

DAVIES J. C., *Some conflicting sources of Hippocratic theory*: RhM CXV 1972 308-310. | Die Unvereinbarkeit des Monismus des Diogenes von Apollonia und Alcmaeons Konzeption der  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\alpha$  konnte die hippokratischen Ärzte nicht davon abhalten, Elemente aus beiden Vorstellungskreisen in empirischem Eklektizismus zu übernehmen.

Pohlenz's assumption<sup>1)</sup> that the Hippocratics were indebted to the air-theology of Diogenes does less than justice both to the empirical spirit of Hippocratic medicine as a whole and also to the undoubted influence upon that school of the theories of Alcmaeon of Croton. Some re-examination of the extent to which the theories of Diogenes and Alcmaeon were accepted by the Hippocratic seems to be required.

A crucial passage is *περὶ φύσων* 3 in which the writer distinguishes between three sources of nutriment (*τροφῶν τροφῶν*) food, drink, and air (*συνία, ποτά, πνεῦμα*). It is significant that *συνία* and *ποτά* are merely mentioned before a fuller explanation of the inclusion of *πνεῦμα* is undertaken. It may well be that we are witnessing here the conflict between the empirical view of the practising physician who would record the most obvious (to him) sources of nutriment before he proceeds to the necessary elaboration of a less commonly received idea which had originated elsewhere in the school of Diogenes. But the air-

1) *Hippokrates und die Begründung der Wissenschaftlichen Medizin*, Berlin 1938, p. 39, et al.

Other references to the question are sporadic. Werner Jaeger's "*Diokles von Karystos*" (Berlin 1938) pps. 216ff. criticized the facile identification by M. Wellmann ("*Fragments der sikelischen Ärzte*", Berlin 1901, pps. 74ff.) of Empedocles' and Diogenes' accounts of the extent to which the embryo depends upon air as its life source. Jaeger questioned the extent to which in-born *pneuma* (*σύνφυτον πνεῦμα*) of Empedocles may be identified with the air-pneumatism of Diogenes. E. Lesky ("*Die Zeugungs- und Vererbungslehren der Antike*", Ak. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit., Mainz 1950) and Solmsen ("*The Vital Heat, the Inborn Pneuma and the Aether*", J. H. S. 77, 1957 pps. 119ff.) both contented themselves with little more than criticisms of Wellmann's basic assumptions. H. Fränkel ("*Wege und Formen Frühgriechischen Denkens*", Munich 1955 pps. 279ff.) and R. B. Onians ("*Origins of European Thought*", Cambridge 1954, pps. 36; 47ff.) made more comprehensive study of the concept of *pneuma* and the cardiac region in Empedocles, Alcmaeon, and Diogenes. Their separate influence upon Hippocrates has, however, been largely ignored until H. A. T. Reiche's more recent study ("*Empedocles' mixture, Eudoxan astronomy and Aristotle's conate pneuma*", Amsterdam 1960, pps. 30ff.). Reiche's statement of the problem is brief but clear; he does not, however, place sufficient emphasis upon the empiricist characteristics of the Hippocratics which made possible their eclectic adoption of conflicting elements in the theories of Alcmaeon and Diogenes. This is the tentative contribution of the present paper.

1947 POK  
DAVIES, J.C.  
1972

theology of the latter reappears in a new guise, in the empirical observations of a physician dedicated to painstaking observation of climatic changes and their effects on the human body. This may well be why the implicit acceptance by the Hippocratics of Diogenes' general view that climate intimately affects human beings requires a lengthier (apologetic) treatment after the rather perfunctory mention of "the air within the body".

Elsewhere<sup>2)</sup> the accepted link between climate and health is developed at length, and the empirical manifestations of such a link are illustrated, but without any specific reference to Diogenes' air-theology.

There is no doubt, however, that the Hippocratics' acceptance of Diogenes' views was also limited by the characteristic monism of the latter's cosmology. In the passage mentioned above, the Hippocratic writer refers to air as exerting a most important influence upon the human body; for all that, it is the foremost influence among others which are of the same cosmological status as itself. In the Hippocratic view, air clearly enjoyed no mystical predominance over other substances. The epileptic's sufferings were due to the coagulative effects of pus which restricted the passage of air to the brain. There is no hint that if a man loses his reason it is because he is deprived of normal contact with a divine and universal *αἴρ*. The return of health follows a readjustment of the proper equilibrium and this requires the proper proportion of air no less than of the other substances provided by *συνία* and *ποτά*.

The undoubted acceptance by the Hippocratic school both of Alcmaeon's discovery of the brain as the central organ of the nervous system and of his general conception of health as the consequence of a right mixture of elements<sup>3)</sup> emphasizes the eclectic quality of Hippocratic doctrine. While the latter was often loud in its criticism of what it regarded as Alcmaeon's limited conception of substance and his consequently restricted view of the nature of disease, it retained a modified form of Alcmaeon's 'crasis' in the general notion of the equilibrium of man and environment, even if it decried the dangers of such oversimplification in the detailed explanation of disease<sup>4)</sup>.

2) "*Airs, Waters, Places*", *passim*.

3) "*Concerning the Holy Disease*" 17; "*Airs, Waters, Places*", 12; cf. Pohlenz, *op. cit.* p. 38.

4) "*On Ancient Medicine*", especially c. 2, et al.

## SOME CONFLICTING SOURCES OF HIPPOCRATIC THEORY

Pohlenz's assumption<sup>1)</sup> that the Hippocratics were indebted to the air-theology of Diogenes does less than justice both to the empirical spirit of Hippocratic medicine as a whole and also to the undoubted influence upon that school of the theories of Alcmaeon of Croton. Some re-examination of the extent to which the theories of Diogenes and Alcmaeon were accepted by the Hippocratic seems to be required.

A crucial passage is *περὶ φνσῶν* 3 in which the writer distinguishes between three sources of nutriment (*τρισσῶν τροφῶν*) food, drink, and air (*σιτία, ποτά, πνεῦμα*). It is significant that *σιτία* and *ποτά* are merely mentioned before a fuller explanation of the inclusion of *πνεῦμα* is undertaken. It may well be that we are witnessing here the conflict between the empirical view of the practising physician who would record the most obvious (to him) sources of nutriment before he proceeds to the necessary elaboration of a less commonly received idea which had originated elsewhere in the school of Diogenes. But the air-

---

1) *Hippokrates und die Begründung der Wissenschaftlichen Medizin*, Berlin 1938, p. 39, et al.

Other references to the question are sporadic. Werner Jaeger's "*Diokles von Karystos*" (Berlin 1938) pps. 216ff. criticized the facile identification by M. Wellmann ("*Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte*", Berlin 1901, pps. 74ff.) of Empedocles' and Diogenes' accounts of the extent to which the embryo depends upon air as its life source. Jaeger questioned the extent to which in-born *pneuma* (*σύμφυτον πνεῦμα*) of Empedocles may be identified with the air-pneumatism of Diogenes. E. Lesky ("*Die Zeugungs- und Vererbungslehren der Antike*", Ak. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit., Mainz 1950) and Solmsen ("*The Vital Heat, the Inborn Pneuma and the Aether*", J. H. S. 77, 1957 pps. 119ff.) both contented themselves with little more than criticisms of Wellmann's basic assumptions. H. Fränkel ("*Wege und Formen Frühgriechischen Denkens*", Munich 1955 pps. 279ff.) and R. B. Onians ("*Origins of European Thought*", Cambridge 1954, pps. 36; 47ff.) made more comprehensive study of the concept of *pneuma* and the cardiac region in Empedocles, Alcmaeon, and Diogenes. Their separate influence upon Hippocrates has, however, been largely ignored until H. A. T. Reiche's more recent study ("*Empedocles' mixture, Eudoxan astronomy and Aristotle's conate pneuma*", Amsterdam 1960, pps. 30ff.). Reiche's statement of the problem is brief but clear; he does not, however, place sufficient emphasis upon the empiricist characteristics of the Hippocratics which made possible their eclectic adoption of conflicting elements in the theories of Alcmaeon and Diogenes. This is the tentative contribution of the present paper.

theology of the latter reappears in a new guise, in the empirical observations of a physician dedicated to painstaking observation of climatic changes and their effects on the human body. This may well be why the implicit acceptance by the Hippocratics of Diogenes' general view that climate intimately affects human beings requires a lengthier (ᾤολογέτις) treatment after the rather perfunctory mention of "the air within the body".

Elsewhere<sup>2)</sup> the accepted link between climate and health is developed at length, and the empirical manifestations of such a link are illustrated, but without any specific reference to Diogenes' air-theology.

There is no doubt, however, that the Hippocratics' acceptance of Diogenes' views was also limited by the characteristic monism of the latter's cosmology. In the passage mentioned above, the Hippocratic writer refers to air as exerting a most important influence upon the human body; for all that, it is the foremost influence among others which are of the same cosmological status as itself. In the Hippocratic view, air clearly enjoyed no mystical predominance over other substances. The epileptic's sufferings were due to the coagulative effects of pus which restricted the passage of air to the brain. There is no hint that if a man loses his reason it is because he is deprived of normal contact with a divine and universal ἀήρ. The return of health follows a readjustment of the proper equilibrium and this requires the proper proportion of air no less than of the other substances provided by σιτία and ποτά.

The undoubted acceptance by the Hippocratic school both of Alcmaeon's discovery of the brain as the central organ of the nervous system and of his general conception of health as the consequence of a right mixture of elements<sup>3)</sup> emphasizes the eclectic quality of Hippocratic doctrine. While the latter was often loud in its criticism of what it regarded as Alcmaeon's limited conception of substance and his consequently restricted view of the nature of disease, it retained a modified form of Alcmaeon's 'crisis' in the general notion of the equilibrium of man and environment, even if it decried the dangers of such oversimplification in the detailed explanation of disease<sup>4)</sup>.

2) "*Airs, Waters, Places*", *passim*.

3) "*Concerning the Holy Disease*" 17; "*Airs, Waters, Places*", 12; cf. Pohlenz, *op. cit.* p. 38.

4) "*On Ancient Medicine*", especially c. 2, *et al.*

The key to the attitude of the Hippocratics towards both Diogenes and Alcmaeon is to be found, I suggest, in the basic incompatibility of Diogenes' monism and Alcmaeon's conception of *μῆξις*. The Hippocratic doctors' awareness of the incompatibility did not overcome a basically empiricist spirit of eclecticism which could retain elements of both theories without a complete adherence to either. This spirit is in accord with the general precepts of the Hippocratic corpus with regard to the formulation of a diagnosis. Both Diogenes and Alcmaeon are implied in the reference of the Hippocratic writer to "occult and dubious subjects" (τὰ ἀφανέα τε καὶ ἀποροέμενα).

Sheffield

John Colin Davies

### DID ARISTOTLE OWN A SCHOOL IN ATHENS BETWEEN 335/34 and 323 B.C.?

Diogenes Laertius and other biographers of Aristotle maintain that after his return to Athens in 335/34 B. C., the Stagirite founded and owned an independent school in that city<sup>1</sup>) – that is, a distinct school in the physical and legal sense of the term, with its own grounds ("garden", *κῆπος*), buildings and library. If this were actually true, then the school of Aristotle must have been on an equal, or almost equal, footing with the Platonic Academy or Museum. In this distinct school, which allegedly was established in (or near) the Lyceum, and which was, and still is, frequently referred to as the "Peripatus" or the "Lyceum", Aristotle taught philosophy and presided as the "scholarch", at least until the summer or early fall of 323 B. C., when he was compelled to leave Athens<sup>2</sup>). This account, which ap-

1) See Diogenes Laertius V. 2, and *ibid.*, V. 10; *Vita Hesychii* 5; *Vita Marciana* 23; *Vita Vulgata* 18; *Vita Latina* 23–24; (anonymous) *II Vita Syriaca* 4–5; (An-Nadim) *I Vita Arabica* 10–11; (Al-Mubashir) *II Vita Arabica* 14–16, and *ibid.*, 24–26; 31; (Usaibia) *IV Vita Arabica* 4, and *ibid.*, 6; 22–24; 33; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *I Epistola ad Ammaeum* 5. Some of the *Vitae* referred to in this note can conveniently be found in I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, vol. 63, no. 2., Göteborg, 1957), *passim*.

2) See A.-H. Chrout, "Aristotle's Flight from Athens in the Year 323 B. C.", *Historia*, vol. XV. no. 2 (1966) pp. 185–191.