὐδ' ἐπαῖειν ἱκανοὶ τῆς τοιαύτης θεωρίας εἰσί, μὴ τοί γε δὴ λογισμῷ τὸ δέον ἐξευρίσκειν. ἐθεάσω δὲ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἐλκῶν τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἄλλοι' ἐπ' ἄλλο μεταβαίνοντας φάρμακον, οὐ μὰ Δία λογισμοῦ τινος ἐξηγουμένου τῆς μεταβάσεως, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλῶν μὲν ἐπειράθησαν πληροῦντων ἔλκη κοῖλα, τὴν δ' ὡς αὐτοὶ καλοῦσιν ἰδιοσυγκρασίαν, ἐφ' οἷς ἕκαστον αὐτῶν εὐδοκίμησεν οὔτε διαγινώσκειν οὔτε μεμνήσθαι δύνανται, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἐπιτάμεινοι μὲν ἐφ' ὃ τι χρὴ μεταβαίνειν, ἐλπίζοντες δ' ἐν πολλῇ τῇ κατὰ μέρος διεξόδῳ πάντως εὐρεθῆσεσθαι ποτε τὸ προσήκον, ἄλλοι' ἐπ' ἄλλο μεταπηδῶσι, τύχη μᾶλλον ἢ λογισμῷ τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος ἰεῦρεσιν ἐπιτρέποντες. ὅμοιοι δ' αὐτοῖς εἰσι, καὶ μὴ θέλωσιν, ὅσοι τῶν Δογματιζόντων ἐπὶ τὰς φυσικὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν σωμάτων οὐκ ἐδυνήθησαν ἀναβῆναι τῷ

Every cavity contrary to nature indicates [the need] for filling, so this also applies in a fleshy part, and this filling is itself the indicator of the discovery of the cures. In order that the things which are filling are discovered, we need considerable discussion, many indications individually, and a method that is logical and precise. At all events, you often see intractable wounds or ulcers, which neither these doctors who give primacy to experience and so rely on polypharmacy, nor all those who profess to follow the course of reason are able to treat. 169K

Now the Thessaleians, while Methodics by name, are, however, "Amethodics" when it comes to matters of truth, just as some asses are toward the lyre, nor are they capable of understanding such a theory, and certainly not of discovering by reasoning what is needed. On the other hand, you have often seen, in such wounds or ulcers, those who rely on experience change sometimes from one medication to another without, by Zeus, providing any rationale for the change. But since they make trial of many agents for filling hollow wounds or ulcers, as they call the particular characteristic, they are unable to either recognize or remember for what aspects each of the agents was held in high regard and, because of this, they now do not know which one they ought to change to. Hoping, no doubt, that what is appropriate will, at some time, be discovered by many individual trials, they jump from one to another, entrusting the discovery of what is useful more to chance than to reason. Some of the Dogmatics are like them, even if they don't wish [to be]; [that is,] those who are not able to advance in the argument as far as the natural origins of 170K

λόγῳ. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοί, καθότι πρόσθεν ἐδείξαμεν, ἐξ ἡμίσεώς εἰσιν Ἑμπειρικοί, οἱ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν διαλαβεῖν περὶ τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων. περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀμεθόδων τούτων Θεσσαλείων τί ἂν τις καὶ λέγοι; μόνοι τοῖνυν οἱ ὄντως μεθόδῳ θεραπεύοντες ἐξευρίσκουσι τε τὸ δέον ἢ φάρμακον ἢ διαίτημα καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν τοιούτων ἐλκῶν ἐπιδεικνύουσι τε τὰ σαφέστατα διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ὀπηλίκον ἀγαθόν ἐστι καὶ ὅσον φῶς παρέχει πρὸς τὰς ἰάσεις ἢ περὶ φύσεως πραγματεία.

καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ὡς τοῖς συνεχῶς ἀφ' ἑτέρου φαρμάκου μεταβαίνουσιν ἐφ' ἕτερον ἐνίστε παροράται καὶ καταφρονεῖται τὸ χρήσιμον, ἐπέδειξά σοι πολλάκις ἐνὶ φαρμάκῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἐλκῶν θεραπεύσας ὧν ἔφθανον ἐκεῖνοι κεχρησθαι. κατεφρονήθη δ' εἰκότως ἡ δύναμις τοῦ τοιούτου φαρμάκου διὰ τε τὴν ἀκαιρίαν τῆς χρήσεως, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ὠφελῆσαι δόξαντος, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσβλάψαι, καὶ διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἐνίστε σαφὲς ἐργάζεσθαι | τὴν πρώτην χρήσιν. ἐθεάσω δὲ καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν ὀδύνας σφοδροτάτας ἰασαμένους ἡμᾶς ἢ λουτροῖς ἢ οἶνου πόσεσιν ἢ πυρίαις ἢ φλεβοτομίαις ἢ καθάρσεσιν, ἐφ' ὧν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἱατρῶν ἢ ταυτὶ τὰ δι' ὀπίου καὶ μανδραγόρου καὶ ὑοσκυάμου συντιθέμενα φάρμακα, μεγίστην λῶβην ὀφθαλμῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλῳ τινὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ παραχρήμα δόκησιν τῆς ἀνωδυνίας ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ νεκροῦν τὴν αἰσθησιν ἐργάζονται. καὶ πολλοὺς οἶσθα μετὰ τὰς τοιαύτας χρήσεις τῶν φαρμάκων, ἐπειδὰν ἀμετρότερον προσαχθῇ, μηκέτ' ἐπανελθόντας εἰς τὸ κατὰ

bodies. For they, too, just as I showed before, are "semi-Empirics"—those who have not been able to understand about the primary elements. And what might someone say about these "amethodical" Thessaleians? Only those who truly treat by method both discover the required medication or regimen for each of such wounds or ulcers and display with the utmost clarity by their actions how great a good the treatise on nature is and how much light it provides regarding cures.⁷

Certainly, I too have often shown you that I have treated such wounds with a single medication from among the medications which those men have mixed beforehand—a medication whose usefulness is sometimes overlooked and neglected by those who change continually from one medication to another. In all likelihood, the potency of such a medication was disregarded because it was used at an inopportune time—a time when the medication not only seemed to be of no benefit but even to be harmful, and because sometimes it had no apparent effect during the first use. You have also seen me cure very severe pains of the eyes with either baths, drinks of wine, vapor baths, phlebotomy or purging, in cases where the majority of doctors have nothing else to offer apart from those medications compounded from opium, mandrake and henbane, to the very great detriment of the eyes. For they bring about the impression of pain relief in the short term by no other means than the destruction of the sensation [of the eyes]. And you know that many people, after the use of these kinds of medications whenever they are applied to

⁷ It is not entirely clear which treatise is referred to here. It is probably *De elementis secundum Hippocratem*.

φύσιν, ἀλλ' ἀρξαμένους μὲν ἐντεῦθεν ἀμυδρῶς καὶ
 μόγις ὁρᾶν, ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ δ' ὑποχύσεσιν ἢ μυδρι-
 ασεσιν ἢ φθίσεσιν ἢ ῥυτιδώσεσιν ἀλόντας.

οἶσθα δὲ δήπου συνδιατρίψας ἡμῖν εὐθὺς ἐκ μει-
 ρακίου, μηδὲ παρ' ἐνὶ τῶν διδασκάλων θεασαμένους
 ἡμᾶς ἔργον τοιοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἐξευρόντας αὐτοὺς τῷ
 λογισμῷ· καὶ ὅτι γε πολλῷ χρόνῳ τὸν ἀφορισμὸν
 ἀνεσκεψάμην ἐκείνον, Ὀδύνας ὀφθαλμῶν ἀκρητοπο-
 σίη ἢ λουτρὸν ἢ πυρίη ἢ φλεβοτομίη ἢ φαρμακείη
 λύει, καὶ ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης ἀκριβείας Ἱπποκράτους
 172K ἡλπιζον μηδ' ἐνταῦθα | μήτε ψεύδός τι μήτ' ἀδύνατον
 λέγεσθαι καὶ ὡς τοῦτ' ἦν με τὸ προτρέψαν ἐπὶ τὴν
 ζήτησιν, ἕως οὗ καὶ ταύτην τὴν Ἱπποκράτους ὁδὸν
 ἐξεύρον διορίσασθαι, πότε καὶ πῶς ἐφ' ἐκάστου τῶν
 εἰρημένων χρηστέον. ὃ καὶ δῆλον ἐποίησα πολλοῖς
 τῶν θεασαμένων τὰ τοιαῦτα, πηλίκη μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς
 θεραπευτικῆς μεθόδου δύναμις, ἡλίκον δὲ κακὸν εἰρ-
 γάσαντο μὴ φυλάξαντες τὴν παλαιὰν ἱατρικὴν οἱ τὰς
 νεωτέρας αἰρέσεις συστησάμενοι. ταῦτά τοι καὶ ὑμεῖς
 καί τοι γε ἄκοντά με κατ' ἀρχὰς ἠναγκάσατε, λιπα-
 ροῦντες διεξελεῖν ἅπασαν τήνδε τὴν πραγματείαν ἣν
 εὐχομαι μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς ὀνησὶν τινα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις
 ἀνθρώποις γενέσθαι, βραχυτάτην δ' ἔχω τὴν ἐλπίδα
 διὰ τὴν κατέχουσιν νῦν ὀλιγωρίαν μὲν τῶν καλῶν,
 ἐπίδοσιν δὲ εἰς τιμὴν πλοῦτου καὶ δόξης καὶ πολι-
 τικῶν δυνάμεων· ἐφ' ἃ τοῖς ἐκτραπέουσιν οὐκ ἐνδέχεται

⁸ On this last, see Rufus, fr. 78.

excess, never return to normal, but from that point on
 begin to see indistinctly or with difficulty, and over time
 suffer from cataracts, mydriasis, miosis or contractions of
 the eyes.⁸

You know, of course, having spent time with me right
 from your youth, that I have not seen such an action in the
 presence of one of my teachers, but have myself made the
 discovery by the process of reason, and that over a long
 period, I have examined closely that aphorism: "Drinking
 neat wine, or bathing, or a vapor bath, or phlebotomy, or a
 medication resolve pains of the eyes."⁹ And on the basis of
 the accuracy elsewhere in Hippocrates, I expected that
 here nothing false or impossible was being said. So this was
 what gave direction to my search until, following the Hip-
 pocratic path, I discovered the way to determine when and
 how I must use each of the things mentioned. Clearly I also
 did this for the many who observed such things—that is,
 how great the power of the therapeutic method is and what
 great harm those men cause who do not preserve the an-
 cient medical art but adhere to the newer sects. Mind you,
 on these things, in actual fact you brought pressure to bear
 on me, although I was hesitant at the beginning when you
 entreated me to go through the whole treatise, which I
 pray to the gods is of some benefit to other men also. How-
 ever, I have very little hope because of the overpowering
 contempt nowadays for good things and the addiction to
 the respect for wealth, reputation and political power, due
 to which it is impossible for those who are devoted to these
 things to discover the truth in any of its existing forms. But

172K

⁹ See *Aphorisms*, VII.46. Neither of the two different versions
 given exactly corresponds to Galen's text.

τάληθές ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν ὄντων ἐξευρεῖν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὅπῃ τῷ θεῷ φίλον, οὕτως τελευτήσῃ.

173K τὴν δ' οὖν θεραπευτικὴν μέθοδον, ἀσκηθεῖσαν μὲν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἰατροῖς, ὀλιγωρουμένην δὲ νῦν ἀνακτησώμεθα καθ' ὅσον οἰοί τ' ἐσμέν, αὐθις ἀναλαβόντες | τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τοῦ προκειμένου παθήματος ἔλκουσ κοίλων. περὶ μὲν δὴ τῆς πρώτης εὐρέσεως τῶν σαρκούτων τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔλκος φαρμάκων ἀρκεῖται τὰ μικρῷ πρόσθεν εἰρημένα,¹ καὶ συγχωρεῖσθω δ', εἰ βούλει, τοῖς Ἑμπειρικοῖς ἃ λέγουσιν ἅπαντα. περὶ δὲ τῆς τῶν εὐρημένων χρήσεως ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπέδειξά σοι πολλάκις· οὐδὲν δ' ἥττον καὶ νῦν ἐπιδείξαι τῷ λόγῳ πειράσομαι πῶς ἐν οἷς ἂν μηδὲν δράσῃ τὸ σύνηθες ἐκάστῳ φάρμακον, ἐπ' ἄλλο μεταβαίνειν εὐμηχάνως τε καὶ τεχνικῶς ἀποροῦσιν οἱ Ἑμπειρικοί. καὶ τοῦτ' εὐλόγως γίνεται τοῦ γὰρ πρώτου φαρμάκου τῆς ἀποτυχίας τὴν αἰτίαν ἀγνοοῦντες, οὐδὲ φυλάξασθαι δῆπουθεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ δευτέρου δύνανται. ἀγνοουμένης γὰρ ἔτι τῆς αἰτίας δι' ἣν ἐνεργεῖ τὸ φάρμακον, οὐδὲ δι' ἣν ἀποτυγχάνει γνῶναι δυνήσονται. ταύτης δ' ἀγνοουμένης οὐδ' ἐφ' ἑτερον ἔτι μεταβαίνειν εὐλόγως ἐγχωρεῖ, φυλάξασθαι γὰρ οὐδ' ἐπ' ἐκείνου δυνήσονται τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν.

174K 3. Εἰπωμεν οὖν ἡμεῖς ἥδη τὴν Ἱπποκράτειον τε ἅμα καὶ ἀληθῆ μέθοδον ἐλκῶν κοίλων ἰάσεως· ἄρχεισθαι | δὲ δῆπουθεν αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας χρή τοῦ πράγματος. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἐν τοῖς κοίλοις ἔλκεσι πρόκειται γεννήσαι

to the extent that these things are pleasing to the god, so they will be accomplished.

Let me, then, revive the method of medicine practiced by the doctors of the past but nowadays held in contempt, insofar as I can, taking up again the argument in the case of the affection before us—the hollow wound or ulcer. Regarding the first discovery of the “sarcotic” medications for such a lesion, let what has been said a little earlier be sufficient and concede, if you will, to the Empirics everything they say. About the use of the discoveries, I demonstrated to you their actions on many occasions. No less shall I now attempt to demonstrate by theory how, among these, a medication that is in common use does not act in each [disease], and how the Empirics don't have the wherewithal to change over to another medication skillfully and according to the rules of the craft. And this is to be expected because, if they are ignorant of the cause of the failure of the first medication, they won't be able to look out for this in the case of the second medication. When the cause by which the medication acts remains unknown, they won't be able to recognize the reason for its failure. And since the cause is not known, it is no longer possible to change to another medication in any rational manner, for they will not be able to look out for the actual cause in that case.

3. So let me now speak of the Hippocratic and, at the same time, true method of cure of hollow wounds and ulcers, and it is clearly necessary to begin this from the substance of the matter. Accordingly, since in hollow wounds and ulcers our task is to recreate the flesh that has

¹ B (cf. quae . . . diximus, KLat); εἰρημένοι K

τὴν ἀπολωλυῖαν σάρκα, δεῖ γινώσκειν περὶ² σαρκὸς γενέσεως, ὡς ὕλη μὲν αὐτῆς αἷμα χρηστόν, ὃ δ' οἶον δημιουργός τε καὶ τεχνίτης ἡ φύσις. ἀλλ' οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν χρὴ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ προσθεῖναι τὴν τίνων καὶ ποῦ. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι τῶν ὑποκειμένων σωμάτων οἷς σὰρξ ἐπιτρέφεσθαι μέλλει, τούτων ἡ φύσις ἔσται δημιουργός τῆς γεννηθησομένης σαρκός. ἀλλ' ἡ φύσις ἐκάστου τῶν σωμάτων ἐδείχθη κατὰ τινα θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ ὕγρου κρᾶσιν ἀποτελεῖσθαι. δῆλον οὖν ὡς ἡ τούτων εὐκρασία κατὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον μόριον ᾧ μέλλομεν ἐπιτρέψαι τὴν λείπονσαν σάρκα τὸν λόγον ἔξει τοῦ δημιουργοῦ. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν σκεπτέον ἐπὶ παντὸς ἔλκους κοίλου δύο ταῦτα, τό θ' ὑποκείμενον εἰ εὐκράτως ἔχει, τουτέστιν εἰ κατὰ φύσιν. ἐδείχθη γὰρ ἡ ἐν τοῖς ὁμοιομερέσι σώμασιν ὑγεία τῶν τεττάρων οὔσα ποιότητων εὐκρασία καὶ προσέτι τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἐπιρρέον, εἰ χρηστόν τε καὶ σύμμετρον. | εἰ μὲν δὴ καὶ τούτων τι μοχθηρῶς ἔχοι, πολλὰ διαθέσεις γίνονται παρὰ φύσιν.

ἡμῖν δ' ὑπόκειται μία κοιλότης ἐν σαρκώδε μορίῳ. ὑποκείσθω τοίνυν ὑγιεινόν τε τὸ χωρίον ἢ τ' ἐπιρροή τοῦ αἵματος ἄμεμπτος ἐν ποσότητι καὶ ποιότητι. καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων οὐδὲν ἂν ἔτι κωλύοι τὴν πρῶτην γένεσιν τῆς σαρκὸς ἄμεμπτον γενέσθαι, μηδενὸς δεηθεῖσαν ἔξωθεν φαρμάκου. τῶν γὰρ αἰτίων ἀμφοτέρων ὑφ' ὧν γίγνεται παρόντων καὶ μηδενὸς τῶν ἔξωθεν ἐμποδῶν ὄντος, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται κωλυθῆναι τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς γένεσιν. ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ δὴ τῷ γεννᾶσθαι

been destroyed, it is necessary to know about the generation of flesh, and that its material is useful blood, and that the "demiurge" or "craftsman," as it were, is Nature. But we must not simply say "Nature" but add the nature of what things and how. It is clear that the flesh of the bodies underlying those wounds will be what causes growth, and the nature of these will be the "demiurge" of the flesh that will be regenerated. But the nature of each of the bodies was shown to consist of a certain *krasis* of heat, cold, dryness and moisture. It is clear that the *eukrasia* of these [qualities] in the underlying part will have the ground of the "demiurge" by which we will cause the growth of the flesh that is lacking. First, then, we must consider in every hollow wound and ulcer these two things: whether what is underlying is *eukratic*—that is to say, if it is in accord with nature, for it was shown that health in *homoiomorous* bodies lies in a *eukrasia* of the four qualities—and, in addition, if the flow of blood is of the right quality and quantity. If, however, one of these things is in a bad state, many abnormal conditions arise.

175K

One, I suggest, is hollowness in a fleshy part. Assume that the place is healthy and the flow of blood without fault in terms of quantity and quality. If things are thus, nothing should still prevent the primary genesis of flesh from occurring faultlessly without the need of any medication externally because, as both causes from which this genesis occurs are present and there are no external hindrances, it is impossible for the genesis of flesh to be prevented. But in the actual generation of the primary flesh, two super-

² B; τὴν περὶ om. K

τὴν πρώτην σάρκα περίττωμα διττὸν ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι, καθότι καὶ τοῦτ' ἐν τοῖς περὶ φύσεως εἴρηται λογισμοῖς, ὡς ἀπάσῃ τῇ κατὰ ποιότητα μετακοσμήσει τῆς τροφῆς ἕτερον μὲν παχύτερον, ἕτερον δὲ λεπτότερον ἔπεται περίττωμα. τούτων τῶν περιττωμάτων καὶ καθ' ὅλον τὸ σῶμα γιγνομένων, αἰὲν τὸ μὲν λεπτότερον ἢ ἄδηλός ἐστι διαπνοή· γίνεταί δὲ καὶ δήλη πολλάκις, ὅταν ἦτοι τὸ ἐμφυτον ἀρρωστήσῃ θερμὸν ἢ τροφή χρησθῇται πλείονι τοῦ δέοντος, ἢ τις ἐπαχθῇ τῷ ζῳῇ κίνησις σφοδροτέρα. τὸ δ' ἕτερον ὃ ἐπιτρεφόμενός ἐστι τοῖς σώμασιν ἡμῶν ῥύπος· καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἔλκεσιν ἰχώρ μὲν καλεῖται τὸ λεπτὸν περίττωμα, ῥύπος δ' ἔλκουσ τὸ παχύ. καὶ διὰ μὲν τὸ λεπτὸν περίττωμα ὑγρὸν τὸ ἔλκος γίνεταί, διὰ δὲ τὸ παχὺ ῥυπαρόν· καὶ δεῖται διὰ τοῦτο διττῶν φαρμάκων, ὡς μὲν ὑγρὸν τῶν ξηραίνοντων, ὡς δὲ ῥυπαρὸν τῶν καθαιρόντων αὐτό. κατ' οὐδένα τοῖνυν χρόνον τῆς φύσεως ἀργούσης οὐδεὶς ἔσται καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ μὴ ταῦτ' ἄμφω κατὰ τὸ κοῖλον ἔλκος ἀθροισθῇσεται· ὥστε οὐδὲ χρόνος ἔσται καθ' ὃν οὐ δεῖσεται τῶν φαρμάκων ἀμφοτέρων, τοῦ τε ξηραίνοντος καὶ τοῦ καθαίροντος. ὁποῖον μὲν οὖν εἶναι χρή τῷ γένει τὸ φάρμακον εὐρηται.

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο, χρή γάρ τι τῶν κατ' εἶδος ἐξευρεῖν ὃ προσαχθήσεται. πόθεν οὖν ἐκεῖνο κακὸν τίνος εὑρεθήσεται μεθόδου, ἢ τῆς ἐν τοῖς Περὶ φαρμάκων ἀπλῶν δυνάμεως εἰρημένης; ἐδείκνυμεν γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνοις τὰ μὲν ξηραίνοντα, τὰ δ' ὑγραίνοντα, τὰ δὲ ψύχοντα, τὰ δὲ θερμαίνοντα τῶν φαρμάκων· ἕνα δὲ

fluities necessarily arise, in that it has been stated in the accounts of nature that in every change in the qualities of nutriment, whether they are thicker or thinner, a superfluity follows. And when these superfluities arise in the whole body, in respect to the thinner, transpiration is always imperceptible; whereas it often becomes perceptible whenever either the innate heat becomes weak, or it uses greater nourishment than is necessary, or some overly strong movement burdens the organism. The other is the filth caused to grow in our bodies. And in wounds and ulcers the thin superfluity is called an "ichor" and the thick superfluity is called the "filth of a wound." Furthermore, due to the thin superfluity a wound becomes moist, while due to the thick superfluity it becomes filthy. Because of this there is need of a twofold [approach to] medications; that is, there is need of those that dry what is moist, and those that purify the actual filth. Accordingly, since at no period of time does nature remain idle, there will be no moment at which both these (i.e. moisture and filth) will not be collected together in a hollow wound or ulcer; so there will be no time at which there will not be need of both medications, the drying and the purifying. It has been shown what kind the medication must be in terms of class.

But this is not enough; it is necessary to discover which particular medications in terms of kind will be applied. How and by what method will that be discovered? Surely it will be from what is stated about potency in my treatise *On the [Mixtures and] Potencies of Simple Medications*? For I showed in that work which medications cause drying, moistening, cooling and heating and which, by virtue of

177K

κατὰ συζυγίαν ἢ θερμαίνοντα καὶ ξηραίνοντα, ἢ ψύχοντα ἢ καὶ ὑγραίνοντα, ἢ θερμαίνοντα καὶ ὑγραίνοντα, ἢ ψύχοντα καὶ ξηραίνοντα· εἶναί τε καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἀπειρον μὲν τι τῷ πλήθει τὸ μᾶλλον τε καὶ ἥττον· εἰς δὲ τὴν χρείαν τὴν ἰατρικὴν ὅροις εὐσθήμοις περιγραφόμενον, πρώτης τινὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς γινομένης τάξεως καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τρίτης καὶ τετάρτης. ἐκ ποίας οὖν τάξεως ἔσται τὸ σαρκωτικὸν φάρμακον, ὃ δὴ μετρίως ἔφαμεν χρῆναι ξηραίνειν τε καὶ ῥύπτειν; ἐκ τῆς πρώτης δηλονότι· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐπιταθεῖν ὥς μὴ μόνον ἐκδαπανᾶν τὸ περιττὸν τῆς ἀπορροούσης ὑγρότητος, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπιρρέοντος αἵματος ἀπτεσθαι, κωλύσει τὴν σάρκωσιν ἀναλίσκον αὐτῆς τὴν ὕλην. ἐδείχθη δὲ τοιαῦτα, λιβανωτὸς τε καὶ κρίθινον ἄλευρον καὶ κνάμνον ὀρόβινόν τε καὶ ἴρις ἀριστολοχία τε καὶ καδμεία καὶ πάναξ καὶ πομφόλυξ· ἅπαντὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλήλων ἐδείκνυτο διαφέροντα τῷ τε μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον. καὶ τῷ μὲν ἀπλᾶς ἔχειν τὰς ἐπικρατούσας δυνάμεις, τὰ δὲ συνθέτους. ἀριστολοχία μὲν γὰρ καὶ πάναξ μᾶλλον ξηραίνει τῶν ἄλλων καὶ θερμότερα τὴν φύσιν ἐστί· ἰ τὸ δὲ κρίθινον καὶ τὸ κνάμνον ἄλευρον ἥττον πολὺ ἐκείνων ξηραίνει καὶ ἥκιστα θερμότητος μετέχει· λιβανωτὸς δὲ θερμὸς μὲν ἐστὶ μετρίως, ἥττον δὲ τούτων ξηραίνει, ὥστε τινὰς φύσεις σωματῶν οὐδὲ ξηραίνει τὴν ἀρχήν· ὀρόβινον δὲ καὶ ἴρις ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τούτων τε καὶ ἀριστολοχίας καὶ πάνακος ἐστίν.

178K

ὅπερ δ' ὁ λόγος ἐκίνησε χρησίμως αὐθις ἀναλάβω-

conjunction, are both heating and drying, or cooling and moistening, or heating and moistening, or cooling and drying. And, in relation to each of these, there is infinite variation in terms of more and less in amount whereas, for medical use, this is circumscribed by distinct boundaries, there being a certain order in them of first, second, third, and fourth. From what kind of order will the enfleshing medication be that I said was necessary to dry and clean moderately? Obviously it is from the first order, and it is raised to a higher level as it doesn't only consume the excess of outflowing moisture but also, since it destroys the inflowing blood itself, it will prevent the growth of flesh, consuming the material of this. Such things were shown—frankincense, barley meal, meal of bitter vetch, iris, aristolochia, cadmia, panax and pompholyx. All these things were demonstrated to differ from each other in terms of more or less. It was also demonstrated that some have simple prevailing potencies while others have compound ones. For aristolochia and panax dry more than the others and are hotter in nature. Barley meal and the barley bran dry much less than they do and partake least of heat. Frankincense, however, is moderately hot but dries less than these, so that it does not dry certain bodily natures at the start. Bitter vetch and iris are in between these and aristolochia and panax.

177K

178K

Let me reiterate what the discussion has usefully produced. Frankincense can certainly produce flesh in a body

σαρκῶσαι δύναται, ξηρὰν δ' οὐ δύναται· χρὴ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαι περὶ τῶν πρώτων ἐνδείξεων ὡς δύο ἔστων αὐτῶν αἱ διαφοραί, τοῦ μὲν κατὰ φύσιν τὴν φυλακὴν ἐνδεικνυμένου καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁμοίων ἑαυτοῦ δεομένου, τοῦ δὲ παρὰ φύσιν τὴν ἀναίρεσιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῶν ἐναντίων· φθείρεται γὰρ πᾶν εἰς ἐναντία τε καὶ δι' ἐναντίων. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἔλκος ὅσῳ περ ἂν ὑγρότερον ᾖ, τοσούτῳ δεῖται φαρμάκου ξηραίνοντος μᾶλλον· ἢ φύσις δ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ σώματος ὅσῳ περ ἂν ὑγρότερα τύχη, τοσούτῳ δεῖται φαρμάκου ξηραίνοντος ἥττον· ὥστε τῶν ἴσῃ ὑγρότητα ἔχόντων ἑλκῶν τὸ μὲν ἐν ξηροτέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ κάμνοντος κράσει μᾶλλον ξηραίνεσθαι δείεται, τὸ δ' ἐν ὑγροτέρᾳ | τοσούτῳ καταδεέστερον, ὅσῳ περ ἂν καὶ ἡ φύσις τῆς φύσεως ἀπολείπηται· τὴν γὰρ ἐπιτρεφομένην σάρκα παραπλησίαν εἶναι χρὴ τῇ προϋπαρχούσῃ. ξηροτέρας οὖν οὕσης τῆς ἀρχαίας ξηροτέραν χρὴ γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν νέαν, ὥστε ἐπὶ πλείον αὐτὴν δεῖ ξηραίνεσθαι, καὶ ὅσῳ περ ἂν ᾖ ἐπὶ πλείον ξηρά, ἐπὶ τοσούτῳ καὶ τὸ προσαγόμενον φάρμακον εἶναι ξηραντικώτερον. ἐπὶ δέ γε τῆς ὑγροτέρας φύσεως εἰς τοσούτον αὖ πάλιν ἥττον ξηραίνοντων χρεῖα ἐστὶ φαρμάκων, εἰς ὅσον καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἥττον ἐστὶ ξηρά.

τοιαύτην οὖν ἔχει κρᾶσιν λιβανωτός, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν σώματος. πρὸς μὲν γὰρ τὰς εὐκράτους καὶ μέσας ὁμολογεῖ, τῶν δ' ὑγρατέρων ἀτρέμα ξηραντικώτερος ὑπάρχει, ὥσπερ οὖν αὖ καὶ τῶν ἀκρως ξηρῶν ὑγρότερος ἀτρέμα. δεόντως οὖν ἐπὶ μὲν

of a moist nature but not in one of a dry nature. What you must know about the primary indications is that there are two differentiae of these: what is in accord with nature indicates preservation and, for this reason, has need of things like itself, while what is contrary to nature indicates removal, and for this reason has need of those things opposite to itself, for all destruction is to opposites and through opposites. Therefore, the wound or ulcer stands more in need of a drying medication to the extent that it is more moist. [Conversely] to the extent that the nature of the body itself happens to be more moist, it is less in need of a drying medication. So, of wounds or ulcers that are equally moist, that in a patient with a drier *krasis* needs to be dried more, whereas that in a patient with a more moist *krasis* is less in need to the extent that the one nature departs from the other nature. For the flesh that is being created ought to be closely similar to that which existed before. Therefore, when the original flesh was drier, the new flesh must become drier, so that this needs to be dried still more; and to the extent to which it is still more dry, the medication being applied also [needs to be] more drying to the same extent. But, on the contrary, in a more moist nature, the extent to which the flesh itself is less dry determines the extent to which there is need of those medications that dry less.

Thus, frankincense has the sort of *krasis* that is consonant with the human bodily nature: to the *eukratic* and middling [natures], it is agreeable; for the more moist [natures], it is slightly more drying; and again, to those that are extremely dry, it is slightly more moistening. Neces-

ἐνίων ἐλκῶν τε καὶ φύσεων ὁ λιβανωτὸς ἐκπύσκει
 μέν, οὐ μὴν καὶ σαρκὸς· κατὰ δέ τινας ἤδη καὶ σαρκὸς.
 παραφυλάξας οὖν εὐρήσεις ὁμολογοῦν τῷ λόγῳ τὸ
 φαινόμενον. ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ὑγροτέραις φύσεσι σαρ-
 κωτικός ἐστιν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ξηροτέραις οὐκέτι· καὶ κατὰ
 μὲν τὰ μετρίως ὑγρὰ τῶν ἐλκῶν οἶός τε σαρκῶν |
 180K ἐστι, κατὰ δὲ τὰ λίαν ὑγρὰ παντάπασιν ἀδύνατος.

ὁρᾷς οὖν ἤδη σαφῶς ὅσων δεῖ θεωρημάτων ἀνδρὶ
 μέλλοντι κατὰ μέθοδον ὀρθῇν ἔλκος ἰᾶσθαι; ἐπειδὴ
 γὰρ εὐρέθῃ πάντως ὑγρότης ἐννύχουσα τῷ πάθει,
 τὸ ξηραίνειν ἐνεδείξατο φάρμακον. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τὰ μὲν
 αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ξηραίνει, τὰ δ' ἥττον, ἕκ τε τῆς τῶν
 ἐλκῶν διαφορᾶς τὸ χρήσιμον ἐλήφθη καὶ τῆς τοῦ
 κάμνοντος φύσεως. ὥστ' οὐ μόνον ἀνάγκη περὶ φύ-
 σεως σώματος ἐπεσκεῖσθαι τῷ μέλλοντι κατὰ τρόπον
 ἰατρούσειν ἔλκος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν περὶ φαρμάκων θεω-
 ρίαν ἀκριβῶς ἐκμετασκέσθαι καὶ κράσεως σώματος
 ὑγρᾶς καὶ ξηρᾶς ἐπίστασθαι γνωρίσματα.

θέασαι τοίνυν ὅση τῶν Μεθοδικῶν ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ τὰς
 ἀποφάσεις τόλμα, τοῦθ' ἐν μόνον ἀρκεῖν αὐτοῖς ἡγου-
 μένοις εἰς ἔλκους ἰᾶσιν κοίλου, τὸ γινώσκειν ὅτι
 πληρωτέον τέ ἐστὶν αὐτὸ καὶ σαρκωτέον· οὐ γὰρ ἐν
 τούτῳ γε τὸ θεραπεύειν ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ τὸ σαρκῶσον
 ἐξευρεῖν. Ἀλλ' εὐρηταί, φησι, τὸ σαρκῶσον τῇ πείρᾳ.
 λέγε τοίνυν καὶ τὸ θεραπεύσον ἐκ τῆς πείρας εὐρή-
 181K σθαι· καὶ μὴ μάτην φρυάττου | μηδ' ἀνατείνου τὴν
 μέθοδον. καίτοι καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῖς Ἐμπειρικοῖς ἡ
 χωρὶς διορισμοῦ πείρα κατέγνωσται· γράφουσι γοῦν

sarily then, in some wounds and ulcers and in some na-
 tures, frankincense causes suppuration but does not, how-
 ever, also produce flesh. In some [natures] it does actually
 also produce flesh. If you consider this, you will find that
 what is observed agrees with the theory. In more moist na-
 tures frankincense is flesh-producing, while in more dry
 natures it is no longer so; and in regard to moderately moist
 wounds and ulcers it can produce flesh, while in those that
 are exceedingly moist it is altogether unable [to do so].

180K

So do you now see clearly the need of such principles
 for a man who intends to cure a wound or ulcer by the right
 method? For when it is found, in general, that moisture is
 present in the affection, it indicates a drying medication.
 But since some of these medications dry more and some
 less, the use is taken from the difference between the
 wounds or ulcers and from the nature of the patient. So not
 only is it essential for someone who intends to cure a
 wound or ulcer properly to give consideration to the na-
 ture of the body; it is also essential for him to have learned
 thoroughly the theory of medications and to know the
 signs of a moist and dry *krasis* of the body.

Look, then, at how great the rashness of the Methodics
 is in their assertions when they claim that this one thing is
 sufficient on its own for the cure of a hollow wound or ul-
 cer—namely, the knowledge that you must fill it and en-
 flesh it. For treatment does not, in fact, lie in this but in the
 discovery of what is enfleshing. “But what is enfleshing is
 discovered by experience,” says [the Methodic]. Just say,
 then, that what is curative is found from experience and do
 not pointlessly crow about and exalt your method. Indeed,
 among the Empirics themselves, experience without dis-
 crimination is condemned. At all events, in the treatises

181K

ἐν τοῖς περὶ φαρμάκων ὑπομνήμασιν ἔμπλαστρος
 πρὸς ἀπαλόχρωτας καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας· ἴσασί τε
 τὸν λιβανωτὸν ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων φύσεων ἑλκη κοῖλα
 μηδὲν ἔχοντα σύμπτωμ' ἕτερον, ἀνατρέφοντα καὶ
 πληροῦντα. πότερον δ' ὕγρα τὰ τοιαῦτα σώματ' ἐστὶ
 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δέχεται μετρίως ξηραίνοντων φαρμάκων,
 ἢ ἄλλη τις αἰτία τοῦ συμβαίνοντός ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐπί-
 στανται. καὶ γὰρ αὖ καὶ πρὸς τὰ γεροντικὰ σώματα
 γεγραμμένον εὐρήσεις ἕτερον φάρμακον, ἄλλο δέ τι
 πρὸς τὰ δυσεπούλωτα καὶ ὀχθώδη τῶν ἑλκῶν, καὶ
 πολλοὺς ἄλλους διορίσμοις ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς θεραπευ-
 τικοῖς ὑπομνήμασι γράφουσιν, ἐξ ὧν ὡς οἶόν τε πρὸς
 τὴν ιδιότητα τῆς θεραπευομένης φύσεως ἐξευρίσκουσι
 τὸ συννοῖσον φάρμακον. ἅπαντες γὰρ οἱ διορίσμοι
 κατὰ τὰς τέχνας ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ πειρῶνται τὸ ἴδιον
 χωρίζειν· καὶ ὅσῳ περ ἂν τις πλείω διορίσῃται, πλησι-
 ἔστερον ἀφικνεῖται τοῦ ἰδίου, τοῦτο δ' αὐτὸ τὸ³ |
 ἀκριβῶς ἴδιον, οὔτε γραφῆναι δυνατόν ἐστιν οὔτε
 λεχθῆναι· διὸ καὶ τῶν Ἐμπειρικῶν τοῖς μάλιστα τῶν
 ἔργων τῆς τέχνης φροντίσασιν καὶ σχεδὸν ἅπασιν τοῖς
 Δογματικοῖς ὁμολόγηται τὸ μηδεμίαν οἶόν τ' εἶναι
 γραφῆναι θεραπείαν ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλὰ τὸ λείπον εἰς τὸν
 στοχασμὸν τῆς τοῦ κάμνοντος φύσεως οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῆς
 ἐκάστου τῶν θεραπευόντων οἰκείας τριβῆς, οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ
 λογικῶς τετεχνᾶσθαι φασὶ χρήναι προστιθέναι· οὐδ-
 εἰς δ' αὐτῶν οὕτως ἦν εὐχερής, ὡς ἅπαντος ἑλκους
 κοῖλου φάρμακον ἐν ἔχειν ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι σαρκω-
 τικόν· οὐ γὰρ εὐρήσεις ἐν οὐδενὶ τοιούτῳ φάρμακον,

182K

about medications they write to apply plasters to those
 who are soft-skinned, children and women, and they know
 that in such natures frankincense causes growth and fills
 up hollow wounds and ulcers that have no other symptom.
 Whether such bodies are moist and, because of this, need
 moderately drying medications, or whether there is some
 other cause of what happens, they do not know. For once
 more, also, in respect to aged bodies, you will find another
 medication is written about, and another in respect to
 wounds and ulcers that are hard to cicatrize and are swol-
 len; and they write of many other distinctions in all their
 therapeutic treatises. From these it is possible for them to
 discover the medication suitable for the particular charac-
 ter of the nature being treated, for all the distinctions in
 crafts attempt to separate the specific from the general
 and, to the extent that someone might make a further dis-
 tinction, the nearer he comes to the specific, although this
 very thing is precisely specific, and cannot either be writ-
 ten or stated. On which account, also, among both those
 Empirics who particularly give thought to the tasks of the
 art, and almost all the Dogmatics, there is agreement that
 it is impossible for any treatment to be written down pre-
 cisely. They say there is something remaining which comes
 down to conjecture about the nature of the patient. Some
 say this must be added from the specific practice of each
 [doctor] providing treatment and some say from being
 devised skillfully on a logical basis. None of them are
 so tolerant of imprecision as to assert that there is one
 enfleshing medication for every hollow wound or ulcer, for
 you will not find a medication of such a kind to cure every

182K

³ B; τὸ om. K

οἷον πᾶν ἕλκος κοῖλον ἰᾶσθαι, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ πλήθος τῆς ὑγρότητός τε καὶ τοῦ ῥύπου καὶ αὐτὴν τοῦ κάμνοντος τὴν κρᾶσιν ὑπαλλάττεσθαι χρὴ τὸ φάρμακον. ἐάσαντες οὖν ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἀναισχυντίαν τῶν Μεθοδικῶν ἴδωμεν ὃ τι ποτὲ λέγουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπειρίας, ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκάστου τριβῆς καὶ γυμνασίας εἰσφέρεσθαι τι χρῆναι πρὸς τὴν τῶν οἰκείων τῷ κάμνοντι φαρμάκων εὔρεσιν ἀξιοῦντες.

183K ὥς γὰρ καὶ πολλάκις εἰρήκαμεν, οὐδὲν μὲν τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἰατρικὴν πραγμάτων καὶ φαρμάκων⁴ ἄρρητον ὑπάρχει κατ' εἶδος, ἀλλ' ὃ μῆτε ῥηθῆναι μῆτε γραφῆναι μῆθ' ὅλως διδαχθῆναι δύναται τὸ ποσὸν ἔστιν ἐν ἐκάστῳ· καὶ δὴ καπὶ τῶν ἑλκῶν ἢ μὲν ὑγρότης καὶ ὃ ῥύπος οὐκ ἄρρητα, τὸ ποσὸν δ' ἄρρητον ἐν ἐκατέρῳ· καίτοι κἀνταῦθα προσέρχεσθαι πῶς βουλόμεθα τῇ δηλώσει πλησίον, ὀλίγον καὶ πολλὸν λέγοντες ῥύπον καὶ λεπτὸν καὶ παχὺν καὶ παντελῶς ὀλίγον καὶ λίαν πολλὸν καὶ μέτριον καὶ σύμμετρον καὶ πῶς ἄλλως οὕτως ὀνομάζοντες πολυειδῶς, ἢ ὥς οἶόν τε πλησίον ἀφικώμεθα τῆς δηλώσεως τοῦ ποσοῦ. πρόσχες οὖν ἤδη μοι τὸν νοῦν ἀκριβῶς, ἢ εἰδῆς ὅσον πλεονεκτεῖ τὸ μεθόδῳ ποιεῖν ὁτιοῦν τὸ δι' ἐμπειρίας μόνως. ἔστω γὰρ ἐγνώσθαι τότε τι τὸ φάρμακον ἑλκους κοῖλου σαρκωτικὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὥς ἂν μὲν ἡμεῖς εἵπομεν ὑγρότερων τὴν κρᾶσιν, ὥς δ' ὁ τηρητικός τε καὶ Ἑμπειρικός, ἀπαλοχρώτων τε καὶ παιδῶν καὶ γυναικῶν, εἴτα νῦν τῷ τοιούτῳ προσαγόμενον ὀνῆσαι μηδέν. ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ζητήσωμεν κατὰ τί μηδὲν ὠφέλησεν, εἰς δύο

hollow wound or ulcer in everyone. Rather, besides the abundance of moisture and filth, the medication must alter the actual *krasis* of the patient. Therefore, if we accept here the impudence of the Methodics, let us see what they say—those who, on the basis of experience, think it right that something ought to contribute to the discovery of the medications that are appropriate to the patient from the specific practice and exercise of each person.

For as I too have often said, none of the matters and medications pertaining to the craft of medicine is inexpressible in terms of kind, but the quantity cannot in each case be stated, or written, or in a word, taught. Further, in the case of wounds and ulcers, the moistness and filth are not inexpressible whereas the quantity in each is inexpressible. And indeed, we wish somehow to come near to expressing this, saying slightly or greatly filthy, thin, thick, extremely slight, very great, average or in due proportion, or however else, naming so diversely that as far as possible we come near to the expression of quantity. Pay strict attention to me now so that you may know how doing anything whatsoever by method gains an advantage over doing it by experience alone. For suppose it is the case that this medication for a hollow wound or ulcer is known to be enfleshing in those whom we might say are more moist in terms of *krasis* or, as the observer and the Empiric might say, in soft-skinned women and children, and now there is no benefit when it is applied to such a person. Let us, then, investigate why it brings no benefit, referring to these two

183K

⁴ καὶ φαρμάκων om. B, recte fort.

184K

τούτους ἀναγαγόντες σκοπούς· ἡ γὰρ ἐνδεέστερον ἢ ἰ
ἀμετροτέρου ἐξήρανε· καὶ σημεία γε τούτων τὸν τε
ῥύπον ἔχομεν καὶ τὸν ἰχώρα. εἰ μὲν γὰρ πλείων ὁ
ῥύπος, ὑγρότερόν τε ὅλον εἴη τὸ ἔλκος, ἐνδεέστερον
ἐξήρανε· εἰ δὲ καθαρὸν τε καὶ ἄνικμον εὐρεθείη,
περαιτέρω τοῦ προσήκοντος. εὐθὺς δὲ καὶ τὸ ποσὸν
τοῦ συμμέτρου μᾶλλον ἢ ἥττον ἐκ τοῦ ποσοῦ τῶν
γνωρισμάτων εἰσόμεθα· καὶ τοσοῦτῳ δυνησόμεθα τὸ
ἐφεξῆς φάρμακον ἢ ξηρότερον ἢ οὐ τοιοῦτον προσ-
ενεγκεῖν.

ὁ δ' Ἐμπειρικὸς ὅτι μὲν οὐκ ἐσάρκωσε τὸνδὲ τινα,
τὸ προσαχθὲν φάρμακον ὀρεῖ· μὴ γινώσκων μέντοι
πότερον τῷ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ ἥττον ξηρᾶναι, μεταβαίνειν
ἐφ' ἕτερον ἀδυνατεῖ. κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ οἱ
περὶ τὸν Ἐρασίστρατον τε καὶ Ἡρόφιλον ἐξ ἡμισείας
ὥσπερ καὶ πρόσθεν ἐδείξαμεν ὄντες Δογματικοὶ κα-
κῶς ἰατρούνουσιν ἔλκος· μόνα γὰρ ἐπιχειροῦσι λογι-
κῶς θεραπεύειν ὅσα τῶν ὀργανικῶν ἐστὶ μορίων ἴδια
νοσήματα· τὸ δ' ἔλκος, ὥσπερ καὶ πρόσθεν εἴρηται,
κοινὸν ἐστὶν ὁμοιομερῶν τε καὶ ὀργανικῶν, ὥστε καὶ
τοῦτο κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἐμπειρικῶς θεραπεύουσι, καθ'
ὅσον ἐν τοῖς ὁμοιομερέσι πέφυκε γίνεσθαι. καὶ μὲν δὴ
κὰν τῷ τὰς ἀπολωλῆας τελέως οὐσίας ἢ κεκολο-
βωμένας ἐπιχειρεῖν ἢ θεραπεύειν, κἀνταῦθα ἀναγκαῖον
αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἀποπίπτειν πολλαχῇ τοῦ λογικῶς. εἰ γὰρ
αὐτὸ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς οὐσία τίς ἐστὶν ὁμοιομερῆς, ἀναγ-
καῖόν ἐστι τὸν προνοούμενον αὐτοῦ τῆς γενέσεως ὑπὲρ
ἀπάσης τῆς φύσεως ἐπίστασθαι. περὶ μὲν δὴ τούτων

185K

indicators; whether it dried too little or too much, and in
fact we have the signs of these things in respect to filth and
the ichor. For if the filth is greater, the wound or ulcer as a
whole is too moist and is dried too little whereas, if it is
found to be clean and without moisture, it is dried beyond
what is appropriate. We will know immediately the quantity
of the balance in terms of more or less from the number of
signs, so we will be able in such a way to apply as the next
medication one which is either more drying or not.

The Empiric, however, sees that the applied medica-
tion did not create flesh in this instance, but nevertheless
does not know whether to dry more or less, and is unable to
change to another medication. In the same way, too, the
followers of Erasistratus and Herophilus, being "semi-
Dogmatics," as we also showed before, treat a wound or
ulcer badly, for they only attempt to treat logically such
diseases as are specific to the organic parts, whereas the
wound or ulcer, as I also said before, is common to both
homoiomeres and organic [parts]. But, to the extent that it
arises in the *homoiomeres* by nature, they treat it empiri-
cally. Indeed, even in this, if they attempt to treat com-
pletely destroyed or badly damaged substances, here too
it is inevitable that, in many instances, they fall short of
what is logical. If what is actually destroyed is some *homoi-
omerous* substance, it is essential for the person who gives
forethought to the genesis of this to know about its whole
nature. I shall certainly speak again about these matters. I

184K

185K

καὶ αὖθις εἰρήσεται. τὸ δὲ μὴ τυχὸν εἶναι πρᾶγμα, καλῶς ἔλκους προνοήσασθαι καὶ ὡς ἡ πρώτη πασῶν ἔνδειξις, ἡ καὶ τοῖς ιδιώταις γνωσκομένη πολλοστὸν ἐστὶ μόριον τῆς θεραπείας, ἐναργῶς ἀποδεδείχθαι νομίζω· καὶ γὰρ ὅτι δραστικά ποιότητές εἰσι θερμότης τε καὶ ψυχρότης καὶ ὑγρότης καὶ ξηρότης ἀναγκαῖον ἀποδεδείχθαι καὶ τούτοις ἐφεξῆς ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ κράσεων ἐγνώσθαι κατὰ τε τὸ ἡμέτερον σύγγραμμα καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα τὰ τούτῳ πλησιάζοντα.

νῦν μὲν οὖν ὁ λόγος ἐφ' ἔλκους εἴρηται κοίλου, μόνην αὐτὴν τὴν κοιλότητα θεραπευόντων ἡμῶν· ἡ γὰρ ὡς ἔλκους θεραπεία κατὰ τὸ παρὸν οὕτω λέλεκται. συνίσταται δὲ καὶ ἥδε κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν μέθοδον· ἀπὸ τε γὰρ τῆς τοῦ θεραπευομένου⁵ κράσεως λαμβάνεται καὶ προσέτι τῆς τῶν φαρμάκων δυνάμεως· εἴρηται δ' ἄμφω ταῦτα τοῦ περὶ τῶν στοιχείων λόγου, μὴ συγχωρηθέντος γὰρ ἐν τῇ μεθόδῳ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς αἰτίας εἶναι τὰς τέτταρας ποιότητας, οὐτ' ἄρξασθαι τῆς μεθόδου δυνατὸν οὕτε προελθεῖν οὕτε τελειῶσαι· τὸ δ' ἐκείνας ἐπιδείξαι δρώσας τε καὶ πασχούσας εἰς ἀλλήλας τῆς περὶ τῶν στοιχείων ἐστὶ θεωρίας. ὅπερ οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεδείξαμεν, ὑπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐνεστῶτος λόγου μαρτυρεῖται, τὸ μηδὲν δύνασθαι πραγματεύεσθαι περὶ μηδενὸς τῶν ὁμοιομερῶν τὸν ἱατρὸν ἄνευ τῆς φυσικῆς ὀνομαζομένης θεωρίας. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοιομερῶν ἀπεδείχθη μόνον, ἐνταῦθα δ' ἤδη πως ὁ λόγος ἐμφανίζει μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁργανικῶν ὁλόκληρον ἐξευρεῖν δύνασθαι τὴν θερα-

186K

think, however, it has been clearly shown that it is not a matter of chance to give proper forethought to a wound or ulcer, nor that the primary indication of all, which is known even to laymen, is just a small part of the treatment. For it is also essential to have established that the active qualities are heat, cold, moisture and dryness, and after this, everything else about *krasias* (mixtures) is known from my book, as are all other things pertaining to this.¹⁰

Therefore, at this point in the discussion of a hollow wound, what has been spoken of is our treatment of the cavity only; the treatment of the wound as a wound hasn't yet been stated for the present. However, this too takes place according to the same method, for it arises from the *krasis* of the person being treated and, as well as this, from the potency of the medications. Both these factors were covered in the discussion about elements. On the question of method, unless it is agreed that the causes of genesis and destruction are the four qualities, it is not possible to start the method, nor to advance it, nor to bring it to completion. To show how those qualities act on and are acted on by each other pertains to the theory about elements. Thus, what I demonstrated in the previous discussion is that no doctor is able to treat systematically any of the *homoiomeres* without what may be termed a "physical theory." But there it was shown only in the case of *homoiomeres*, whereas here the discussion already makes it clear in a certain way that it is not possible to discover any complete

186K

¹⁰ This is taken to be a reference to *De temperamentis libri III*, I.509–694K as a whole.

πείαν μηδένα χωρὶς τοῦ κακέινης προσάφασθαι· δειχθήσεται δ' ἐναργέστερον ἐτι ταὐτὸ τοῦτο παρ' ὅλην τὴν πραγματείαν.

187K

4. Ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν τοῦ ἔλκους θεραπείαν μόνου μετέρχεσθαι καιρός· εἴη δ' ἂν μόνον ἐπειδὰν μήτε διάθεσις αὐτῷ συμπαρῇ μηδεμία μήτε σύμπτωμα. μὴ τοῖνυν ἔστω μήτε ρευματικὸν τὸ ἥλκωμένον μόριον μήτε κακόχυμον μήθ' ἢ ὅλως δύσκρατον· ἀλλὰ μηδὲ κοιλότης αὐτῷ συνέστω, μηδὲ τοῦ δέρματος ἀπώλεια μηδεμία. καὶ γὰρ αὖ τοῦτο παρορώσιν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἱατρῶν, οὐ συνιέντες ὡς ἐπειδὰν ἔλκος κοῖλον πληρωθὲν ὁμαλὲς μὲν ὑπάρχη, πλατὺ δέ, διττὴ καὶ νῦν ἔστιν ἐν τῷ μορίῳ διάθεσις, ἑτέρα μὲν οὐσίας δέρματος ἀπώλεια, δευτέρα δὲ συνεχείας λύσις. ἐπειδὰν μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἢ συνεχείας λύσις, ἥτοι τῆς ἐπιδερμίδος ἢ καὶ τοῦ δέρματος ἅπαντος ἢ καὶ τῆς ὑποκειμένης ἅμ' αὐτῷ σαρκός, ἔλκος ἔστιν οὕτω τὸ πάθημα καὶ δεῖται κολλήσεως μόνης. εἰ γὰρ συναχθεῖ πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ χεῖλη τοῦ δέρματος, οὐδὲν ἔστι μεταξὺ τοῦ δέρματος ἑτερογενές, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ πεπληρωμένου τε καὶ ὁμαλοῦ ἔλκου· ἐπ' ἐκείνου γὰρ οὐχ ἄπτεται τὰ πέρατα τοῦ ἔλκους ἀλλήλων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἥλκωμένης ἀπάσης χώρας ἀπόλωλε τὸ δέρμα καὶ χρὴ γεννηῆσαι δῆπουθεν αὐτό· κατὰ μέντοι τὸ διηρημένον ὑπὸ τινος ὀξέος κολλήσεως δεῖ μόνης, οὐ μὴν καὶ γενέσεως δέρματος. ὅταν οὖν ἔλκος ἀπλοῦ προκείμενον ἢ θεραπείαν εὐρεῖν, ὑποτίθεσθαι χρὴ τῷ λόγῳ διαίρεσιν σαρκώδους μέλους χωρὶς ἀπωλείας ἢ

treatment in the case of the organic bodies apart from the application of theory. This will be made even more apparent throughout the entire treatise.

4. It is time now to pass on to the treatment of the wound whenever it exists in isolation with neither a condition nor a symptom accompanying it. Let us assume that the wounded part is not subject to flux, is not *kakochymous*, and is not on the whole *dyskratic*. But let there be no hollowness present with it, nor any destruction of the skin. For again, the majority of doctors also overlook this, not realizing that whenever a hollow wound is filled and is level but flat, there is now a twofold condition in the part, the one being loss of the substance of the skin, and the other, dissolution of continuity. Whenever there is this dissolution of continuity alone, either of the epidermis or of the whole skin, or also of the underlying flesh along with it, a wound is in this way the affection, and needs conglutination alone. If the margins of the skin are drawn together with each other, there is nothing in between of a different class to skin, just as in the case of the wound that has been filled and is level. In the latter case, the opposite sides of the wound do not contact each other but the skin of the whole wounded region is lost and there is need, obviously, to regenerate this. However, in relation to what has been divided by something sharp, there is need of conglutination alone and not of the generation of skin as well. Therefore, whenever what lies before us is to discover the treatment of a simple wound, what must be taken as foundational in the discussion is the division of the fleshy part

187K