CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTION xv

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS 1

1. The Mind-Body Connection 3
2. Exercising the Body 59
3. Individual Physiologies 115
4. Nourishing the Body 131
5. Definitions of Health and Disease 147

NOTES 191

SOURCE TEXTS 203

FURTHER READING 211
Galen’s views on the *psychē* (itself a word with broad meanings in Greek, some of which correspond to the concepts of “mind,” “soul,” and perhaps “life force” in English) are a complex, unique amalgamation of his own anatomical investigations and clinical experiences, the recorded observations and theories of his predecessors, and philosophical (especially Platonic, but also Aristotelian) thought. An excellent overview of this complicated topic and its relationship with the broader intellectual milieu in which Galen learned and wrote may be found in Singer’s 2013 volume *Galen: Psychological Writings*. In brief, as Singer argues, Galen described his views on the physiological, mechanistic
interrelationship of the body and the soul primarily in a text he wrote in an earlier phase of his career, *The Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*. Some of these ideas are further explored in a later work, *The Capacities of the Soul Depend on the Mixtures of the Body*. The selections included here come not from these more technical texts, but instead from treatises he focused on near the end of his life. They highlight Galen’s sensitivity to patients’ mental needs and demonstrate how he applies philosophical concepts in a practical way to improve patients’ (and his own) mental health. These texts also show his awareness of the connection between mental and physical health, a concept that has been the subject of increased investigation in modern medical research. His recommendations regarding emotional regulation, contextualization of loss, and the importance of continued efforts toward self-improvement are commonly
encountered in psychological and therapeutic approaches today.

Avoiding Distress

This recently discovered (2005) text intimately describes Galen’s method for coping with emotionally challenging circumstances, including references to the great personal losses he sustained in the fire of 192 CE. Although “Avoiding Distress” has been known to scholars for less than twenty years, there have been multiple editions offering their own subtle changes to the original Greek text, a consequence of a poor-quality manuscript whose owners have restricted scholars’ access to it. I have primarily followed the text of the Budé edition, with some changes (indicated with endnotes) that reflect Garofalo’s emendations and Nutton’s English translation. The addressee is probably a long-time friend of Galen’s from his hometown,
(38) Ἰσως ᾧν φήσεις ἐπιτάττεσθαι σου τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ βούλεσθαι μάλλον γνώναι πῶς ἀπολέσας τοσαύτην ποικιλίαν κτημάτων ὃν ἐκαστὸν αὐτὸ καθ’ ἐαυτὸ μόνον λυπηρότατον ἄν ἔγένετο τοῖς ἀλλοις ἄνθρωποις, οὐκ ἤνιαθην ὡς ἄτος ἄτος, ἀλλὰ πάνυ ὢδιὼς ἤνεγκα τὸ συμβάν. (39) Ἐγὼ δὲ σοι διττὴν ἀπόκρισιν πρὸς τοῦτο ποιήσομαι, τὴν μὲν ἀναμνήσειν πολλάκις ἀκηκόας διερχομένου τοιούτους λόγους ὃν καὶ νῦν ἄρξομαι τῆς ἀναμνήσεως.
Pergamum, and the letter was probably written in early to mid-193 CE. Epicurean, Stoic, Aristotelian, and Platonic elements can be found in the advice Galen offers, which is all the more moving because, as he argues, it has worked for him.

A DOCTOR’S ADVICE FOR COPING WITH LOSS, FROM PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

(38) Maybe you will say that your desire has been spurred onward and that you want to know more about how I, when I lost so many possessions—the loss of each of which on its own would have been incredibly upsetting to other men—was not distressed by it as other men would be, but instead tolerated the accident very easily. (39) I will give you two reasons for this, one of which you must remember, since often you heard me discussing anecdotes of the sort with which I now begin my recollection.
HOW TO BE HEALTHY

φιλότιμος Ἀρίστιππος, οὐκ ἀρκούμενος διαίτη
eὐτελεῖ ἀλλὰ καὶ πολυτελεῖας ὅψων [ἄν] ἑκάστης
ἥμερας διδοὺς ὅργυριον ἑκάστοτε δαψιλὲς τοῖς θερ-
μοτέριοις τῶν κατ’ αὐτὸν ἔταιρων—ὁμως καὶ τὶ πολ-
λῶν δεόμενος ὅ ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος—, (40) ἀνιών ποτε ἐκ
Πειραιῶς—εἰώθει ἀεὶ βαδίζειν οὐ μόνον τὰς ὀὖτω
βραχείας ὁδοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς μαχρὰ—, ἐπειδὴ
ἐθεάσατο τὸν οἰκέτην μὴ δυνάμενον ἑπεθανατίσαι τῷ
φορτὶ—φασκώλιον δὲ ἦν τὸ τούτου χρυσὸν χρυσόν—, ἑκέλευσεν ἀποχέαι τοσοῦτον ὡς τὸ λοιπὸν εὐφορον
αὐτῷ γενέσθαι. (41) Κατὰ τὴν αὐτήν οὖν γνώμην
ἐπραξε καὶ τόδε: τέσσαρας ἔχων ἀγροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς πα-
τρίδος, ἑνα κατὰ τῖνα περίστασιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἓξ
αὐτῶν ἐπέλασεν ὡς λοιπὸν ἐχεῖν τρεῖς. (42) Ἀπα-
ντήσας οὖν τὶς τῶν πολιτῶν ἑτούμος* ἣν ἐπὶ τῇ ζημίᾳ
συλλυπεῖσθαι: γελάσας οὖν ὁ Ἀρίστιππος ἐφη: “τι

* I here use the reading ἑτοίμος of Garofalo and Lami, Galeno: L’anima e il dolore, and of Nutton CMG V 8,1, Galeni De Praecognitione, instead of the reading οἷος of Boudon-Millot, Jouanna, and Pietrobelli, Galién, vol. 4, Ne pas se chagriner.
The profligate Aristippus, not content with a thrifty lifestyle, frequently gave large sums of money to host extravagant daily feasts for the more zealous among his pupils—but there were many things that even he did not have. (40) One day, as he was coming back from the Piraeus (it was his custom always to walk, not only for short trips like this one, but also for longer ones), when he saw that his servant was unable to hold on to his burden (his little bag was full of gold), he ordered the servant to take out as much of the gold as needed to make the remaining burden easy to carry. (41) In the same frame of mind, he also did this: although he had four fields in his hometown, he lost one of them because of some difficulties in his affairs, with the result that he had three left. (42) One of his fellow citizens, coming to meet him, was eager to show his sympathy for the loss. Aristippus
μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ <σύ> συλλυπήσῃ τρεῖς άγροὺς ἔχοντι τοιούτους οἶον <ἐνα> μόνον αὐτὸς ἔχεις ἢ ἐγώ σοι συλλυπήσομαι;

πάνυ καλῶς ἐνδεικνύμενος ὁ πολλάκις ἰκουσας παρ’ ἐμοῦ λεγόμενον ώς οὐ χρή πρός τι τῶν ἀπολλυμένων ἐμβλέπειν καὶ λογίζεσθαι πῶς οἱ τρεῖς άγροὺς δεξάμενοι τοῦ πατρὸς οὐκ ἀνέξονται βλέπειν ἐτέρους ἔχοντας τριάκοντα· (43) καὶ γὰρ ἐάν τριάκοντα ἔχωσιν, ἐτέρους ὑπόνται πεντήκοντα ἔχοντας· ἐὰν <κατὰ> ταὐτὰ πάλιν αὐτοὶ κτήσωνται τοσούτους, ἔχοντας ὑπόνται τινας ἄλλους ἐβδομήκοντα, κἂν ἑκείνους ἔχωσιν, ἄλλους θεάσονται πλείους τῶν ἑκατόν ἔχοντας, ὡστε κατὰ βραχὺ προϊόντες ἀπάντων ἐπιθυμήσονται, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀεὶ πένητες ἔσονται, μὴ πληρουμένης αὐτῶν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας.
laughed and said, “Why should you show me sympathy, when I have three of these kinds of fields, while you only have one? Or should I be showing you sympathy?”

He very finely demonstrates what you have heard me say very often: you should not fixate on what was lost, and you should consider how men who have received three fields from their father cannot stand to look at other people who have thirty fields. (43) For in fact if they have thirty, they will focus on other people who have fifty. Again, if in the same way they will obtain as many, then they will focus on others who have seventy fields, and even if they have these, they will see others who have more than a hundred, with the result that, proceeding little by little like this, they will covet everything. In this way, they will always be poor because their longing is insatiable.
Ἐὰν δὲ τις μὴ πόσους ἀγροὺς ἄλλος ἔχει διὰ τέλους σκοπῆ, ἀλλ᾽ ἣ<δη> τοὺς ἰδίοις ἀναλώμασιν ἐξαρκοῦντας αὐτῷ, τὴν τῶν περιττωμάτων ἀπώλειαν ἀκηδῶς οἴσει. (44) Ἐὰν μὲν γάρ τις ἕνα μόνον ἔχων ἄγρον ἀπολέσῃ τούτον, ἀπορο<ς> ἐσται παντάπασιν, ὡστε εἰκότως ἀνιαθήσεται, ἕνα δὲ ἀπολέσας <τις> ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων, ἐν ἰσω καταστήσεται τοῖς τρεῖς ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὡστε τούτῳ μὲν μέγα οὐδὲν μὴ λυπεῖσθαι τρεῖς ἀγροὺς ὑπολοίπους ἔχοντι, μέγα δὲ τὸ τὸν μηδὲ ἕνα κεκτημένον ἄγρον ἀλύπως φέρειν πενίαν ὡς ὁ Κράτης ἐφερε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον εἰ <τις> μηδὲ οἰκίαν ἔχει[ν] καθάπερ ὁ Διογένης. (45) Οὐκοῦν ἔμοι τί πράγμα μέγα μηδ᾽ ὅλως ἀνιαθέντι διὰ χρημάτων ἀπώλειαν; Ἡν γάρ ἀεὶ τὰ λειπόμενα πολὺ πλέω τῶν ἰκανῶν.
(44) But, if someone is not forever keeping an eye on how many fields someone else has, but instead looks to what suffices for his own expenses, he will bear the loss of the excess with indifference. (45) On the other hand, if someone with a single field loses it, then he will be totally without means and will reasonably be distressed. But someone who lost one of his four fields is in the same position as those who had three from the beginning, so it is no great thing for the man who still has three fields not to be upset. But it is a great thing for the man who never owned a field to endure his poverty without distress, as Crates endured it, and for that reason an even greater thing if he never had even a house, like Diogenes.  

(46) So really, it was no great affair for me to be wholly unperturbed at the loss of my property, for what remains is much more than enough.
Affections and Errors of the Soul

This text, likely written later in Galen’s life, is part of the tradition of practical ethics, the idea that philosophical concepts could positively and productively affect one’s mental state and behavior. The philosophical origins of such therapy for the soul may be found in multiple schools of thought, including Stoicism, Epicureanism, Platonism, and Aristotelianism (as is the case for much of Galen’s work). Although there are many affections about which one could be concerned—among them rage, anger,
fear, distress, envy, and excessive desire—in this text, Galen focuses especially on anger and distress. The excerpt appears in the beginning of the treatise, when he is making a distinction between affections, which he argues have a more irrational component, and errors, which are more aligned with rational capacities (although these distinctions are not perfect or absolute). Galen addresses the work to someone who must have been one of his oldest friends, who shared his political views and maintained a relationship with him despite the distance that likely separated them.
(4.2D = 5.2.14K) ἐγὼ δ’ αὐτὸ τούτο πρῶτον, ὡς οἶσθα, διώρισα, τὸ μὲν ἁμάρτημα κατὰ ψευδὴ
(4.4D = 5.3K) δόξαν εἰπὼν γίγνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ πάθος κατὰ τιν’ ἀλογον ἐν ἡμῖν δύναμιν ἀπειθοῦσαν τῷ
λόγῳ· κοινῇ δ’ ἀμφότερα κατὰ <τὸ> γενικότερον
σημαίνομενον ἁμαρτήματα κεκληθοῦσαν. λέγομεν οὖν
ἁμαρτάνειν καὶ τὸν ἀκολασταίνοντα καὶ τὸν θυμῷ τι
πράττοντα καὶ τὸν διαβολὴ πιστεύοντα.

γέγραπται μὲν οὖν καὶ Χρυσίππῳ καὶ ἄλλοις πολ- 
λοίς τῶν φιλοσόφων θεραπευτικὰ γράμματα τῶν
τῆς ψυχῆς παθῶν, εἰρητικά δὲ καὶ πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλους
<περὶ τούτων> καὶ τῶν ἑταίρων αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸ
τούτων ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος· καὶ ἦν μὲν βέλτιον ἐξ ἐκεί-
νων μανθάνειν αὐτά, ὡσπερ κάγῳ. τὰ δ’ οὖν κεφά-
λαια διὰ τοῦ πρῶτον λόγου τούδε διὰ συντόμου,
ἐπειδὴ κελεύεις, διήξω σοι πάντα, καθ’ ἢν ἡδή τάξιν
AFFECTIONS AND ERRORS OF THE SOUL

(4.2D = 5.2.14K) From the very first, I made this distinction, that an error occurs in accordance with false (4.4D = 5.3K) belief,¹⁴ and that affection¹⁵ occurs according to some irrational faculty in us that does not comply with reason; colloquially, both in a more general sense are called errors. So, we say that someone has erred when he behaves dissolutely, or does something from anger, or believes a false accusation.

Chrysippus and many other philosophers have written therapeutic texts for affections of the soul, and Aristotle and his followers, and Plato before them, also discussed these things. It would be better to learn these things from them, as I did. So, in this first section, I will set out for you the main points in an abridged form, since you are requesting that I do so, according
handleSubmit
to the arrangement you heard before, when you asked about Antonius’s book.

That we are probably making mistakes even if we ourselves believe that we are not slipping up can be readily gathered from the following: we see that all assume that they are without error entirely, or that they make a few small errors rarely, and that it is \((4.20D = 5.4K)\) above all those who think this way whom others believe err the most. I have also learned the following through my experience as much as anything else: men who enjoin others to point out their errors are the sort of people whom I have rarely witnessed making mistakes, but those who assume that they are the best without entrusting judgement to others I have seen slipping up most and most often.

As a young man, I used to think that the Pythian oracle’s command “Know thyself” was overrated, since I did not think it was any
δικαίως ἐπαινούμενον. ἀκριβῶς μὲν γὰρ ὁ σοφώτατος μόνος ἀν ἐαυτὸν γνοίη, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀκριβῶς μὲν οὐδείς, ἢττον δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτερος ἔτερον. καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ὅλω τῷ βίῳ καὶ κατὰ πάσας τὰς τέχνας τὰς μὲν μεγάλας ὑπεροχάς τε καὶ διαφορὰς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπαντος ἀνδρός ἐστί γνώναι, τὰς δὲ μικρὰς τῶν φρονίμων τε καὶ τεχνιτῶν, οὕτω κατὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἔχει (5.9D = 5.5K) καὶ παθῶν. ὅστις μὲν ἐπὶ μικροῖς ὀργιζόμενος σφόδρας δάκνει τε καὶ λακτίζει τοὺς οἰκέτας, οὕτως μὲν σοι δήλος ἐστιν ἐν πάθει καθεστηκώς, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὅστις ἐν μέθαις ἑταίραις τε καὶ κώμοις καταγίνεται. τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ μεγάλη χρημάτων ἢ ἀτιμίας μετρίως ταραχθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν οὐκέθα ὁμοίως ἐστι φανερὸν, εἰ τοῦ γένους τῶν παθῶν ὑπάρχει, ὡσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ πλαχτοῦντα φαγεῖν ἀκυρώτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτα κατάδηλα γίνεται τῷ προμελετήσαντι τῇ ψυχῇ
great commandment. I later saw that it is justly praised, for only the wisest might know himself accurately, but among all others none might do so accurately, though some do know themselves better or worse than others do. For just as in every aspect of life and in every craft, it is within everybody’s power to recognize great achievements and distinctions in matters, but only knowledgeable and expert men can recognize the finer differences, so also this is true of errors \((5.9D = 5.5K)\) and affections. You clearly recognize that the sort of man who bites and kicks his staff when violently angry over trivial matters is in a state of affection, as is the sort of man who when drunk busies himself with escorts and parties. Being moderately troubled in spirit by a great financial loss or public disgrace falls less clearly into the category of affections (like eating cake immoderately does), but these [distinctions] are in fact obvious to someone who has
ἐξοδιάσαντι <τε> ἀπάντων παθῶν ἐπανορθώσεως δεόμενα:

δόστις οὖν βούλεται καλὸς κἀγαθὸς γενέσθαι, τούτῳ ἐννοησάτω, ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ἐστιν αὐτὸν ἄγνοεῖν πολλὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτημάτων· ὅπως <δ’> ἂν ἐξεύροι πάντα, δυνάμενος ἐγὼ λέγειν, ὡς εὐρών αὐτός, οὔπω λέγω, διότι τὸ βιβλίον τούτο δύναται ποτὲ καὶ εἰς ἄλλων ἁρικέσθαι χεῖρας, ὅπως ἂν κακεῖνοι γυμνασθῶσι πρότερον ὁδὸν εὑρεῖν τῆς γνώσεως τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτημάτων. ὡσπερ <οὖν> καὶ σέ μοι λέγειν (5.23D = 5.6K) ἰξίωσα καὶ, μέχρι τὸ σαυτῷ δοκοῦν ἀπεφήνω, διεσιώπησα, καὶ νῦν οὕτω πράξω, παρακαλέσας τὸν ὁμιλοῦντα τῷ γράμματι καταθέμενον αὐτὸ ζητῆσαι, ὅπως ἂν τις ἐαυτὸν δύνατο [τὸ] γνωρίζειν ἁμαρτάνοντα.
trained his soul beforehand and has discharged what is necessary for the correction of all his affections.¹⁷

Therefore, whoever wants to become a fine and good person, let him bear this in mind, that one is necessarily unaware of many of one’s own errors. How one could discover all of them, I am able to tell you, as I found out on my own, but I will not yet do so because this book at some point may come into the hands of other people, so that they, too, may first exert themselves to discover a method for recognizing their own personal errors. So, just as I thought it appropriate that you tell me [what you think] (5.23D = 5.6K) and remained silent for as long as you shared your opinions with me, now I will do the same: I ask the person who is joining in conversation with this text to set it aside and to examine how he might be able to recognize when he is committing an error.
δύο γάρ, ώς Αἴσωπος ἔλεγε, πῆρας ἐξήμμεθα τοῦ τραχήλου, τῶν μὲν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν πρόσω, τῶν ἰδίων δὲ τὴν ὑπίσω, καὶ διὰ τούτο τὰ μὲν ἀλλότρια βλέπομεν ἀεί, τῶν δὲ οἰκείων ἀθέατοι καθεστήκαμεν. καὶ τούτον γε τὸν λόγον ὡς ἀληθῆ προσίενται πάντες. ὁ δὲ Πλάτων καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀποδίδωσι τοῦ γιγνομένου· τυφλώττειν γάρ φησί τὸ φιλοῦν περί τὸ φιλούμενον. εἰπερ οὖν έχαστος ἠμῶν ἐκεῖνον ἀπάντων μάλιστα φιλεῖ, τυφλώττειν ἀναγκαῖον ἔστιν αὐτὸν ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦ. πώς οὖν ὑπεται τὰ ἱδια κακὰ; καὶ πώς ἀμαρτάνων γνώσεται; πολλῷ γὰρ ἤκεικεν ὁ τε τοῦ Αἴσωπου μῦθος καὶ ὁ τοῦ Πλάτωνος λόγος ἀνελπιστήρα τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτημάτων εὑρεσιν ἀποφαίνειν· εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦ φιλεῖν τις ἐκεῖνον ἀποστῆσαι δύναται, τυφλώττειν ἀναγκαῖον ἔστι τὸ φιλοῦν περὶ τὸ φιλούμενον.

οὐ μὴν οὐδ’ ἐγὼ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα τόδε τὸ βιβλίον ἥξιον ἄν (6.17D = 5.7K) ἐπισκέψασθαι καθ’
For we have, as Aesop said, two knapsacks around our necks, the one in front filled with the wrongs of others, and the one in back with our own. Because of this, we are always able to see others’ wrongs, but we are blind to our own. And everyone accepts this statement as true. Plato also provides the reason for this occurrence: he says that the lover is blind concerning the object of his love. If in fact each of us loves himself most of all, he is necessarily blind when it comes to himself. How, then, will he see his own wrongs? And how will he recognize when he errs? To many, Aesop’s fable and Plato’s argument seem to present our discovery of our personal errors as rather futile. For if someone is not able to set aside his love for himself, it is necessary that the lover be blind concerning the object of his love.

But I would not have considered my reader to be worthy of studying this
αὐτὸν <περί> τῆς τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτημάτων εὑρέσεως, εἰ μὴ χαλεπὸν ὦ τὸ πράγμα, κἂν τις ὡς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐσχεμμένος ἢ καθ’ αὐτὸν. καὶ τοῖνυν ἐγὼ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀποφαίνομαι γνώμην, ἵνα, εἰ μὲν τινα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκαστὸς ἐτέραν ὁδὸν εὑροί, προσλαβών καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφεληθῇ πλέον ὄτε διπλῆν ἄνθρωπος ἐναρκής εὐρών ὁδὸν σωτηρίας· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀλλ’ αὐτὴ γε τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ διατελῇ χρώμενος, ἄχρι περ ὥστε ἐτέραν εὐρή βελτίων· τίς οὖν ἡ ἐμὴ, λέγειν ἢ ἢδη καιρός, ἀρχὴν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς διατελῆς ἀποφαίνομαι.

'Ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν ἁμαρτήματα διὰ [τὴν] ψευδὴ δόξαν γίγνονται, τὰ δὲ πάθη διὰ τιν’ ἀλογον ὑμην, ἔδοξέ μοι πρῶτον ἔλευθερωσαί τῶν παθῶν· εἰκὸς γάρ πως καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ψευδῶς ἡμᾶς δοξάζειν. ἔστι δὲ πάθη ψυχῆς, ἀπερ ἄπαντες γινώσκουσι, θυμός καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ φόβος καὶ λύπη καὶ φθόνος καὶ ἑπιθυμία
book for himself regarding the discovery of his own errors unless the matter were a difficult one, even for someone who was especially engaged in self-reflection. And now I am giving my own opinion, in order that, if each person should find any another method, he might be helped more by applying mine in addition, since he has discovered a double method for preserving himself instead of a single one. If not, at least he might continue using our method until he finds a better one. At this point, I will describe my approach, having already established the beginning of my argument.

Since on the one hand, errors are born of false beliefs, while affections are born of some irrational impulse, it seemed to me that one should first liberate himself from his affections, since it is likely that we somehow form false beliefs because of them. There are the affections of the soul that everyone knows: anger, rage, fear, grief,
σφόδρα. κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην καὶ τὸ φθάσαι
πάνυ σφόδρα φιλεῖν ή μισεῖν ὑπὸ τοὺν πράγμα πάθος
ἐστίν. ὥρθως γὰρ ἔσχεν εἰρήσθαι τὸ “μέτρον ἄρι
στον”, (7.6D = 5.8K) ὡς οὐδενὸς ἀμέτρου καλῶς
γιγνομένου.

πῶς οὖν ἂν τις ἔκκοψει ταῦτα μὴ γνοὺς πρότε-
ρον ἔχων αὐτά; γνώναι δ’, ως ἐλέγομεν, ἀδύνατον,
ἐπειδὴ σφόδρα φιλοῦμεν ἡμᾶς. ἀλλὰ κἂν μὴ σαυτὸν
ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐπιτρέπῃ σοι κρίνειν, ἄλλον γε συγχω-
ρέι δύνασθαι κρίναι τὸν μήτε φιλοῦμεν ὑπὸ σοῦ
μήτε μισοῦμεν. ὅταν οὖν ἀκούσῃς τινὰ τῶν κατὰ
τὴν πόλιν* ἐπαινοῦμεν ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἐπὶ τῷ μηδένα
κολακεύσῃ, ἐκείνῳ προσφοιτήσας τῇ σαυτοῦ πείρᾳ
κρῖνον, εἰ τοιοῦτὸς ἐστιν, οἶος εἶναι λέγεται, καὶ
πρώτον, ἐὰν ἱδῇς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλουσίων τε καὶ

* Omitting “ὅν μήτε φιλήσειν οἴδε μήτε μήτε μισήσειν,” after De
Boer, Galeni De propriorum animi cuinislibet affectuum dignotione
et curatione; and Singer, Galen: Psychological Writings.
envy, and violent desire. In addition, in my opinion, to swiftly form a violent feeling of love or hate for anything is also an affection. It seems to me that the phrase “moderation is best” is rightly stated, \(7.6D = 5.8K\) as no one does well without moderation.

So, how should someone eradicate these affections, if he from the start does not recognize that he has them? To recognize them, as we were saying, is impossible, since we love ourselves intensely. But although this argument does not leave it to you to judge yourself, it does on the other hand concede that it is possible to judge someone you neither love nor hate. So, whenever you hear that someone is praised throughout the city on the grounds that he does not flatter anybody, spend time with this man and, from your experience, judge for yourself if he is the sort of person he is said to be. First, if you
πολὺ δυναμένων ἡ καὶ τὰς τῶν μονάρχων οἰκίας ἐπιόντα συνεχῶς, γινώσκει μάτην ἀκηκοέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ἀληθεύειν ἅπαντα (ταῖς γὰρ τοιαύταις κολακείαις ἔπεται καὶ τὸ ψεύδεσθαι), δεύτερον ἢ προσαγορεύοντα ἢ παραπέμποντα τοὺς τοιούτους ὁρῶν αὐτὸν ἡ καὶ συνδειπνοῦντα. τοιούτων γάρ τις ἑλόμενοι βίον οὐκ ἀληθεύει, (7.20D = 5.9K) ἀλλὰ καὶ κακίαν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔχει, φιλοχρήματος ὢν ἡ φίλαρχος ἡ φιλότιμος ἡ φιλόδοξος, ἡ τινα τούτων ἡ πάντα.

τὸν δὲ μὴ προσαγορεύοντα μήτε παραπέμποντα μήτε συνδειπνοῦντα τοῖς πολὺ δυναμένοις ἢ πλουτοῦσι καὶ κεκολασμένη τῇ διαίτῃ χρώμενον ἐλπίσας ἀληθεύσειν εἰς βαθύτεραν ἀφικέσθαι πειρῶ γνώσιν, ὁποῖος τίς ἔστιν (ἐν συνουσίαις δ’ αὐτῇ πολυχρονιωτέραις γίγνεται), κἂν εὔρης τοιοῦτον, ἰδίας ποτὲ
see him always going to the homes of the wealthy and powerful, or also at the houses of rulers, know that this man’s reputation for always telling the truth is false, since lying also follows this kind of flattery. Second, this also holds true if you see him greeting, accompanying, or also dining with such people. Someone who chooses this kind of life not only does not tell the truth \((7.20D = 5.9K)\) but also is necessarily thoroughly bad, since he will be some or all of these things: money loving, power grubbing, attention seeking, or image conscious.

On the other hand, if you entertain the hope that some man who does not greet, accompany, or dine with powerful or wealthy men and who enjoys a chastened lifestyle is truthful, try to come to a deeper understanding of what sort of man he is, as happens through an extended acquaintance. If you do find that he is truthful, ask
μόνω διαλέχθητι παρακαλέσας, ὃ τι ἂν <ἐν> σοι βλέπῃ τῶν εἰρημένων παθῶν, εὐθέως δηλοῦν, ὡς χάριν ἔξοντι τούτου μεγίστην ἡγησομένῳ τε σωτήρα μᾶλλον ἢ ei νοσοῦντα το σῶμα διέσωσε. κἂν ὑπόσχηται δηλώσειν, ὅταν ἴδῃ τι τῶν εἰρημένων πάσχοντά σε, κάπετα πλειόνων ἠμερῶν μεταξύ γεγονότων δηλοντί, μέμψαι τόν ἀνθρωπον, αὐθίς τε παρακάλεσον ἐτι λιπαρέστερον ἢ ως πρόσθεν, ὡ τι ἂν ὑπὸ σοῦ βλέπῃ κατὰ πάθος πραττόμενον, εὐθέως μηνύειν. ἐὰν δ᾿ εἶπῃ σοι, διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἐωρακέναι περὶ σε τοιοῦτον ἐν τῷ μεταξύ, διὰ τοῦτο μηδ᾿ αὐτὸς εἰρηκέναι, μὴ πεισθῆς (8.11D = 5.10K) εὐθέως μηδ᾿ οἰηθῆς ἀναμάρτητος ἐξαίφνης γεγονέναι, ἀλλὰ δυοὶν θάτερον, ἢ διὰ ῥαθυμίαν οὐ προσεχθήκεναι σοι τὸν παρακληθέντα
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