

Immortel, designed by Clément Le Tulle-Neyret, is a type family with four variants developed according to the Hippocratic theory of humors that explains these latter through the presence of one of the four principal fluids. Each one is the cause behind the development of a character trait: phlegm represents a lymphatic, sluggish, slow character (*Immortel Infra*); yellow bile, an angry and prideful character (*Immortel Colera*); blood, a jovial and warm character (*Immortel Vena*); and black bile provokes hopelessness and melancholy (*Immortel Acedia*).

This type family is envisaged like a human being, able to reveal different temperaments through the forms that it adopts. Each variant can be substituted for another without causing any change in the bulkiness of the text, as the metric system, which provides a structural link between the variants – set width, x-heights, the length of ascenders and descenders, height of capitals – is constant.

Typographically, each variant is inspired by the work of type designers, following the course of history:

- *Immortel Infra* finds its source in the work of Robert Granjon, a typeface engraver from the 16th century;
- *Immortel Colera* in the work of Jean Jannon, an engraver from the 17th century;
- *Immortel Vena* is influenced by the work of Jacques-François Rosart, an engraver from the 18th century;
- *Immortel Acedia* takes its inspiration from the engraving *Melencolia I* by Albrecht Dürer (1514) and attempts a synthesis between two traces of a priori opposing tools, one made by the flat tip and the other by the narrow point. In this sense it is closer to a 21st century typeface.



Imm

Immortel Infra and *Vena*, variants intended to be used with running text, possess two italics: the first, called “Median”, slightly slanted, is ideal for composing long text; the second, called “Italic”, with its very sharp angle and ornate instrokes and terminals, is ideal for emphasis.

To best serve running text, the *Infra* and *Vena* variants possess two grades: this signifies that these two variants have two slightly different weights that conserve the same set width so as to have a more or less dark text color according to the page layout and/or the sensitivity of the user. Grade 2 can also be used to compose knocked out text on a dark background.

This type family began life in October 2016 in the *Atelier national de recherche typographique* (ANRT, Nancy - France). Its development was pursued thanks to the support of the *Centre national des arts plastiques* (CNAP) in 2018.

Infra
Colera
Vena
Acedia





Alchemic approach to four humors in relation to the four elements and zodiacal signs, 1574. Book illustration in "Quinta Essentia" by Leonhart Thurneisser zum Thurn (gen. Leonhard Thurneysser). Woodcut.

240 PTS

Infra

120 PTS

Colera Ve

56 PTS

Vena Acedia Infra Co

32 PTS

Colera Vena Acedia Infra Colera Ve

24 PTS

Acedia Infra Colera Vena Acedia Infra Colera Ve

16 PTS

Vena Acedia Infra Colera Vena Acedia Infra Colera Vena Acedia Infra C

INTRODUCTION

OWNERSHIP AND LICENCE

A typeface is created by a designer whose art is to transform an original typographic artwork into a computer file or files. As a consequence a typeface is – as a work – protected by laws pertaining to intellectual property rights and – as software – can not be copied and/or installed without first acquiring a nominative licence.

In no way, shape or form may a typeface be transmitted to a third party or modified. The desired modifications in the context of the development of a visual identity, can only be effected by the designer himself and only after acquisition of a written authorisation from 205TF.

The user of a 205TF typeface must first acquire of a licence that is adapted to his needs (desktop, web, application/epub, TV/film/videos web).

A licence is nominative (a physical person or business) and is non-transferable. The licensee can not transmit the typeface files to other people or organisations, including but not limited to partners and/or subcontractors who must acquire a separate and distinct licence or licences. The full text of the licence and terms of use can be downloaded here: any person or entity found in breach of one or more terms of the licence may be prosecuted.

THE OPENTYPE FORMAT

The OpenType format is compatible with both Macintosh and Windows platforms. Based on Unicode encoding it can contain up to 65,000 signs* including a number of writing systems (Latin, Greek, Cyrillic, Hebrew, etc.) and numerous signs that allow users to create accurate and sleek typographic compositions

(small capitals, aligned and oldstyle numerals, proportionals and tabulars, ligatures, alternative letters, etc.). The OpenType format is supported by a wide range of software. The dynamic functions are accessed differently depending on the software used.

*A Postscript or Truetype typeface can contain no more than 256 signs.

SUPPORTED LANGUAGES

Abenaki	Folkspraak	Luxembourgish	Shona
Afaan Oromo	French	Maasai	Sicilian
Afar	Frisian	Makhuwa	Silesian
Afrikaans	Friulian	Malay	Slovak
Albanian	Gagauz	Maltese	Slovenian
Alsatian	Galician	Manx	Slovio
Amis	Ganda	Maori	Somali
Anuta	Genoese	Marquesan	Sorbian Lower
Aragonese	German	Meglenoromanian	Sorbian Upper
Aranese	Gikuyu	Meriam Mir	Sotho Northern
Aromanian	Gooniyandi	Mirandese	Sotho Southern
Arrernte	Greenlandic	Mohawk	Spanish
Arvanitic	Greenlandic Old	Moldovan	Sranan
Asturian	Orthography	Montagnais	Sundanese
Atayal	Guadeloupean	Montenegrin	Swahili
Aymara	Gwichin	Murrinhpatha	Swazi
Azerbaijani	Haitian Creole	Nagamese Creole	Swedish
Bashkir	Han	Ndebele	Tagalog
Basque	Hawaiian	Neapolitan	Tahitian
Belarusian	Hiligaynon	Ngiyambaa	Tetum
Bemba	Hopi	Niuean	Tok Pisin
Bikol	Hotcak	Noongar	Tokelauan
Bislama	Hungarian	Norwegian	Tongan
Bosnian	Icelandic	Novial	Tshiluba
Breton	Ido	Occidental	Tsonga
Bulgarian	Ilocano	Occitan	Tswana
Romanization	Indonesian	Old Icelandic	Tumbuka
Cape Verdean	Interglossa	Old Norse	Turkish
Catalan	Interlingua	Oshiwambo	Turkmen
Cebuano	Irish	Ossetian	Tuvaluan
Chamorro	Istorianian	Palauan	Tzotzil
Chavacano	Italian	Papiamentu	Ukrainian
Chichewa	Jamaican	Piedmontese	Uzbek
Chickasaw	Javanese	Polish	Venetian
Chinese Pinyin	Jerriais	Portuguese	Vepsian
Cimbrian	Kaingang	Potawatomi	Volapuk
Cofan	Kala Lagaw Ya	Qeqchi	Voro
Corsican	Kapampangan	Quechua	Wallisian
Creek	Kaqchikel	Rarotongan	Walloon
Crimean Tatar	Karakalpak	Romanian	Waraywaray
Croatian	Karelian	Romansh	Warlpiri
Czech	Kashubian	Rotokas	Wayuu
Danish	Kikongo	Sami Inari	Welsh
Dawan	Kinyarwanda	Sami Lule	Wikmungan
Delaware	Kiribati	Sami Northern	Wiradjuri
Dholuo	Kirundi	Sami Southern	Wolof
Drehu	Kurdish	Samoan	Xavante
Dutch	Ladin	Sango	Xhosa
English	Latin	Saramaccan	Yapese
Esperanto	Latino Sine	Sardinian	Yindjibarndi
Estonian	Latvian	Scottish Gaelic	Zapotec
Faroesee	Lithuanian	Serbian	Zulu
Fijian	Lojban	Seri	Zuni
Filipino	Lombard	Seychellois	
Finnish	Low Saxon	Shawnee	

INTRODUCTION

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF USE

To buy ore By buying a typeface you support typeface designers who can dedicate the time necessary for the development of new typefaces (and you are of course enthusiastic at the idea of discovering and using them!)

Copy? By copying and illegally using typefaces, you jeopardise designers and kill their art. In the long term the result will be that you will only have Arial available to use in your compositions (and it would be well deserved!)

Test! 205TF makes test typefaces available. Before downloading them from www.205.tf you must first register. These test versions are not complete and can only be used in models/mock ups. Their use in a commercial context is strictly prohibited.

RESPONSIBILITY

205TF and the typeface designers represented by 205TF pay particular attention to the quality of the typographic design and the technical development of typefaces.

Each typeface has been tested on Macintosh and Windows, the most popular browsers (for webfonts) and on Adobe applications (InDesign, Illustrator, Photoshop) and Office (Word, Excel, Power point).

205TF can not guarantee their correct functioning when used with other operating system or software. 205TF can not be considered responsible for an eventual “crash” following the installation of a typeface obtained through the www.205.tf website.

G1 ROMAN

Immortel Infra G1 Roman

G1 MEDIAN

Immortel Infra G1 Median

G1 ITALIC

Immortel Infra G1 Italic

G2 ROMAN

Immortel Infra G2 Roman

G2 MEDIAN

Immortel Infra G2 Median

G2 ITALIC

Immortel Infra G2 Italic

STYLES

ROMAN

Immortel Colera Roman

ITALIC

Immortel Colera Italic

G1 ROMAN

Immortel Vena G1 Roman

G1 MEDIAN

Immortel Vena G1 Median

G1 ITALIC

Immortel Vena G1 Italic

G2 ROMAN

Immortel Vena G2 Roman

G2 MEDIAN

Immortel Vena G2 Median

G2 ITALIC

Immortel Vena G2 Italic

STYLES

ROMAN

Immortel Acedia Roman

ITALIC

Immortel Acedia Italic

OPENTYPE FEATURES

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Automatically spaced capitals.
2. Punctuation is optically repositionning
3, 4. Specific small capitals whereas
optically reduced capitals.
5. Specific glyphs in several languages.
6, 7, 8, 9. Specific superior
and inferior glyphs.
10, 11. Proportional figures. | 12, 13. Tabular figures, practical when
the user needs alignment in columns.
14. Slashed zero to distinguish with
letter 0.
15. Standard ligatures automatically correct
collision between two characters.
16. Smart ligatures.
17. Specific contextual glyphs. |
|---|--|

	FEATURE OFF	FEATURE ON
1. FULL CAPS	Lacassagne	LACASSAGNE
2. CASE SENSITIVE FORMS	(Hôtel-Dieu)	(HÔTEL-DIEU)
3. SMALL CAPS	Caluire-et-Cuire	CALUIRE-ET-CUIRE
4. CAPS TO SMALL CAPS	VAULX-EN-VELIN	VAULX-EN-VELIN
5. LOCALIZED FORMS		
ROMANIAN	Chişinău Galaţi	Chişinău Galaţi
CATALAN	Paral·lel	Parallel
FRENCH	Il dit : « Vous fîtes »	Il dit : « Vous fîtes »
TURKISH	Lafi filan	Lafi filan
6. ORDINALS	No Nos no nos IA IO	N ^o N ^{os} n ^o n ^{os} I ^a I ^o
7. FRACTIONS	I/4 I/2 3/4	¼ ½ ¾
8. SUPERIORS	Mr M ^{me} I ^{er}	M ^r M ^{me} I ^{er}
9. INFERIORS	H ₂ O Fe ₃ O ₄	H ₂ O Fe ₃ O ₄
10. PROPORTIONAL LINING FIGURES	0123456789	0123456789
11. PROPORTIONAL OLD STYLE FIG.	0123456789	0123456789
12. TABULAR LINING FIGURES	0123456789	0123456789
13. TABULAR OLD STYLE FIG.	0123456789	0123456789
14. SLASHED ZERO	o 0	o 0
15. LIGATURES	Afficher	Afficher
16. DISCRETIONARY LIGATURES	Portfolio, Lunette, Théâtre	Portfolio, Lunette, Théâtre
17. CONTEXTUAL ALTERNATES	o8x32mm IOX65mm Stef's book Qg Qj Qp Qq Qy	o8×32mm IO×65mm Stef's book Qg Qj Qp Qq Qy

OPENTYPE FEATURES

The stylistic set function allows to access to specific signs which replace glyphs in the standard set.
A typeface can contain 20 stylistic sets.

	FEATURE OFF	FEATURE ON
ARROWS (SS01)	--W --E --S --N --NW --NE --SE --SW --NS --WE	← → ↓ ↑ ↖ ↗ ↘ ↙ ↕ ↔
ORNAMENTAL LIGATURES (SS02)	Rectiligne, cristallin, espace	Rectiligne, cristallin, espace

Immortel Infra



Immortal Infra represents phlegm: a lymphatic, sluggish and slow character. It finds its source in the work of Robert Granjon, a typeset engraver from the 16th century.

56 PTS

The doctrine of
the four humours.
In the order stated

32 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours.
In the order stated above—not
necessarily following one another,
but often existing side by

24 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the
order stated above—not necessarily following
one another, but often existing side by side—
these various meanings evolved in the course
of a development covering more than two

16 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above
—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by
side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development
covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings
emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a
case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival.
The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal
conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the

12 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit

10 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements

and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural

8 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in

diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and

6 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day;

for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and

56 PTS

*The doctrine of the
four humours.
In the order stated*

32 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours.
In the order stated above—
not necessarily following one
another, but often existing side by*

24 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order
stated above—not necessarily following one
another, but often existing side by side—these
various meanings evolved in the course of a
development covering more than two thousand*

16 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not
necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these
various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more
than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old
meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay
and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the
different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible
and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together*

12 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera

10 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence

and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate

8 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia.

Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression

6 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral

pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and perception. The Pythagoreans themselves did not evolve a doctrine of four humours, but they prepared the ground by postulating a series of tetradic

ITALIC

56 PTS

*The doctrine of the
four humours.
In the order stated*

32 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours.
In the order stated above—not
necessarily following one another,
but often existing side by side—*

24 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order
stated above—not necessarily following one
another, but often existing side by side—these
various meanings evolved in the course of a
development covering more than two thousand*

16 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily
following one another, but often existing side by side—these various
meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two
thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give
way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of
parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite
literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the
“black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”)*

ITALIC

12 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur

10 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according

to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in bieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox”

8 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur

terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in bieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name

6 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in bieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics,

especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and perception. The Pythagoreans themselves did not evolve a doctrine of four humours, but they prepared the ground by postulating a series of tetradic categories (such as, for instance, those already mentioned: earth, air, fire and water; spring, summer, autumn and winter). In this system, once it was evolved, the four humours could easily be

56 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated

32 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours.
In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by

24 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two

16 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the

12 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (*atra bilis*), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “*Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit*

10 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (*atra bilis*), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and

to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “*Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.*” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural

8 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (*atra bilis*), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “*Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant*

in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and

6 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (*atra bilis*), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “*Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.*” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day;

for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and

56 PTS

*The doctrine of the
four humours.
In the order stated*

32 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours.
In the order stated above—not
necessarily following one another,
but often existing side by*

24 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order
stated above—not necessarily following one
another, but often existing side by side—these
various meanings evolved in the course of a
development covering more than two thousand*

16 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not
necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these
various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more
than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old
meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay
and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the
different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible
and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together*

12 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem,

10 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence

and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate

8 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia.

Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for

6 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in hieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology

was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and perception. The Pythagoreans themselves did not evolve a doctrine of four humours, but they prepared the ground by postulating a series of tetradic

ITALIC

56 PTS

*The doctrine of the
four humours.
In the order stated*

32 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours.
In the order stated above—not
necessarily following one another,
but often existing side by side—these*

24 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order
stated above—not necessarily following one
another, but often existing side by side—these
various meanings evolved in the course of a
development covering more than two thousand*

16 PTS

*The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily
following one another, but often existing side by side—these various
meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two
thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give
way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of
parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite
literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the
“black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”)*

ITALIC

12 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur

10 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according

to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in bieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox”

8 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur

terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in bieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics, especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name

6 PTS

The doctrine of the four humours. In the order stated above—not necessarily following one another, but often existing side by side—these various meanings evolved in the course of a development covering more than two thousand years. Although new meanings emerged, old meanings did not give way to them; in short, it was a case not of decay and metamorphosis, but of parallel survival. The original basis of the different meanings was the quite literal conception of a concrete, visible and tangible part of the body, the “black bile” (atra bilis), which, together with the phlegm, the yellow (or “red”) bile, and the blood, constituted the Four Humours. These humours corresponded, it was held, to the cosmic elements and to the divisions of time; they controlled the whole existence and behaviour of mankind, and, according to the manner in which they were combined, determined the character of the individual. “Sunt enim quattuor humores in homine, qui imitantur diversa elementa; crescunt in diversis temporibus, regnant in diversis aetatibus. Sanguis imitatur aerem, crescit in vere, regnat in pueritia. Cholera imitator ignem, crescit in aestate, regnat in adolescentia. Melancholia imitatur terram, crescit in autumnno, regnat in maturitate. Phlegma imitatur aquam, crescit in bieme, regnat in senectute. Hi cum nec plus nec minus iusto exuberant, viget homo.” In these clear, terse sentences of an early medieval natural philosopher, we have the ancient doctrine of the Four Humours. This system was destined to dominate the whole trend of physiology and psychology almost until the present day; for what the “heterodox” schools of antiquity had opposed to humoral pathology was either forgotten or else merged into the orthodox doctrine by the second-century eclectics,

especially Galen. In the same way Paracelsus’s objections went long unheard. This system can be accounted for only by the combination of three very ancient (and, in part at least, specifically Greek) principles: 1. The search for simple primary elements or qualities, to which the complex and apparently irrational structure of both macrocosm and microcosm could be directly traced. 2. The urge to find a numerical expression for this complex structure of bodily and spiritual existence. 3. The theory of harmony, symmetry, isonomy, or whatever other name men may have chosen to express that perfect proportion in parts, in materials, or in faculties, which Greek thought down to Plotinus always regarded as essential to any value, moral, aesthetic or hygienic. In seeking, then, to ascertain the origin of humoralism, we must go back to the Pythagoreans, not only because the veneration of number in general attained its highest expression in Pythagorean philosophy, but more particularly because the Pythagoreans regarded the number four as specially significant. They used to swear by four, “which holds the root and source of eternal nature”; and not only nature in general, but rational man in particular, seemed to them governed by four principles, located in the brain, the heart, the navel and the phallus respectively. Even the soul was later on envisaged as fourfold, enclosing intellect, understanding, opinion and perception. The Pythagoreans themselves did not evolve a doctrine of four humours, but they prepared the ground by postulating a series of tetradic categories (such as, for instance, those already mentioned; earth, air, fire and water; spring, summer, autumn and winter). In this system, once it was evolved, the four humours could easily be

Immortel Colera



Immortel Colera represents yellow bile:
an angry and prideful character.
It's inspired by the work of Jean Jannon,
an engraver from the 17th century.

56 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next

32 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled.

24 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales

16 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements,

12 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which

10 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own

particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor too fine in quality. This perfect combination produced the man with the largest understanding and the keenest wit. If all the elements were not equally apportioned, the man would be a fool. If the number of the apportioned

8 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number.

In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements

were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor too fine in quality. This perfect combination produced the man with the largest understanding and the keenest wit. If all the elements were not equally apportioned, the man would be a fool. If the number of the apportioned atoms was either too great or too small, the man produced would be either gloomy and lethargic, or hot-blooded and enthusiastic, but incapable of sustained effort. And if the combination was more perfect in one part of the body than in another, this would produce individuals with a marked specific talent— orators, for instance, if the “crasis” of the tongue, artists if that of the hands, was especially good. From this it will be seen that Empedocles had firmly— almost too firmly—established the unity of macrocosm and microcosm (man and universe deriving from the same primary elements), and that he had already made an attempt to demonstrate

6 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor too fine in quality. This perfect combination produced the man with the largest understanding and the keenest wit. If all the elements were not equally apportioned, the man would be a fool. If the number of the apportioned atoms was either too great or too small, the man produced would be either gloomy and lethargic, or hot-blooded and enthusiastic, but

incapable of sustained effort. And if the combination was more perfect in one part of the body than in another, this would produce individuals with a marked specific talent— orators, for instance, if the “crasis” of the tongue, artists if that of the hands, was especially good. From this it will be seen that Empedocles had firmly—almost too firmly—established the unity of macrocosm and microcosm (man and universe deriving from the same primary elements), and that he had already made an attempt to demonstrate a systematic connexion between physical and mental factors—in other words, to put forward a psychosomatic theory of character. But it will also be seen that this attempt was far too general and far too speculative to satisfy the requirements of a specifically anthropological theory, much less of a medical one. In so far as he held that human beings, as well as the physical universe, were composed only of earth, air, fire and water, Empedocles did indeed establish a common basis for the macrocosm and the microcosm: but he ignored what was proper to the microcosm as such. He reduced man to general, cosmic elements, without probing that which is specifically human; he gave us, as it were, the original matter, but not the materials of man’s composition. Those of a more anthropological turn of mind could not rest content with this, but were driven to search for specific substances (and faculties) in man, which should somehow correspond to the primary elements constituting the world as a whole, without being simply identical with

56 PTS

*Thus from the
Pythagoreans the
road leads next to*

32 PTS

*Thus from the Pythagoreans the road
leads next to Empedocles, in whose
doctrine the first of these conditions
was fulfilled. He endeavoured to*

24 PTS

*Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next
to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of
these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to
combine the speculations of the old natural
philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who*

16 PTS

*Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose
doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to
combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or
Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all
existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic
doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number.
In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the
“four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth,*

12 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor

10 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination,

different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor too fine in quality. This perfect combination produced the man with the largest understanding and the keenest wit. If all the elements were not equally apportioned, the man would be a fool. If the number of the apportioned atoms was either too great or too small, the man produced would be either gloomy and lethargic, or hot-blooded and enthusiastic, but incapable of sustained effort. And if the combination was more perfect

8 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor

too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor too fine in quality. This perfect combination produced the man with the largest understanding and the keenest wit. If all the elements were not equally apportioned, the man would be a fool. If the number of the apportioned atoms was either too great or too small, the man produced would be either gloomy and lethargic, or hot-blooded and enthusiastic, but incapable of sustained effort. And if the combination was more perfect in one part of the body than in another, this would produce individuals with a marked specific talent— orators, for instance, if the “crasis” of the tongue, artists if that of the hands, was especially good. From this it will be seen that Empedocles had firmly— almost too firmly—established the unity of macrocosm and microcosm (man and universe deriving from the same primary elements), and that he had already made an attempt to demonstrate a systematic connexion between physical and mental factors—in other words, to put forward a psychosomatic theory of character. But it will also be seen that this attempt was far too general and far too speculative to satisfy the requirements of

6 PTS

Thus from the Pythagoreans the road leads next to Empedocles, in whose doctrine the first of these conditions was fulfilled. He endeavoured to combine the speculations of the old natural philosophers, such as Thales or Anaximenes, who thought only in terms of matter and therefore traced all existence back to one primary element, with the precisely opposite tetradic doctrine of the Pythagoreans, which was based on the idea of pure number. In this attempt he evolved the doctrine of the Four Elements, which paired the “four roots of the All” with four specific cosmic entities—the sun, the earth, the sky and the sea. These elements were of equal value and power, but each had its own particular task and its own particular nature. In the course of the seasons each in turn gained the ascendancy, and it was their combination, different in each single case, which brought into existence all individual things and which alone determined the characters of men. The perfect combination was, first, that in which all the elements were equally apportioned; secondly, that in which the elemental units— as we should say, the atoms—of the combination were neither too many nor too few in quantity, neither too coarse nor too fine in quality. This perfect combination produced the man with the largest understanding and the keenest wit. If all the elements were not equally apportioned, the man produced would be either gloomy and lethargic, or hot-blooded and enthusiastic, but incapable of sustained effort. And if the combination was more perfect in one part of the body than in another, this would produce individuals with a marked specific talent— orators, for instance, if the

“crasis” of the tongue, artists if that of the hands, was especially good. From this it will be seen that Empedocles had firmly—almost too firmly—established the unity of macrocosm and microcosm (man and universe deriving from the same primary elements), and that he had already made an attempt to demonstrate a systematic connexion between physical and mental factors—in other words, to put forward a psychosomatic theory of character. But it will also be seen that this attempt was far too general and far too speculative to satisfy the requirements of a specifically anthropological theory, much less of a medical one. In so far as he held that human beings, as well as the physical universe, were composed only of earth, air, fire and water, Empedocles did indeed establish a common basis for the macrocosm and the microcosm: but he ignored what was proper to the microcosm as such. He reduced man to general, cosmic elements, without probing that which is specifically human; he gave us, as it were, the original matter, but not the materials of man’s composition. Those of a more anthropological turn of mind could not rest content with this, but were driven to search for specific substances (and faculties) in man, which should somehow correspond to the primary elements constituting the world as a whole, without being simply identical with them. Empedocles’s immediate successors had already felt the need of making his anthropological concepts rather more elastic, by partly depriving the elements composing man of their purely material nature and by attributing to them a more dynamic character. Philistion, the head of the Sicilian school of medicine founded by Empedocles, still, it is true, described man as a combination of the four elements earth, air, fire

Immortel Vena



Immortel Vena represents blood:
a jovial and warm character.
It finds its source in the work
of Jacques-François Rosart, an engraver
from the 18th century.

56 PTS

Both theories
reached their full
maturity not long

32 PTS

Both theories reached their full
maturity not long before 400,
when humoralism really
originated. It originated then for

24 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity
not long before 400, when humoralism really
originated. It originated then for the very
reason that the ideas discussed by us so far
concerning the elements and qualities were

16 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400,
when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very
reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements
and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the
humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These
humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition,
in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible
(as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment

12 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two

10 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus

humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know

8 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus

distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be

6 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value

for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable sub-species, it was necessary to distinguish two independent “humours”, the yellow bile and the black. These four humours were always present in the human body and determined its nature; but according to the season sometimes one and sometimes another gained the ascendancy—the black bile, for instance, in the autumn, whereas the winter was unfavourable to it and the spring inimical, so that autumn-engendered pains would be relieved by the spring. The four humours, then, caused both illness and health, since their right combination was health, but the predominance or defect of one or another, illness. These are all ideas of which the origin can now be established. The notion of the humours as such comes from empirical medicine. The notion of the tetrad, the definition of health as the equilibrium of the

MEDIAN

56 PTS

*Both theories
reached their full
maturity not long*

32 PTS

*Both theories reached their full
maturity not long before 400,
when humoralism really originated.
It originated then for the very*

24 PTS

*Both theories reached their full maturity
not long before 400, when humoralism really
originated. It originated then for the very reason
that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning
the elements and qualities were now—not*

16 PTS

*Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when
humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that
the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities
were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically
demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known
in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of
illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as
symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body*

12 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were

10 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed

very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C.

8 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and

one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in

6 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology

proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable sub-species, it was necessary to distinguish two independent “humours”, the yellow bile and the black. These four humours were always present in the human body and determined its nature; but according to the season sometimes one and sometimes another gained the ascendancy—the black bile, for instance, in the autumn, whereas the winter was unfavourable to it and the spring inimical, so that autumn-engendered pains would be relieved by the spring. The four humours, then, caused both illness and health, since their right combination was health, but the predominance or defect of one or another, illness. These are all ideas of which the origin can now be established. The notion of the humours as such comes from empirical medicine. The notion of the tetrad, the definition of health as the equilibrium of the different parts, and of sickness as the disturbance of this equilibrium, are Pythagorean contributions (which were taken up by Empedocles). The notion

ITALIC

56 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400,

32 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason

24 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied

16 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly

ITALIC

12 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused

10 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary

elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise Of the Nature of Man, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to

8 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names

phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise Of the Nature of Man, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable

6 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise Of the Nature of Man, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's

first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable sub-species, it was necessary to distinguish two independent “humours”, the yellow bile and the black. These four humours were always present in the human body and determined its nature; but according to the season sometimes one and sometimes another gained the ascendancy—the black bile, for instance, in the autumn, whereas the winter was unfavourable to it and the spring inimical, so that autumn-engendered pains would be relieved by the spring. The four humours, then, caused both illness and health, since their right combination was health, but the predominance or defect of one or another, illness. These are all ideas of which the origin can now be established. The notion of the humours as such comes from empirical medicine. The notion of the tetrad, the definition of health as the equilibrium of the different parts, and of sickness as the disturbance of this equilibrium, are Pythagorean contributions (which were taken up by Empedocles). The notion that in the course of the seasons each of the four substances in turn gains the ascendancy seems to be purely Empedoclean. But the credit for combining all these notions in one system, and thereby creating the doctrine of

56 PTS

Both theories
reached their full
maturity not long

32 PTS

Both theories reached their full
maturity not long before 400,
when humoralism really
originated. It originated then for

24 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity
not long before 400, when humoralism really
originated. It originated then for the very
reason that the ideas discussed by us so far
concerning the elements and qualities were

16 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when
humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason
that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and
qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours
as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had
long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first
instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in
vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought

12 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two

10 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus

humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know

8 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus

distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be

6 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value

for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable sub-species, it was necessary to distinguish two independent “humours”, the yellow bile and the black. These four humours were always present in the human body and determined its nature; but according to the season sometimes one and sometimes another gained the ascendancy—the black bile, for instance, in the autumn, whereas the winter was unfavourable to it and the spring inimical, so that autumn-engendered pains would be relieved by the spring. The four humours, then, caused both illness and health, since their right combination was health, but the predominance or defect of one or another, illness. These are all ideas of which the origin can now be established. The notion of the humours as such comes from empirical medicine. The notion of the tetrad, the definition of health as the equilibrium of the

56 PTS

*Both theories
reached their full
maturity not long*

32 PTS

*Both theories reached their full
maturity not long before 400,
when humoralism really originated.
It originated then for the very*

24 PTS

*Both theories reached their full maturity not
long before 400, when humoralism really
originated. It originated then for the very reason
that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning
the elements and qualities were now*

16 PTS

*Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when
humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that
the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities
were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically
demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known
in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of
illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as
symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body*

12 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter.

10 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very

similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C.

8 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and

one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the

6 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise *Of the Nature of Man*, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology

proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author's first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable sub-species, it was necessary to distinguish two independent “humours”, the yellow bile and the black. These four humours were always present in the human body and determined its nature; but according to the season sometimes one and sometimes another gained the ascendancy—the black bile, for instance, in the autumn, whereas the winter was unfavourable to it and the spring inimical, so that autumn-engendered pains would be relieved by the spring. The four humours, then, caused both illness and health, since their right combination was health, but the predominance or defect of one or another, illness. These are all ideas of which the origin can now be established. The notion of the humours as such comes from empirical medicine. The notion of the tetrad, the definition of health as the equilibrium of the different parts, and of sickness as the disturbance of this equilibrium, are Pythagorean contributions (which were taken up by Empedocles). The notion

ITALIC

56 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400,

32 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason

24 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied

16 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly

ITALIC

12 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused

10 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary

elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise Of the Nature of Man, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt

8 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names

phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise Of the Nature of Man, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author’s first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable

6 PTS

Both theories reached their full maturity not long before 400, when humoralism really originated. It originated then for the very reason that the ideas discussed by us so far concerning the elements and qualities were now—not without violence—applied to the humours as empirically demonstrated in the human body. These humours had long been known in the specifically medical tradition, in the first instance as causes of illness, and, if they became visible (as in vomiting or the like), as symptoms of illness. Nourishment brought substances into the body which, thanks to the digestion, were partly made use of (that is, turned into bones, flesh and blood), but were partly indigestible; and from the latter arose the “surplus humours”, the notion of which had developed very similarly to that of the cosmic primary elements. Euryphon of Cnidus had assumed an indefinite number of such humours, which rose to the head and generated illnesses: Timotheus of Metapontus believed they were caused by a single acid salty fluid; and Herodicus of Cnidus distinguished two such fluids, one sour and one bitter. These were the two humours which later received the names phlegm and bile—phlegm because it caused inflammation, although not a few writers attributed to it the qualities of cold and moisture. Such a correlation is presupposed in the very important treatise Of the Nature of Man, attributed by the ancients, as we know from Galen, either to Hippocrates or to his son-in-law Polybus, and written in any case not later than 400 B.C. What gave this document its unique value for posterity was its attempt to combine in one system humoral pathology proper with general cosmological speculation, more particularly that of Empedocles. Guided by this desire, the author’s

first step was to reject the view of those who held that the human body originated from, and subsisted in virtue of, a single element only. He was moreover, as far as we know, the first writer who put forward a theory of the four humours. At the outset—though later it was to become almost canonical—it could only be established with the help of two quite arbitrary assumptions. The blood had to be included in the system, although it was not in fact a surplus humour; and in the bile, which hitherto had been regarded as a single fluid, or else split down into innumerable sub-species, it was necessary to distinguish two independent “humours”, the yellow bile and the black. These four humours were always present in the human body and determined its nature; but according to the season sometimes one and sometimes another gained the ascendancy—the black bile, for instance, in the autumn, whereas the winter was unfavourable to it and the spring inimical, so that autumn-engendered pains would be relieved by the spring. The four humours, then, caused both illness and health, since their right combination was health, but the predominance or defect of one or another, illness. These are all ideas of which the origin can now be established. The notion of the humours as such comes from empirical medicine. The notion of the tetrad, the definition of health as the equilibrium of the different parts, and of sickness as the disturbance of this equilibrium, are Pythagorean contributions (which were taken up by Empedocles). The notion that in the course of the seasons each of the four substances in turn gains the ascendancy seems to be purely Empedoclean. But the credit for combining all these notions in one system, and thereby creating the doctrine of

Immortel Acedia



Immortel Acedia represents black bile that provokes hopelessness and melancholy. It takes its inspiration from the engraving *Melencolia I* by Albrecht Dürer (1514) and attempts a synthesis between two traces of a priori opposing tools, one made by the flat tip and the other by the narrow point. In this sense it is closer to a 21st century typeface.

56 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of

32 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of

24 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to

16 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could

12 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like

10 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded

as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one alone and permitting no divergencies), the physician, of all people, could not avoid the conclusion that this absolutely healthy man represented an ideal hardly ever met with in reality. Thus, in such a tradition, what had of old been symptoms of illness came gradually to be regarded

8 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at

all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one alone and permitting no divergencies), the physician, of all people, could not avoid the conclusion that this absolutely healthy man represented an ideal hardly ever met with in reality. Thus, in such a tradition, what had of old been symptoms of illness came gradually to be regarded, at first unconsciously, as types of disposition. Complete health was only an ideal, approximated, but never in fact attained. It was logical enough, if one said of someone in whose body the humours were perfectly combined that he was “in the very best of health” for it was thereby implicitly admitted that someone in whom one or other humour predominated could nevertheless enjoy good health, though not in the highest possible degree. And thus it had to be conceded that in fact it was usually a predominance of one or other humour which determined a man's constitution and that such an individual, though predisposed to certain quite definite

6 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one alone and permitting no divergencies), the physician, of all people, could not avoid the conclusion that this absolutely healthy man represented an ideal hardly ever met with in reality. Thus, in such a tradition, what had of old been symptoms of illness came gradually to be regarded, at first unconsciously, as types of disposition. Complete health was only an ideal, approximated, but never in fact

attained. It was logical enough, if one said of someone in whose body the humours were perfectly combined that he was “in the very best of health” for it was thereby implicitly admitted that someone in whom one or other humour predominated could nevertheless enjoy good health, though not in the highest possible degree. And thus it had to be conceded that in fact it was usually a predominance of one or other humour which determined a man's constitution and that such an individual, though predisposed to certain quite definite illnesses, normally seemed quite healthy. The words “phlegmatic” and so on came to be used for peculiar but (within the limits of this peculiarity) not necessarily morbid aspects of human nature; and once the doctrine of four humours had been systematised in the form described, it was bound gradually to become a doctrine of four temperaments. As “Hippocrates” says at one point, “too dry a summer or autumn suits phlegmatics but does the greatest harm to choleric, who are in danger of being dried up completely, for their eyes run dry, they are feverish, and some fall into melancholy sicknesses” — which shows that the Hippocrateans themselves envisaged men with constitutions determined by a permanent predominance of either phlegm or yellow bile, who were not as a rule actually ill but merely predisposed to certain illnesses, and who were in certain circumstances even susceptible to illnesses other than those deriving from their predominant humour. From this time onward the expressions “choleric”,

56 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours

32 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which

24 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which

16 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in

ITALIC

12 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one alone and permitting no

10 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with

the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one alone and permitting no divergencies), the physician, of all people, could not avoid the conclusion that this absolutely healthy man represented an ideal hardly ever met with in reality. Thus, in such a tradition, what had of old been symptoms of illness came gradually to be regarded, at first unconsciously, as types of disposition. Complete health was only an ideal, approximated, but never in fact attained. It was logical enough, if one said of someone

8 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one

alone and permitting no divergencies), the physician, of all people, could not avoid the conclusion that this absolutely healthy man represented an ideal hardly ever met with in reality. Thus, in such a tradition, what had of old been symptoms of illness came gradually to be regarded, at first unconsciously, as types of disposition. Complete health was only an ideal, approximated, but never in fact attained. It was logical enough, if one said of someone in whose body the humours were perfectly combined that he was “in the very best of health” for it was thereby implicitly admitted that someone in whom one or other humour predominated could nevertheless enjoy good health, though not in the highest possible degree. And thus it had to be conceded that in fact it was usually a predominance of one or other humour which determined a man’s constitution and that such an individual, though predisposed to certain quite definite illnesses, normally seemed quite healthy. The words “pblegmatic” and so on came to be used for peculiar but (within the limits of this peculiarity) not necessarily morbid aspects of human nature; and once the doctrine of four humours had been

6 PTS

But this combination of the purely medical doctrine of humours with a system of natural philosophy gave rise to a curious difficulty of which earlier writers were quite unconsciolls but which was later to come very much to the fore and which was never wholly resolved. On the one hand, with the exception of blood, the humours taken over from medicine were quite useless substances, not to say harmful. They were excretions, “humores vitiosi”, causing illness, first observed primarily in vomiting and other symptoms; and one could only speak of true health when all the humours were present in the right combination, so that each harmful influence neutralised the other. On the other hand, these very substances, though regarded as in themselves causes of illness, or at least as predisposing factors, were paired with the universal (and hygienically neutral) qualities, cold, moist, warm and dry. Each gained the ascendancy once a year without necessarily causing acute illnesses; and since the absolutely healthy man was one who was never ill at all (so that he must be as like every other absolutely healthy man as two peas in a pod, the right combination of the humours being one alone and permitting no divergencies), the physician, of all people, could not avoid the conclusion that this absolutely healthy man represented an ideal hardly ever met with in reality. Thus, in such a tradition, what had of old been symptoms of illness came gradually to be regarded, at first unconsciously, as types of disposition. Complete health was only an ideal, approximated, but never in fact attained. It was logical enough, if one said of someone in whose body the humours were perfectly combined that he was “in the very best of health” for it was thereby implicitly admitted that someone

in whom one or other humour predominated could nevertheless enjoy good health, though not in the highest possible degree. And thus it had to be conceded that in fact it was usually a predominance of one or other humour which determined a man’s constitution and that such an individual, though predisposed to certain quite definite illnesses, normally seemed quite healthy. The words “pblegmatic” and so on came to be used for peculiar but (within the limits of this peculiarity) not necessarily morbid aspects of human nature; and once the doctrine of four humours had been systematised in the form described, it was bound gradually to become a doctrine of four temperaments. As “Hippocrates” says at one point, “too dry a summer or autumn suits pblegmatics but does the greatest harm to choleric, who are in danger of being dried up completely, for their eyes run dry, they are feverish, and some fall into melancholy sicknesses”—which shows that the Hippocrateans themselves envisaged men with constitutions determined by a permanent predominance of either pblegm or yellow bile, who were not as a rule actually ill but merely predisposed to certain illnesses, and who were in certain circumstances even susceptible to illnesses other than those deriving from their predominant humour. From this time onward the expressions “choleric”, “pblegmatic”, and “melancholy”, were capable of two fundamentally quite different meanings. They could denote either pathological states or constitutional aptitudes. It is true, however, that the two were closely linked, since it was usually one and the same humour which adverse circumstances permitted to develop from mere predisposition into actual illness. As Isidore says, “the healthy are governed by these four humours, and the sick

CREDITS

Designed by: Clément Le Tulle-Neyret
Mastering: Rosalie Wagner
Translation: Derek Byrne
205TF staff: Alexis Faudot, Rémi Forte, Damien Gautier,
Emma Marichal, Florence Roller

CAUTION

In order to protect the work of the typeface designer,
this pdf file is locked.
205TF will initiate legal action against anyone unlocking this pdf.

CONTACT

205 Corp.
24, rue Commandant-Faurax
69006 Lyon
France

T. +33 (0)4 37 47 85 69
contact@205.tf

SAS 205 Corp.
SIRET 522 580 430 00026
TVA Intra FR-45522580430

COPYRIGHT

205TF is a trademark of 205 Corp.

