CHAPTER 4

The Treatise *Affections* in the Context of the Hippocratic Corpus

*Pilar Pérez Cañizares*

When and why the treatise *Affections* was included in the CH remains unclear, but it is significant that Erotian did not use it in his *Hippocratic Glossary*. Whether this was due to the concern to distinguish authentic from non-authentic Hippocratic treatises that already existed in his time, or whether the version of the CH Erotian used did not include *Affections* yet, cannot be established with the extant evidence.

There was considerable scholarly activity on the Hippocratic works between Erotian and Galen, including the editions of the CH produced in the age of Hadrian by Dioscorides and Artemidorus Capito, which are considered to be the origin of the collection transmitted by the medieval manuscripts of the CH and may have contained *Affections*. Nevertheless, as is the case for earlier...

---

1 Hippocrates’ περὶ παθῶν (*De Affectionibus*). Editions available of this text are Littré 1849, 206–272 and Potter 1988, 1–91.
2 See Nachmanson 1917 and 1918.
3 Both Ilberg 1894, 127 and Nachmanson 1917, 458 suggest that the list of treatises considered authentic included in Erotian’s preface may not be his own, but the work of some members of the dogmatic school, who considered themselves the heirs of Hippocrates. Be that as it may, the fact that Erotian himself was interested in authenticity is shown by the fact that he says that he will use only the treatises that were considered authentic (cf. Nachmanson 9.1 ἑκεῖν καὶ ἐπεὶ τῶν ἀληθῶς κομιζομένων συντεχνάτων) and mentions his intention of demonstrating that *Prorrh*. 11 was not the work of Hippocrates. (cf. Nachmanson 9.8, Προρρητικὸν α’ καὶ β’, ὡς ὡκ ἔστιν Ἱπποκράτους, ἐν ἄλλοις δειξόμεν). See Appendix for the list of treatises included and excluded by Erotian. No gloss was attributed to *Aff*. by Nachmanson, not even as dubious. Therefore not only was *Aff*. not mentioned explicitly in the preface, but unlike *Vict*. and *Morb*. 4, from which glosses were taken even though they were not mentioned by title (see Appendix), it appears that *Aff*. was not consulted at all by Erotian.
4 On Dioscorides and Artemidorus Capito see Manetti and Roselli 1994, 1617–33. Two of the five oldest manuscripts transmitting parts of the CH contain *Aff*.: the Marcianus gr. 269 (M) of the 10th c. and the Vindobonensis med. gr. 4 (Θ) of the eleventh. The bibliography on both is very abundant and goes beyond the scope of this chapter. On Artemidorus’ edition as the origin of the version of the CH included in the medieval manuscripts see Pfaff 1933, esp. 76.
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stages in the formation of the CH, not even a single reference to the treatise has survived from this period.\(^5\)

The first extant references to Affections are made by Galen. In contrast to Erotian, Galen takes into consideration all the treatises attributed to Hippocrates in his day—and not only the ones he considers authentic—when writing his Glossary.\(^6\) The Corpus that Galen glosses contains therefore about ten more treatises than the one Erotian used as a basis for his Glossary.\(^7\) However, Affections does not seem to have interested him much either, as he mentions it only twice.\(^8\) In both passages Galen refers to the authorship of the treatise, and it is worthwhile examining both of them in a wider context to try to uncover Galen’s intentions in mentioning Affections.

The context in which this first reference to Affections appears is Galen’s commentary on Hippocrates’ Aphorism 6.1, which deals with lientery. In relation to this disease, Galen quotes Erasistratus’ description of what the ancients thought about lientery, only to immediately refute his view.\(^9\) According to Galen, no medical authority before Erasistratus had mentioned the existence of bloody mucous material mixed with undigested food in the excrement of people suffering from lientery, as Erasistratus claimed they had, because it was not there to be seen. Galen’s aim is to show his disagreement both with

---

5 The only extant source for Artemidorus and Dioscorides is Galen, who comments on readings appearing in the texts edited by both authors. The Hippocratic treatises involved are in general those that Galen commented on, there is therefore no citation of references to Aff by these early editors. The testimonies were collected by Ilberg 1890, 111–137.

6 Galen, Glossary of Hippocratic Terms, 19.68.10 K, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἠδη τῶν γλωττῶν ἀφιξόμεθα, πάντων τῶν Ἰπποκράτει ἐπιγεγραμμένων βιβλίων ἐκλέγοντες αὐτά, οὐκ ἐκ τῶν γνησίων μόνον.

7 On this see Roselli 1998, 184–185. For a very detailed description of Galen’s lexicographical explanations and the identification of the passages they refer to see Anastassiou and Irmer 1997.

8 Anastassiou and Irmer 1997, 51–53 contains five glosses in which Galen explains uncommon terms that appear in Aff as well as the two passages.

9 All translations included in this chapter are my own, unless otherwise stated. cf. Aph. 6.1 (4.562 L). Ἐν τῇσι χρονίσει λειεντερίαν ἐξυρεγμίη ἐπιγινομένη, μὴ γενομένη πρότερον, σημειοῦ στυγδόν. ‘In cases of lientery, acid eructations supervening which did not occur before are a good sign’. Commentary on Hippocrates’ Aphorisms 6.1. (18A. 6.11; 8.10 K), ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ περὶ παθῶν Ἱπποκράτους, εἴτ’ οὖν αὐτὸ τοῦ Ἰπποκράτους ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον ἐπιγραμμένον ἐπὶ τῷ περὶ παθῶν Ἱπποκράτους, εἴτ’ οὖν αὐτὸ τοῦ Ἰπποκράτους ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον ἐπὶ τῷ περὶ παθῶν Ἱπποκράτους. Λειεντερία· τὰ σιτία διαχωρεῖ ἄσηπτα, ὑγρά· ὀδύνη δὲ οὐκ ἔνι· λεπτύνονται δὲ τὸ σῶμα. ‘In Hippocrates’ Affections—this book is either by Hippocrates himself or by Polybus, his pupil—is written the following on lientery: ‘Lientery: The foods are excreted undigested and moist; there is no pain, but they slim down the body’. The passage is edited in Garofalo 1988, no.261a. For Galen’s continuous attacks on Erasistratus and the Erasistrateans see Smith 2002, 78–84. For a discussion of this passage see ibid., 197–198.