Richard J. Durling

Lycinos could mean 'Your command was only for six stades' but no fixed number of stades was mentioned in c. 16.

ἐκστάδιος was read by at least two sixteenth century editions, by Bourdelot, Paris 1615, by the vulgate edition of Hemsterhuys and Reitz and by Jacobitz. It has the best manuscript authority and is a lectio difficilior. However the two most recent editors, Kilburn, Loeb vol. 6, and G. Husson, both print ἐκστάδιος, Kilburn without comment, Husson wrongly ascribing it to Γ . This is certainly misleading and, in my opinion, retrogressive as well.

Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Writings (Part II)

By RICHARD J. DURLING, Kiel

I.

In my earlier paper (Glotta 57 [1979] 218-224), I concentrated on Galen's pharmacological writings. I deal here with all the works contained in volumes I-X of Kühn's much-criticised edition, using where available more modern editions¹). I do not attempt to list all the instances of each word. I do attempt to distinguish carefully each various nuance. In many cases, I refer the reader (as I did not before) to G. W. H. Lampe's excellent A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1978) for further examples of both literal and figurative usage²). I hope some scholar will later examine Lampe's lexicon with a view to determining to what extent the early Fathers were familiar with ancient medical terms and how they applied them. When the time comes (as I hope it will) to compile a Dictionary of Ancient Medical Terms (whether coined by physicians or by laymen), I hope that the language of the Church Fathers will be included. A lexicographer should have large views.

¹) I have not excerpted those later books of *De Hippocratis et Platonis decretis* which have not yet been re-edited by Phillip De Lacy, but have on the other hand added instances from Galen's Commentaries on Hippocrates' *Epidemics*. These are conveniently indexed in CMG V 10,2,3.

²) Lampe asterisks Greek words not found in LSJ. Thus he asterisks $\delta \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \chi \delta \sigma \varepsilon$, $\kappa \eta \lambda \delta \tau \delta \mu \delta \omega \delta \eta \varepsilon$, and $\delta \mu \delta \omega \delta \mu \delta \omega \delta \omega \varepsilon$. He cannot be blamed for not knowing the words occur earlier in Galen.

Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Writings (Part II)

I adopt the same arrangement³) as I did before, viz.:

- a) words or parts of speech not found in LSJ;
- b) new meanings and/or corrected meanings;
- c) words which are not (pace LSJ) only late or Byzantine;
- d) word which are not (pace LSJ) only poetic or biblical;
- e) words which are not (pace LSJ) merely Hippocratic;
- f) words which can be shown to be common termini technici.

a) $dv d\beta \eta \xi \iota \zeta$, $\dot{\eta}$, coughing up, expectoration, Gal. VIII 287.6 (αΐματος) cf. ἀναβήσσω: there is no need to conjecture ἀνάρρηξις. ἀναθρεπτικῶς in such a way as to feed up, Gal. X 487.13 (à. τε καὶ ἀναληπτικ $\tilde{\omega}_{\varsigma}$): the adj. is common (cf. infra, sub f.). ἀντιδείκνυμι, counterindicate, τὸ ἀντιδεικνύμενον and τὰ ἀ. Ι 166.15, 18, cf. ἀντενδ-. ἀπανταχόσε, to every place, everywhere, UP 12.5, 15.4 [= II 193.8 H., 349.18 H.] Lampe p. 173 cites three Patristic examples. $\beta \alpha \rho \nu \sigma \mu \delta \varsigma$, $\delta = \beta \alpha \rho \nu \tau \eta \varsigma$, Gal. VII 466.1 ($\tau o \tilde{\nu} \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau o \varsigma$ δλου) s.v.l. διαλειπτικός, $\dot{\eta}$, όν (διαλείπω), intermittent, Gal. IX 284.17, 328.9. $\delta i \sigma \varepsilon \varphi \vartheta \circ \varsigma$, or, twice boiled, CMG. V 4,2 206.4, 312. 19, 326.12, cf. Gal. XI 575. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu \rho \nu \vartheta \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \tilde{\iota} \rho \varsigma$, α , ov, on the ninety-sixth day, Gal. VII 501.10 (ἐνν-!). κηλοτομέω, Pass., undergo an operation for hernia, Gal. I 197.13: for which cf. (with Lampe) Mir. Artem. 24 (p. 35.2) (active) and ib. 44 (p. 73.1) (passive). $\lambda o \xi \omega \delta \eta \zeta$, $\varepsilon \zeta$, oblique, Gal. II 297.3: Lampe (p. 812) cites exx. of its metaphorical use, crooked, misdirected. δμοιομερῶς, homogeneously (opp. ὀργανικῶς), Gal. VII 99.6: cf. (with Lampe) Ath. Syn. 35 (p. 262.25; M.26.756A). $\pi \alpha \lambda \mu \omega \delta \omega \zeta$, palpitatingly, Gal. VII 65.18: the reading is almost certain. LSJ cites the neuter of VIII 484.16 and IX 188.11 in connection with mad or frenzied utterance $(\pi. \varphi \vartheta \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \sigma \vartheta a)$. $\pi \iota \varkappa \varrho \circ \chi \circ \lambda \acute{\iota} a$, $\mathring{\eta}$, bitter bile, biliousness, occurs at VII 727.1: I have not been able to check Reedy's modern edition of the *De tumoribus* but do not doubt the text is sound. (The adj. πικρόχολος occurs passim in Galen, a substantive in -ία on the lines μελαγχολία appears unobjectionable.) On the other hand, προάπτομαι, touch before, Gal. IX 250.6 and προαραιόω, rarefy before at IX 495.12 seem dubious, likewise προσαφέψω, boil down besides, at X 789.11 (read προ-?). δοωδία, runningness (?) I 192.7 may have been a Methodic t.t., cf. $\delta o \tilde{\omega} \delta \varepsilon \zeta$ (A) $v \delta \sigma \eta \mu a$: if so, it is attested seemingly nowhere else. The adv. $\sigma \varkappa \iota \varrho \varrho \omega \delta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ was

Glotta, LVIII, 3/4

9

261

³⁾ I owe it to my friend, Prof. Fridolf Kudlien.

262

listed in my earlier article (Glotta 57 [1979[219): the reading at XII 59.6 is confirmed by the occurrence at both VIII 475.10 and IX 163.9. $\tau \varrho i\beta \iota \beta \lambda o \varsigma$, or, consisting of three books, Gal. I 408.5 ($\pi \varrho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon i a$) is certain. $\tau v \varphi o \mu \acute{e} v \omega \varsigma$, smoulderingly, is adopted by the latest editor of Galen's De Crisibus, Dr. Bengt Alexanderson at 122.8, to my mind rightly: Kühn follows the inferior MSS. in reading $\tau v \varphi o \mu \epsilon v \sigma v$. To the above list should be added two voces Latinae: $\tau \dot{\eta} v \delta \eta \varkappa o \varkappa \tau a v$ occurs at X 467.17 and $o \dot{v} v \acute{e} \delta \omega v = unedo$ at CMG V 4,2 304.23. For the latter, cf. Colum. 8, 17, 13 and Pliny 15.98, 23.15,17.

Much more doubtful are comparative and superlative adverbial forms, e.g. $d\mu a v \varrho \sigma \tau \acute{e} \varrho \omega \varsigma$ Gal. IX 249.8; $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \varphi a \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \acute{e} \varrho \omega \varsigma$ IX 249.7,9; $\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \sigma \tau \acute{a} \tau \omega \varsigma$ (διαιτᾶν) X 439.15; $\sigma \tau \sigma \chi a \sigma \tau \iota \varkappa \omega \tau \acute{e} \varrho \omega \varsigma$ IX 249.8; and $\dot{\omega} \varkappa v \tau \acute{e} \varrho \omega \varsigma$ IX 454.17. Similarly with positives: I would like more evidence for $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi a \sigma \mu \acute{e} \nu \omega \varsigma$ at VII 810.17, though compare διεσπασμένως (v.l. διεσπαρμένως) at Hp. Epid. 1.1, 3.2; $\dot{\sigma} \psi \iota - \mu a \vartheta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ VIII 601.5; and $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \acute{\iota} \omega \varsigma$ (διητᾶτο) VII 751.2. $\sigma v \nu \acute{a} \pi a \xi$ at II 381.17 seems also dubious.

I am more confident about the many verbal adjectives in Galen which LSJ failed to list. ἀλλοιωτέον, one must change, VI 242.6 (= 106.35 Koch); ἀνασωστέον, one must restore, X 838.3 (τὰ διαφθειφόμενα); ἀνατμητέος, α, ον, to be dissected II 481.5; ἀσιτητέον, one must fast, X 807.10; ἐκθεφαπεντέον, one must cure perfectly, completely, VI 440.9 (= 193.9 Koch); ἐμψυκτέον, one must cool, Nat. Fac. II (= SM III 193.24); ἐπενεκτέον (ἐπιφέφω I.6), one must give a name to, IX 813.5 (where Kühn has ἐπαν-!: different senses in Lampe p. 514); προσδοτέον, to be given in addition, X 576.6; and finally στυπτέον (στύφω), one must astringe, X 795.13.

To conclude this section on a negative note: at least one Galenic entry in LSJ should be deleted. χονδροσύνδεσμος cartilaginous

connextion, Gal. I 569 is a chimera: read with MSS and Helmreich, the latest editor, χόνδεφω σύνδεσμος.

b) ἀλλοτρίως, foreign to the purpose or inappropriately [cf. ἀλλότριος II 2 c. of λόγοι], Chrysipp. ap. Gal. PHP 200.35, 204.9; ἀμάλακτος (of bodies) means at VI 40.5 not softened, rather than 'that cannot be softened' $(= \dot{a}. 1)$; $\dot{a} \nu a \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a} \nu o \mu a \iota$ in sense close to LSJ II.3, ἀναλαμβάνειν έαυτόν, recover oneself, at X 679.7; translate τῶν ἀναλαμβανομένων convalescents: ἀνίατος, or, has the sense uncured at X 220.16, not incurable (the sense it normally has, e.g. at X 221.5); for $d\varrho \varrho \varepsilon \pi \dot{\eta} \varsigma$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \varsigma$, LSJ gives no exx. of the literal meaning, inclining to neither side. But see Gal. II 266.12, 760.6 (= 31.4 Moore); UP 6.16; 12.9,15; 13.2 (= I 355.16, II 209.10,227.21, 237.23 H.) and CMG V 10,2,1 21.2. $\alpha\sigma\eta\mu\sigma\varsigma$, $\sigma\nu$, is used by Galen of days on which critical signs, i.e. signs normally indicative of a crisis, are absent: see IX 751.9 (= 199.4-6 A.), 776.10-11 (opp. εἴσημος, for which see IX 776.16-17). δεικτός, ή, όν, = capable of being shown, demonstrable, VIII 678.13. δεκαταῖος, α, ον, frequently means on the tenth day, IX 935.14, and CMG V 10,2,1 7.10,17, in connexion with crises and critical effluvia (e.g. sweat). At Gal. VIII 90.15, Archigenes uses $\delta \iota \alpha \varkappa \circ \pi \eta$ to mean cutting, incision: the reading is common to all MSS of De locis affectis. διασταλτικός, $\dot{\eta}$, $\dot{\phi}\nu$, means of course diastolic at IX 298.3 where it is applied to δύναμις (cf. συσταλτικός below). διατένης, ες, for which LSJ cites only Thphr. CP 2.15.2 in the sense tending is applied to the pulse at VIII 943.2 in the sense distended but one should perhaps read διάτονος, ον, for which see IX 343.4 (σφυγμός). Archigenes is fond of the Adv. $i\sigma\chi\nu\tilde{\omega}\zeta$ which he uses in the sense slightly: so at VIII 87.7, 106.15 and 107.5. $\kappa v \lambda \lambda \delta \varsigma$, δ , is used at IX 907.18 of a month which has 29 days: students of the Greek calendar should verify this. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varkappa \iota \nu \eta \tau \dot{\varepsilon} o \varsigma$, α , or, means not to be removed at VI 410.12 (= 180.27 Koch) but to be changed (though the nuance is indeed subtle in this context). More important is the Adv. $\xi \eta \varrho \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ for which LSJ cites only the meaning by the use of dry powder. βήττειν ξ. means of course to have a dry cough at IX 626.8 (= 116.27 A). $\partial \rho \gamma \alpha \nu \iota \varkappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma = organically$ at Gal. VII 99.6 VIII 275.14 and doubtless elsewhere. For περικαῶς LSJ cites only an erotic usage, π . Exerv $\tau i \nu \delta \varsigma$, to be hot with love for: nothing is said of the phrase π . $\pi v \varrho \acute{\epsilon} \tau \tau \epsilon v$, to be afflicted with a burning fever, for which see IX 291.10, 722.17 (=180.5 A). One of the many colourful terms employed by Archigenes to describe the pulse is $\delta \alpha \varkappa \omega \delta \eta \varsigma$, at VIII 662.18. I can only surmise he meant

263

264

this in LSJ's sense 1, ragged, but with Archigenes there is no knowing (as Galen admitted on more than one occasion). LSJ should at least have cited this application. $\sigma\pi\varepsilon\varrho\mu\alpha\ell\nu\omega$ pace LSJ is not used only of the male: at IV 536.9, 593.10 and UP 14.7,10 (= II 302.13 H., 318.9 H.). Galen clearly refers to female seed, a charming concept which was to enjoy a very long life⁴). $\sigma\nu\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\tau\iota\kappa\delta\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\sigma}\nu$, means of course systolic at IX 298.3 (opp. $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\tau\iota\kappa\delta\varsigma$ (for which supra). Finally, $\varphi\iota\lambda\sigma\tau\iota\mu\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\nu$ cannot possibly mean one must seek distinction at VIII 553.16: $\mathring{\eta}\mu\widetilde{\iota}\nu$ ov $\mathring{\varphi}$. here = we must not contend.

c) I include in this section words or forms for which LSJ cites only authors of the third century A. D. or later or various glossators and scholiasts. I cannot sufficiently emphasize how misleading it is to cite such derivative authors as the Byzantine compilers Oribasius, Aëtius of Amida, Paul of Aegina and Alexander of Tralles when Galen (as so often) has anticipated them.

Nor should Aristotelian commentators and philosophers generally be cited for medical terms and physicians be overlooked. But this is sometimes the case ⁵).

 $\dot{a}\gamma\eta\varrho\alpha\sigma i\alpha$, $\dot{\eta}$, eternal youth, Sch. II. 11.1. The utopian concept is an old one 6): see Galen VII 670.16. $\dot{a}\gamma v\mu\nu\alpha\sigma\tau i\alpha$, $\dot{\eta}_{i}=\dot{a}\gamma v\mu\nu\alpha\sigma i\alpha$, Porph. Abst. 1.35: but see Gal. Anim. Pass. 5.27 (= CMG V 4, 1.1.61.7: δι' ά. καὶ βραδυτῆτα ψυχῆς). ἀνάνευσις, ή, II. upward inclination, Dam. Pr. 56. Frequently used by Galen of upward movement (of the head) e.g. at II 456.7, 460.16; PHP 204.33, 232.13; UP 12.9 (= II 208.21 H.). ἀντένδειξις, ή, counter-indication, Steph. in Hp. 2.282 D. Long anticipated by Galen, e.g. at X 630.14 (pl.). ἀντιδιαίρεσις, ή, II. in Surgery counterincision, Paul. Aeg. 4.48: already in Galen at I 386.9 and XI 128.11,14. $do\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha$, $\dot{\eta}$, I.3 indecision, $\tau \tilde{\eta} \zeta \psi v \chi \tilde{\eta} \zeta$ Plot. 2.4.10. But see Gal. Opt. Doctr. 1 (= SM I 82.6 = 179.5 B.). ἀποκρημνίζω, throw from a cliff's edge, Hld. 2.8. LSJ cites no passive but see s.v. κρημνίζω: used of a type of pulse by the enigmatic Archigenes at VIII 662.12, 942.18. ἀπό- $\pi \varrho \bar{\iota} \sigma \iota \varsigma$, $\hat{\eta}$, sawing off, Paul Aeg. 6.77: already in Galen at X 442.5. διακαής, ες ... used of πυρετοί by Simplicius in Cael. 602.9. Why cite Simplicius when the adj. is common? See Galen Q. a. m. 3 (= SM II 38.12), X 759.11 and XI 65.2 and cf. the exx. indexed in CMG V 10,2,3 p. 74. δυσδιαφορησία, ή, difficulty of dissipation, Cass. Pr. 66: cite also Gal. I 220.2 (the term is almost certainly rare).

⁴⁾ See especially M. Anthony Hewson, Giles of Rome and the mediaeval theory of conception. London, 1975, pp. 67 ff. 5) See e.g. διακαής below.

⁶⁾ See now F. Kudlien in Rh. Mus. 121 (1978) 218-225 (at p. 220).

265

έπαλειπτέον, one must anoint, Orib. Syn. 5.53.17, Paul Aeg. 2.46: why overlook Gal. X 498.14? For the impersonal use of έπείγω, LSJ (IV.3) cites only Longin. 43.6, but note Gal. IX 309.3 has οὖκ ἐπείγει λέγειν, there's no pressing need to say, and cf. with Lampe p. 512 Eus. h. e. 4.18.3 (M 20.373 C). ἐπηρεάζω III. of the action of a disease, διάφορα ε. μόρια Steph. in Hp. 1.204 D. Stephanus (of uncertain date) was no innovator, surely: cf. Gal. IX 283.9,14 (pass.). $\dot{\epsilon}\tau o\iota\mu o\tau\dot{\epsilon}\rho\omega\varsigma$ is attested from Alex. Trall. 12: cite Gal. II. 312.13 in addition to XI 622.14. παρακολουθητέον. one must follow, Procl. in Ti. I 26 D.: cf. Gal. Anim. Pass. 5.8 (CMG V 4, 1.1.18.10). παροχετευτέον, one must divert, opp. αντισπαστέον, Aët. 5.100. Better Gal. X 861.9 (where Kühn has παροχευτέον!). περικράνιον, τό, = cervicale, Gloss. Cite rather Gal. VIII 205.14 (CMG V 10,2,2 11.25 is uncertain). $\pi \eta \lambda \sigma \pi \sigma \iota \delta \varsigma$, $\delta = \pi \eta \lambda \sigma \pi \lambda \delta \vartheta \sigma \varsigma$, potter, BGU 362 viii 8 (iii A.D.), Alex. Aphr. Pr. I 49. Cite Gal. X 395.11. $\pi \rho o \varepsilon \iota \sigma \beta \acute{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$, II.2. supervene, come on before, $\tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma \ \tilde{\omega} \rho a \varsigma$ Aët. 5.23: but already in Gal. IX 704.10 (= 168.12 A). $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ μείγνῦμι, I.3 mix in as well, Zos. Alch. p. 142 B.: already in Gal. X 910.12. συνάρχω II. Med. 2. begin at the same time as, c. dat., Phlp. in de An. 588.4: but see Gal. IX 563.11 (= 77.10 A). For the neut. ύπόγυον as Adv. LSJ cites [s. v. ὑπόγυιος] only Gloss. cf. ὑπόγυιον, recently, at Gal. VII 949.8, VIII 858.2, IX 520.9 and also Lampe's three exx. on p. 1446.

Much more research needs to be done on the employment of allegedly poetic words in prose. How often, however, does a poetic word need to be employed in prose for it to lose its poetic associations? And how conscious are the prose authors of these poetic associations? Is not the distinction, in the last resort, utterly artificial?