CHAPTER 5. AN EDITION OF THE LATIN ALEXANDER ON COUGHING

5.1. Principles and Conventions Used in the Edition

This chapter contains a provisional text of the first eleven chapters of the second book of the Latin Alexander, that is, most of the section on coughing, with full critical apparatus, English translation, the corresponding portions of Puschmann’s Greek text (II, 147, 1–155, 28), and some notes on the text and language.

The presentation of this material is intended to serve two main purposes. In the context of the present work, it offers on the one hand in the very full critical apparatus (and in the accompanying notes) an extended illustration of the tradition of the text and the relations existing between the manuscripts argued for in Chapter 4, and on the other hand an opportunity to make some observations and raise a larger number of questions regarding the Latinity of the Latin Alexander, some of which are drawn together in 5.3 below. In the broader context of ongoing work on the Latin text, this chapter offers a sample of the form and content currently envisaged for the full edition.

In the text, I use, by and large, standard classical orthography for Latin words, partly for the sake of clarity, partly because there is little to be gained — even if it were a feasible undertaking — from attempting to reconstruct the spelling of the original (see 5.2 below on the spelling of the manuscripts and the Appendix). In the case of Greek words in Latin letters, I have let myself be guided more by the forms in the manuscripts, thus making concessions to changes in the pronunciation and/or conventions in the spelling of e.g. *collyrium*, *dyspnoea*, *epiphora*: I write *collirium*, *dispnia*, *epifora*, and similarly *colera* (*colericus*, etc.), *emoptoicus* (*amoptuikos*), *icor*, *melancolia* (*melancolicus*, etc.) *scirodia*, and the unanimously-attested *inquimatizare* (*knematizein* ‘inject, treat by injections’), *pigra* (*pitra*, an antidote), and *strigni* (*stigno*). In the text, I also make use of the following conventions:

- [ ] enclose secondary material already in the archetype.
- <> enclose original material already lost in the archetype.
- italics signal material already corrupted in the archetype.
- +– –+ in the Latin/Greek text enclose material absent from the corresponding portion of the Greek/Latin version.

In the apparatus, in general, unless they have a bearing on the reconstruction of the text or of a form attributable to the archetype, I ignore trivial orthographical variants (such as -ti- vs -ci-) and non-standard forms reflecting phonetic developments in Imperial and later Latin (e.g. alternation between e and i, b and u, h and zero), where these do not affect the grammatical or lexical form to be reconstructed (e.g. an isolated *conpedente* in P1 for *competenti*; again, on orthography, see 5.2 below). In the presentation of information in the apparatus, I have tried also to adhere consistently to the following conventions:

---

1 This applies especially to the use of ae, -ti-ci-, f and h. I admit one or two departures from classical norms (e.g. sulfur, see 5.2 below). For now, I write *unges*, *ungere*, etc. and *urgetur*, etc., although γ at least seems to have spelled these verbs with gu.

2 See André, *Plantes*, 251.
1. Variations affecting groups of words (e.g., points of word-order) are set out before those concerning individual constituent words.

2. Variants are cited in order of increasing distance from the chosen reading.

3. Illegible or partly illegible forms are reported only when they can contribute something, e.g., in virtue of their length by suggesting one reading rather than another.

4. ‘(?)’ beside a reported form indicates that the reading is doubtful.

5. Manuscripts are cited in chronological order by family (γ before η before ε) and within each (sub-)family (e.g., D Ox Ge), although within ε, where things remain relatively uncertain, I tend to move from left to right across the stemma (θ', θ'', κ); contaminated manuscripts are cited with the relevant family in each instance.

6. With reference to a single manuscript, \(X^{i} = X \text{ ante correctionem.}\)

7. \(\text{word-form}_{n}\) (e.g., \(\text{et}_{2}\)) = the \(n\)th occurrence of the word-form (e.g., the second occurrence of \(\text{et}\)) in the section of text addressed by the apparatus at that point.

Finally, the notes are primarily philological and linguistic in nature. They contain very little on medical-historical aspects of the Latin Alexander, except in so far as these bear on the text and its interpretation. While in some senses regrettable, this is I think right and proper given the primary requirement of establishing a usable text (and of seeking linguistic criteria for identifying its date and place of origin), and especially because a new medical-historical commentary on Alexander must be based anyway on the Greek text, and on a new edition thereof (taking full account of the Latin version).

My first purpose in the notes is, then, to discuss significant manuscript variants, to justify the text that I have printed here, but also to consider alternative possibilities. This often depends to some extent at least on the usage of the Latin Alexander, which in the absence of an edition of the text is far from easy to determine. The information presented here in the notes (and elsewhere in the present study) is based for Books 1 and 2 of the Latin version on my own annotated electronic transcription of Angers 457, for Book 3 on a photocopy of the 1504 printing, and, for the Greek text, on Puschmann’s edition (the Hakkert reprint and the text contained in the TLG) together with, for the relevant portions of the work (Section 2.1 above), a (rather faint) photocopy of the relevant folios of Venice, Marc. gr. 295 (Puschmann’s Mf).

The second point of the notes is more strictly linguistic, having regard to the questions of the Latinity and the translation-techniques of the maker(s) of the Latin Alexander. At this early stage in the reconstruction of the text, observations offered under these headings are inevitably rather isolated and piecemeal. In that they are based on incomplete or imperfect evidence, they are often tentative and provisional, and they frequently raise implicitly or explicitly further questions which can be answered only in the course of further work on the edition. It seemed nevertheless preferable to include rather than to suppress these questions, in order both to make clear my proposed agenda and to invite help and comment from interested readers.

5.2. THE SPELLING OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

With the notable exception of the descendants of β, and P1 in particular, the spellings — including the erroneous spellings — of the manuscripts of the Latin Alexander are literary in nature and hence unpromising as evidence for contemporary pronunciation. In some cases, it seems plausible to reconstruct for the archetype a certain (non-classical) morphological and orthographical forms, but on the whole the
tradition contains sufficient variation, even in the representation of a given word in a
given manuscript, to render hopeless the notion of systematically reconstructing the
orthography and morphology used by the maker of the archetype, let alone that of the
original translation. I illustrate these general observations, both positive and negative, in
a series of examples set out in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1: Some examples of orthographical variants in the manuscripts
of the Latin Alexander
(Shading of a cell indicates that the word or form to the left with the spelling feature in bold
is attested in the manuscript above; the sign ‘~’ in a shaded cell means that the manuscript
above attests both the ‘abnormal’ and the ‘normal’ spelling of the word or form to the left.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPIRATED CONSONANTS</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Ox</th>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>ed.</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stomacus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caphalasena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melancula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cataricum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e孰or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nihilo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miehi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i AND y</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Ox</th>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>ed.</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yeh(b)or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyros-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NON-ETYMOLOGICAL /h/ |
|----------------------| P1 | M | A | O | Ma | C | G1 | P2 | L2 | B | P3 | Ma | D | Ox | Ge | G2 | ed. | L1 |
| habundans            |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| his (= nom. sg. a)   |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| prohicer             |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| ad hore              |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |

| TWO PRONOMINAL FORMS |
|----------------------| P1 | M | A | O | Ma | C | G1 | P2 | L2 | B | P3 | Ma | D | Ox | Ge | G2 | ed. | L1 |
| his (= dat.-abl. pl. h(a) |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f vs ph</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Ox</th>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>ed.</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sulfur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SINGLE AND GEMINATE CONSONANTS |
|------------------------------| P1 | M | A | O | Ma | C | G1 | P2 | L2 | B | P3 | Ma | D | Ox | Ge | G2 | ed. | L1 |
| saccus                  |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| appium                  |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| glutinosus             |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| intollerabilis         |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| sacurat                |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |

| WORD-FINAL -d ~ -t |
|--------------------| P1 | M | A | O | Ma | C | G1 | P2 | L2 | B | P3 | Ma | D | Ox | Ge | G2 | ed. | L1 |
| set                 |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| solud                |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| laud                  |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |
| capud                |    |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |     |     |

(continued)
If we may ascribe to the archetype forms unanimously attested in the manuscripts, and in particular in the oldest manuscripts (P1, M, A, and O), we may reconstruct with confidence, on the one hand, the following ‘correct’ spellings:

- stomachus and cataplasma rather than stomacus and cathaplasma
- flegm- (in flegma, flegmaticus, flegmon, etc.) rather than fleum-
- sucus rather than succus
- sed, uelut, aliud and caput rather than set, uelud, alit and capud
- -ntia rather than -ncia (at least in accidentia, assimilantia, distemperantia and nascentia)
- sentiunt, faciunt, sufficat and proiciunt rather than senciunt, fatiunt, sufficiat and proitiunt

and dative-ablative plural his rather than hiis.

On the other hand, we should be obliged also to write melancolia, melancolicus,3 catarticum; nominative singular his (assuming correction in ms. A) for is ‘he’; very probably habundans (discounting P1 and again supposing correction in A) for abundans; and tercia (standard in all the early witnesses, with the sole exception of ms. M) for tertia.

And we should be uncertain whether to write achora or acora, ichor or icor or ychor or ycor, thorax or torax, nichil or nihil, michi or mihi, sulphur or sulfur, and -ci- or -ti- in a host of words containing etymological -i-, including the very common patior, patiens.

The examples of attested -ci- and -ti- forms reveal particularly clearly the extent to which spellings are tied to words rather than to sounds or sequences of sounds, and even then are subject to variation in the output of a single copyist (witness the variant forms of actio, curatio, initium, thorax in our oldest ms., P1). Given the special status of P1 (on which, more below), the long interval of time between the making of the Latin Alexander and the copying of M (the second-oldest witness), and the fact that we must still regard

---

3 The patterns of spelling differ slightly even for such closely-related words as melancolia and melancolicus (to the extent that the later tendency to abbreviate the latter allows a pattern to emerge).
the question of the place of manufacture as open (in both geographical and sociolinguistic terms), for now at least I resist even those unanimously-attested non-classical spellings which are immediately clear and unambiguous (such as habundans and tertia), although I do report good manuscript evidence for non-standard spellings in the apparatus.

As already noted, the really interesting (i.e. non-standard!) orthography in the tradition of the Latin Alexander is more or less confined to descendants of β, and of these P1 has the lion’s share. It is really only on this side of the tradition that one encounters in significant numbers the familiar written reflections of the sound-changes under way in Vulgar Latin/Proto-Romance, such as confusion of (a) (above all) i and e; (b) u and o; (c) the letters representing voiced and voiceless consonants; (d) single and geminate consonants.  

4 Failing indication to the contrary, the examples in Table 5.2 below are all from ms. P1.

Table 5.2: Non-standard spellings in Par. lat. 9332 (and one or two other mss.)

(a) i for orig. long e (or unaccented short e):
- humonis (nom. acc. pl.), oportur, pectenis (pl.; cf. pectinis v1), qualitatis ... simplicis (pl.), refrigirandi, tussientis ... respirantis (pl.), ueninosis; aparat (for apparel), differentia
e for orig. short i (or unaccented long i):
- acedentiae, coleris (for colliiris), contenentur, debelem, defferenzia, defiese, humorebus, manefesta, mereto, netro, pegritia, pera (also M u v1), subcolecruis (for subcolericus), uetello; degerere (for digerere), insequente, requeuenttur (for requirontur)
(b) u for orig. long o (or unaccented short o):
- cognuscenda, cibus (for cibos), multus (for multos); humur
o for orig. short u (or unaccented long u):
- confitemor, eorom (for eorum), polmone; notrimento
(c) voiced for voiceless:
- acora (for acora), agris, ago (for acris, acro), ygor (i.e. ichor), dracia (for trachea), sdrigno
  (for stricn-), grassitudinem (for crass-)
voiceless for voiced:
- clica (for glíc- = γλύκ-, collicantur (for colligatur), expetientia (for exped-), meticatiuus
  (for mitiga-)
(d) single for geminate:
- acedentia, aparat, cacauo (caccabo), coleris (for collirius), defficle, inflammationem (also B), reditur
  geminate for single:
- oppium (also OMu)

Then there are (more isolated) examples of the syncope of short unstressed vowels (e.g. the familiar calda (also in mss. u and v1), frigda, 5 but also the less familiar Fluminus, Flagrius for Philumenus, Philagrius), the omission of h (e.g. abere, abens, etc., abitudo, adibere), the assimilation of certain consonant-clusters (ss for rs: pessica; t for ct: petenes (for pectines), and conversely ct for t: tectinula (for titinula); (u)m for gm: augmentare).

4 This side of the family also throws up the occasional morphological or lexical vulgarism, such as the replacement of differre by dilatare (in P1, M and P3 and therefore in γ and γ') or the 2nd-declension form tenus (for tenuis) in M; these are in addition to the small number of banal late or vulgar forms to be reconstructed for the archetype, such as acora, -ae (fem.) for Greek ἀκόρα, -ός (masc.), acro ablative singular masculine/neuter of acer, rubras for ruber, etc.

5 On the other hand, frigd- seems to be the standard form in derivatives, such as infrigdare (for which only P1 and A sometimes, and L1 and ed. consistently, attest the stem infrigida-).
Ms. M has surprisingly few of these spellings in common with P1, and is characterized instead by other phonetically-conditioned ('vulgar') spellings which are rare in P1, notably uncertainty in the writing of word-final s (e.g. *per artelia*<>), nominative plural *humore*, nominative singular *lacrimas*, genitive singular *amenti*) and above all confusion of *b* and *u*: note e.g. (with *b* for *u*) *botitum*, *delabas*, *inabant*, *mitigatibus* (for *-tiuus*), *solbis*, and conversely (with *u* for *b*) e.g. *inueccilitate* (cf. *inuecellitatem* in P1), and, above all, forms of *adhibere* and adjectives in *-bilis* (deuilem, insanauilem, insustentauilem, intolerauilis, terriuili); more isolated examples in P1 include *requieberit* on the one hand, and *bueere et* (for *biberint*), *souetaneas* (for *subitaneas*) on the other.\(^6\)

Characteristic of the spelling rather than the pronunciation — the forms are in direct defiance of the pronunciation — of the makers of M and especially P1 is the non-assimilation of preverbs: both attest words beginning *ads*- (also in ms. u), *adr*-; M alone has *obp*-,[...]

5.3. The Latinity of the Latin Alexander: Some Provisional Remarks

The following brief remarks on the Latinity of the Latin Alexander are naturally based almost entirely on the chapters so far edited, and are consequently provisional in the extreme. If the phonology and morphology of the descendants of *b* (with the partial exception of v1) are vulgar (see 5.2 above), there are repeated signs of a higher level of Latinity in their syntax and morphosyntax, so that I still incline to the general view\(^8\) that the maker(s) of the Latin Alexander had a good command of a fairly high and ‘correct’ register of Late Latin. Another observation that seems to be receiving repeated confirmation is that of striking, and often enough apparently unique, lexical and grammatical agreements between the Latin Alexander and the Latin Oribasius. A third working hypothesis that I think deserves airing is that we should reckon with distinguishing the efforts of more than one translator (hence my frequent, cautious use of ‘maker(s)’). I deal briefly here with each of these points in turn.

\(^6\) Other, idiosyncratic forms in descendants of *b* that probably reflect both contemporary pronunciation and lack of familiarity with the target form include, in P1: *coare* (for *quare*), *sint copius* (for *sincopos*); in M: *inquisnamitas* (for *inquimatisma*). There is a possible reflex of the palatalization of *d* and *g* before a front vowel in the forms *faticium*, *fastigium* (for *fastidium* in P1) and *inerat* (for *ingerat*) in v1.

\(^7\) There are isolated and generally incorrect examples of *ae* in other mss., e.g. *ipsae* in A, *oportae* in O and P2, and a correct *ordinandae* in P3.

\(^8\) Expressed and illustrated in Langslow, ‘Alex. Trall.’.
5.3.1. A RELATIVELY HIGH LEVEL OF LATINITY?

The Latin of the hyparchetype is of a much higher order than that of \( \beta \), and the question arises whether \( \beta \) vulgarized or \( \delta \) normalized what each found in his exemplar descended from \( \alpha \). A priori, it seems to me, the former alternative — namely that a relatively correct archetype was vulgarized in or before the making of \( \beta \) — is made more likely by the presence in \( \beta \) of morphosyntactic features of standard, ‘high’ Latin, especially in the absence of their hypercorrect use in \( \beta \). So, for example, a correctly-used subjunctive or a construction such as the ablative absolute, the *ab urbe condita* construction, or *necessarium est* + accusative and infinitive or + *ut* with subjunctive, is much more likely to be a relic of something old and correct than an (at all events, sporadic) attempt to improve the Latin of an archetype even more vulgar than \( \beta \).

The presence of features which in the classical period would have counted as vulgar need not tend against the general view of an at least reasonably high command of Latin on the part of the translator(s). The few secure non-classical forms so far identified, such as dative singular *acro*, nominative singular *rubrus*, may safely be regarded as standard by the fifth or sixth century at the latest (cf. Väänänen, *Lat. vulg.*., §234).

Nor is this general view of a relatively high level of Latinity in the Latin Alexander necessarily undermined by the steadily accumulating evidence of linguistic proximity between the Latin Alexander and the Latin versions of Oribasius (see the next section). Indeed, in my view, to raise this as an argument in favour of a vulgarizing Latin Alexander would be to beg the question of the linguistic register of the Latin Oribasius, texts which have arguably been ill served by their respective traditions and editors.

5.3.2. AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE LATIN ALEXANDER AND THE LATIN ORIBASIUS

Lexical and grammatical agreements between the Latin Alexander and the Latin Oribasius continue to multiply. To those that I have already recorded,\(^9\) may be added yet further instances, both medical and non-medical, including (in alphabetical order):

- *alius alter* ‘other’ (pleonastic; see 2.5.3 and note 98 below)
- *gargalio* ‘uvula’ (also in the Latin Hippocrates; see 2.10.2 and note 172 below)
- *manifestum est quia* (see 2.1.4 and note 35 below)
- *spissus* (or *pinguis*) *et glutinosus humor* (see 2.10.t–1 and notes 161, 169, below)
- *uentositas spiritus*, for Greek *pneumatos* (at e.g. 1.85.11, Section 4.10.3 above).\(^{10}\)

---

9 In Langslow, ‘Alex. Trall.’: *acidonicus*/*acetonicus* ‘bitter’; *aspratilis* (of fish) ‘living in rocky places’; *bullitionem facere* ‘bubble, boil’; *operatiuus* ‘effective, drastic’; *princeps* (*neruorum*) ‘main nerve’ (or ‘starting-point (of the nerves)’, ‘brain’?); *sablonosus* ‘sandy’; *uirga* ‘penis’; the spelling *mirti*- for Greek *mursi*-.

10 I omit other features common to these texts which are attested more widely in later Latin, such as the use of *postea* = *postquam* (2.11.5 and note 194 below) or the use of *pus* ‘pus’ as a masculine noun (2.8.1 and note 133 below).
The evidence, then, continues to mount linking these texts in terms of translation-technique and hence by implication in space and time. Significant are not only unusual shared translation-equivalents for Greek terms (such as the last example above, or the double translation *digerere et uel euentare* for Greek διαφορεῖν, note 9 above) but also the ‘indirect’, non-medical items including those in note 9 above or the particle discussed in detail in Langslow, ‘utique’. In that article, I was concerned to emphasize the differences between the older and the younger Oribasius (texts which, thanks in large part to the manner in which they have been edited, are standardly lumped together and spoken of in the same breath as out-and-out vulgar) and the differences between both versions of Oribasius and the Latin Alexander. Especially as the particle *utique* is attested in more than a few other late Latin texts, it was not part of my purpose in that article to argue with reference to these medical translations for proximity in their respective points of origin in time and space. Here, however, I would underline the importance of *utique* in two complementary if opposite respects: on the one hand, the very frequency of its use and the manner of one or two of its uses in the two versions of Oribasius and the Latin Alexander are surely significant links between these three texts; on the other hand, the fact that the overall pattern of use of the particle varies markedly from text to text is a salutary reminder that a single glossary, or set of translation-equivalents, may yield very different results in the hands of different translators. One would never think to suggest that the two versions of Oribasius were the work of a single man, and their respective uses of *utique* now constitute one documented divergence between them, with possible implications for their respective overall levels of Latinity. Equally, the possibility of multiple authorship is seldom raised in connection with late medical translations/compilations, even though the notion is a priori far from absurd and may find support in consistent stylistic differences between different parts of the ‘same’ text.

5.3.3. More Than One Translator?

Even in the short space of those few chapters of the Latin Alexander that I have attempted to reconstruct so far, I have been repeatedly struck by stylistic divergences that might just reflect the work of different translators. At this stage, most of the features that I think one can legitimately point to as potential tell-tales of the work of more than one translator concern sentence-structure, word-order and a tendency to *variatio*, rather than lexical choice in the matter of translating technical vocabulary.11 Reading in text-order the sample chapters presented in 4.10 above and 5.4 below, I was struck first in 2.36–7 (and to a lesser degree in 2.235–6) by an apparently greater concern for and control of a certain higher style in the Latin manifested especially in the following features:

(a) the consistent use of a connecting particle to link each sentence to the preceding;
(b) hyperbaton apparently not suggested by the Greek, e.g. at 2.37.4 ‘malos qui continentur humores’ ( = τὴν κρατοῦσαν κακοχωμίαν);

11 On the rare use of *statim* and the very frequent use of *mox*, see 2.36.3 and note ad loc. in 4.10.4 above. Other possible tell-tales include the use of *ad* + gerund at 2.37.11 ‘tempus ad commemorandum’, and the use at 2.235.3 of a form of *possunt* for potential *āv* instead of the automatic, translationese use of *utique*.
Stylistically elevated Latin is no guarantee of a flawless, or even superior, translation of the Greek (the chapters on gout, for example, fall down over Greek ὀπόληπτιν as early as the second sentence, 2.235.2 ‘Relinquitur enim . . . ’), and further study may falsify, or at least fail to substantiate, the hypothesis that at least two different men were responsible for translating 2.36–7 on the cardiaca passio, 2.235–6 on gout, and the very start of Book 2, set out below, on coughing.
De tusse

2.1.1 Tussis quidem 12<est>13 accidentia et ipsa, quemadmodum 14 et dispnia, 15 et 16 differentias 17 et ipsa habet qualitatis 18 causarum, [sed] quoniam 19 initium habet modo a calida distemperantia, 20 est autem quando 21 a frigida aut humida aut etiam sicca.

De tusse] De tussi ed.1 L1 Capitolium primum ad tussim P3 om. P1 O P2L2

Tussis ... accidentia] T... deinde Magnum spatium Ox [quidem] equidem M si quidem P1 AO Ma (quidem P1'1) <est> scrispimus [accidentia] accedentia P1 plurima accidentia Ma | et ipsa (et ipsas AD) quemadmodum P1M DOxGe quemadmodum et ipsa φ quemadmodum cett. rasuram ante quemadmodum habet P2 [et]. om. M P3'φ | dispnia (dispnia (dispnia Ox dispnya Ma) AOMu L2MaOxGe dispnia D ed.) de spuma P1 disponet M | et, G1L2BP3 Ma Ox [cf. disponet M] habet et C om. cett. [differentias] -tia (defe - P1) P1M differre scias Mu | et ipsa habet MP2 | et ipsas habet AMu Ma et ipsas habuit P1 et ipsas C habet et ipsas L2B habet ipsas G1 habet et DOxGe φ habet ex P3 (ex add. m2) habent O [qualitatis P1 O (?) -e P3 corr. ex -es -m2 qualitas uel qualitatis (?)] O (fort. corri. ex -es) -es cett. [causarum] om. ed. causa (?) (an ex causarum corr. uel abrasum?) O [sed] seclusimus) om. P3Ma | initium habet [h. i. D [initium] initio O | habet -ent (?) O habuit P1 | modo] hoc modo Ox [a] ad P1 de D et OMu ex P3Ma om. OxB calida distemperantia] -am -iam O | est autem P1M AO P3Ma] om. cett. | inter autem et quando uestra quando a calida distemperantia est quoque AMu (dittog. notauit A) | quando P1M AO P3Ma whenque G1CP2L2B om. DOx φ | a A G1CP2L2 aut P1M O autem B ex P3Ma modo a OxGe φ modo de D | inter frigida et aut uestra] disponentur autem habet C uerba uel calida habet O | aut uel Ma | etiam) om. OxGe φ

12 quidem quidem is one of several particles (including also quiique and utique) used very frequently in the Latin Alexander. It often answers a particle in the Greek, notably in the frequent chapter opening Quoniam quidem, which translates ὅτι μὲν at 2.51 = II, 321, 2, 2.57 = II, 379, 1, 2.74 = II, 407, 6, ἐπειδή de at 2.16 = II, 245, 24, 2.211 = II, 353, 7 (note also 1.122 solet quidem contingere = II, 99, 8 ἐπειδή de συμβαίνει). Also common are phrases of the type 1.41 primo quidem ... postea autem = I, 493, 10–11 πρῶτον μὲν ... στῇσιν de (cf. 1.47 = I, 501, 5 and numerous examples in Book 2), or 1.57 sic quidem = I, 517, 5 οὕτως μὲν. But quidem is often used for emphasis when there is no corresponding particle in the Greek, e.g. at 1.23 et quidem = I, 469, 8 καὶ τότε, and as apparently here. With the use of quidem here at the start of a chapter with no obvious match in the Greek, cf. 1.17 Psidracia quidem sunt parvi tuberculi = I, 459, 22 ψυχράκαι εἰσὶ μικρὰ ὕπερχαι; 2.204 Pessima quidem passio = II, 335, 5 δεινὸν τι πάθος (unless here quidem is a corruption of quaedam for τί).

13 <est> We obviously need the copula in the Latin (cf. Greek ἔστιν). Its presence and its position matching that of Greek ἔστι may be reflected in the extra syllable between tussis and quidem seen in the variant readings equidem and si quidem. On the other hand, it follows quidem in the similar chapter opening 1.17 quoted in note 12, and I tentatively follow suit here.

14 quemadmodum In comparisons expressed in Greek with ὡσπερ, καθώσπερ, in the Latin Alexander quemadmodum is apparently commoner and more widely used than ut, which in comparative function survives mainly in the fixed phrases ut supra, ut dictum est, ut est 'such as, for example'; note, however, ut for παραπληκτός at 2.11.5 ut phthísici solent (see below). sicut is also common, not only in the fixed phrases sicut dictum est, sicut scrispimus, and especially it seems in the chapters from Philumenus and Philagrius. The distribution of quemadmodum, ut and sicut may repay further attention. quomodo, on the other hand, is rare in the Latin Alexander in comparative function. I have
2.1.1. Concerning coughing

Coughing also, like dyspnoea, is a mere symptom, and it, too, has causes of different qualities. For it takes its beginning sometimes from a hot imbalance, sometimes, too, from a cold or a wet or even a dry imbalance.

II, 147, 1–4 (Book 5, ch. 1) Puschmann

Περὶ βηχῶς

Ἡ βῆς ἦστι σύμπτωμα καὶ αὕτη καθάπερ καὶ ἡ δύσπνοια. διαφόροις δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἔχει τὰς ποιούσις αἰτίας· ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχέται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας, ἐσθ’ ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχρᾶς ἢ ἔτηρᾶς ἢ ψυχρᾶς.

found only three examples in Book 1 (plus two instances of indefinite quomodo volueris ‘however you like’, at 1.110 and 119), and one in Book 2. Interestingly, three of these four instances have a negative first element (as does Vitae patr. 5.5.13, quoted by Hofmann and Szantyr, 649): 1.69 ‘nulla sic quomodo ista herba’ (I, 551, 26 σοῦνδψ ὄντως ὄχι), 1.85 ‘nihil sic dolorosum ... quomodo’ (II, 3, 9–11), 2.139 ‘non enim aliiud inuenies melius quod sic possit malaxare duritias quoniam habet’ (I, 463, 20 παραπλήσθης τοῖς + participle). The distribution of quomodo ‘as’ in Latin generally, and the fact that it alone is continued in Romance (Ital. como, Fr. comme, etc.), suggest that it was stylistically lower than quemadmodum (already in Cicero, in casual registers; cf. Landgraf, 137–8); on the various replacements of ‘comparative’ ut, see Svennung, Palladius, 509–11, Hofmann and Szantyr, 648–50. The favouring of quemadmodum by the maker(s) of the Latin Alexander may be a further hint of relatively high linguistic pretensions.

15 dispinia The Greek word is used only here and at 2.35 dispnai (II, 273, 7 δισπναίοι). Otherwise, the following Latin equivalents are used: 1.143 difficultatem spiritus, dificiliter respirant (II, 229, 6, 8); 2.7.1, 2.9.1 difficultas spirandi (II, 151, 2, 25); 2.7.2 auct respirantes (II, 151, 4 δισπναοῦστον); 2.259 suspiriosi (II, 543, 12). Of these, difficultas spiritus and difficultas spirandi are well attested as equivalents of δισπναοι in earlier Latin texts, while suspiriosi is somewhat of a surprise, being earlier used to render οσματικον (cf. Langslow, Medical Latin, Index, s.v.).

16 et differentias This et may be a later addition (perhaps in θσ, whence G1 and L2, although it is also in B and OX), or it may be original and reflected in dispnai M.

17 differentias It is tempting to correct to differentiae, but the Latin Alexander does not appear to attest the adjective differentia! For a parallel where the Latin tradition has unanimously differentia + genitive for Greek adjective διόφορος, cf. 1.85.12 ‘differentia est causae’ = II, 5, 16 διόφορα ἐστὶ τὰ αἴτια. The singular, differentium, is thinkable here also.

18 qualitatis The Latin does not translate Puschmann’s text. Did the translator’s Greek text have ποιοῦσις? Or was the translator anticipating the content of the next clause? The low quality of his work in this chapter makes the latter possibility unlikely. For a parallel mismatch between Greek and Latin versions, cf. I, 441, 5–6 τὸ γούμον αἵτινα τὸ πάθος = 1.1 qualitas causae passionis: qualitas, for quälis, for (ó)ποιον, also illustrates the tendency of the Latin translator to nominalize.

19 [sed] quoniam Presumably ποτὲ is translated by modo, so does quoniam translate γάρ (as at e.g. 2.241 = II, 511, 25 (where NB Pod. has quoque for quoniam))? But why sed? It is tempting to suppose that sed quoniam is for ἀλλ’ ὅτι in the translator’s text: cf. the variant reading in Greek ms. L ἀλλότερον for ποτὲ (reported by Puschmann); although in the Greek Alexander ἄλλοτε (well attested in the δὲ clause) is unparallelled in the μὲν clause, it would be an easy error. If this is right, modo must have been added by our translator to partner est autem quando. I tentatively take quoniam for γάρ and sed either as accidentally transposed from before differentias (for δὲ) or as anticipating sed quoniam in 2.1.3.

20 calida distemperantia On the Hippocratism of Alexander, see Temkin, ‘Hippokratismus’.

21 est autem quando For est autem quando, cf. 2.5.4 = II, 149, 19–20 ἐστὶν εἰς τὰς Puschmann but ἐστὶ δὲ ὅτε LM (see note ad loc.); 2.41 = II, 289, 20 ἐστὶ δὲ ὅτε; 2.129 ‘in splene enim est quando et actum mittimus’ (not in Greek; Mihăileanu p. 171, 1 prints a comma between est and quando!).
2.1.2  Non solum autem secundum qualitates puras aut\textsuperscript{22} simplices, sed et secundum humores\textsuperscript{23} superfluentes\textsuperscript{24} simili tert existit\textsuperscript{25} seu calida\textsuperscript{26} siue frigida aut alia aliqua qualitate assumpta.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{22} puras aut simplices Cf. 2.1.3 pura uel simplex. In both places, A alone has \textit{et}, and here P1’s \textit{pura iam} suggests a corruption of \textit{puras aut} rather than of \textit{puras et}.

\textsuperscript{23} humores More usually, \textit{humores} translates χυμοι, but for \textit{humores = ὄλη, cf. 1.6 = II, 447, 10 and 2.185 = II, 475, 26 quoted in note 24.}

\textsuperscript{24} humores superfluentes I print for now the text of θ\textsuperscript{v}. The correction of the reading of γ to \textit{humorum superfluentiam} (suggested to me by Michael Reeve) is both minimal and elegant, but \textit{superfluitia} is unparalleled in the Latin Alexander (and registered neither by Georges nor by Souter). A second neat alternative (suggested to me by Cloudy Fischer) is \textit{humorem superfluentem} (the ending of \textit{humorum} being occasioned by that of secundum). I would like to canvass also the possibility of reading \textit{humorum superfluentium qualitates}. The Latin tradition appears to reflect two attempts to restore an accusative after \textit{secundum} (viz. \textit{humorum superfluitates} in δ, and \textit{humores superfluentes in θv}). The very form of the apparently secondary \textit{superfluitates} could support an original sequence \textit{superfluentium qualitates}. With \textit{humorum superfluentiam} cf. 2.185 plenitude \textit{humorum fluentium} (II, 475, 26–7 πληθος ὄλης ἐπιρρυσσάντος). Note that \textit{superfluidas} (from the lexicalized adjective \textit{superflius}) is used not infrequently by our translator(s), but always to translate περιττώµα, περιττώµατα, περιττός (e.g. at 2.12 (II, 157, 11), 2.40 (II, 287, 16), 2.152 (II, 441, 20), 2.205 (II, 341, 4), and cf. 2.39 (II, 285, 13 περιττόν) and 2.56 (II, 333, 13 ἀπεριττοῦ); verbal and participial forms of \textit{superflu}, on the other hand, (and of \textit{supercurro}, e.g. 2.5.1 below, 1.124 = II, 105, 21) are used to render forms of ἐπιρρύω, including the verbal adjective ἐπιρρυστός (if the Greek text here is sound). One should perhaps note the formal similarity of ἐπιρρυστόν (the Greek form we are here translating) and περιττόν, and the fact that the former occurs (according to the TLG) only twice in Alex. Trall., here and on the very next page (II, 149, 14 = 2.5.2); verbal and participial forms on the stem ἐπιρρυ-, on the other hand, number close to a hundred (according to the TLG). The Greek text should perhaps be emended.
2.1.2 But it emerges not only from qualities pure and simple but also similarly from the superfluous humours, when either a hot or a cold or some other quality has been taken on (by the condition).

II, 147, 4–7 Puschmann

οὐ μόνον δὲ κατὰ ποιότητα ψιλὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ὑλὴν ἐπίρρυτον ὀσαύτως συνισταται + παντὸς τοῦ ἐπιρρέοντος χυμοῦ + ἢ θερμήν ἢ ψυχράν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ ποιότητα προσειληφότος.

25 *existit* A plural form, *existunt* (or *existent*?), closer in form to the attested participles) is also thinkable, as the subject in the next sentence is the plural *tussiculae* ‘coughs’. Finite forms of *existere* are not common in the Latin Alexander, but one may compare e.g. 1.114 ‘et maxime ubi inflammationes rubrae existunt’, where *ubi . . . existunt* renders the genitive absolute at II, 87, 19 (cf. 1.125 = II, 107, 28); on the very frequent use of the present participle *existens*, see note below on 2.3.1 *existente*.

26 *calida . . . frigida* What lies behind the -us endings in γ (whence presumably -os in θ)? An accusative plural, or a late Latin nominative plural ending agreeing with *humores*?

27 *qualitate assumpta* I have tentatively written an ablative absolute (for the Greek genitive absolute), as elsewhere we have seen some evidence that the translator controls this construction (cf. e.g. 2.5.4 *urgente causa*; 2.158.3 *Quibus agniti*; 2.158.6 *amisco nutrimento . . . tunica comesta*; 2.158.7 *virtute amissa*). η replaced the absolute participle with a finite periphrastic construction (*sit assumpta*, with the subjunctive after *seu*); this is faintly reminiscent of *fit extenuata* in η and κ for *extenuatur* at 2.158.6 (for the text see Section 4.10.5), although I have argued (above, p. 118) that *fit extenuata* is more probably original. The rest of the tradition made the participle conjunct in the accusative plural agreeing with *superfluitates*. 
2.1.3 Scire autem aportet et hoc quomodo differunt abinuicem tussiculae secundum causas singulas\(^{28}\) sed quoniam\(^{29}\) et secundum loca, et quaequam quidem earum ipsa loca patiuntur, alia etiam compatiuntur.\(^{30}\)

2.1.4 Propter quod\(^{31}\) non una est causa tussis sed uaria, de qua re oportet nos accedere\(^{32}\) cum omni studio ad cognoscendam uniuscuiusque ureritatem. Confitemur\(^{34}\) enim et manifestum est quia\(^{35}\) sine cognitione non possunt bene curari.

autem] om. D \(\phi\) | oportet| -it P1 | hoc] hic \(\phi\) hec Ma | abinuicem] ad- MaOx \(\phi\) | tussiculae] -ae M- is P1 | singulas] sineolas P1 | sed quoniam (s. s. Ma)] sed \(\phi\) om. G1P3Ma\(^{0}\)OxGe \(\eta\) | om. O et ipsa Ox | et,] om. AMuC G1P2L2B s. s. Ge | quaequam Ma] quiaquam M quaquam P1O quanquam AMuC P2L2B quando Ge et quando s. s. Ox m2 quam \(\phi\) que G1P3D\(\phi\)q[uidem] quidam Mu quod(?) P1 | earum A P2CL2B \(\phi\)] eorum G1MaD\(\phi\)eOx erunt (er\(\i\)) M \(\varepsilon\) O autem P1 om. P3 | ipsa local] om. G1P3 | patiuntur] -antur AMuC P2L2BD\(\phi\)e | alia etiam M AOMu P2L2BD] alia quidem C et que G1P3Ma et que membra \(\phi\) (membra in marg. ed. s. s. G2) | om. P1OX | compatiuntur | -antur CP2B\(\phi\)e am. P1Ox |

propter quod P1M O D\(\phi\) propterea AC P2L2B et propterea Ox quoniam G1P3Ma \(\phi\) | inter propter quod et non habet uerba per partes agnoscenda sunt quia D | una] est] est una G1C2P2L2BG| causa] cura L om. Mu | post tussis add. cuiusdem P3 m3 | sed] sed et D | uaria] uarie P1 | res L | oportet nos] nos oportet Ox \(\phi\) | nos et nos P1 om. O | accedere] super c alteram habet (fort. iocose) litteram p P1 accingere Ox \(\phi\) occurrere M | cum] vi P1 om. C | omni studio] omnem studium P1 | cum omni studio accedere G1 cognoscendam (cognoscenda P1)] agnoscendam A G2L agnoscendam Ox gnosendum P3\(^{0}\) (ad praeponit supra m3) ad noscendam Ma | post uniuscuiusque habent tussis Ox \(\phi\) | ueritatem P1M AO B] uarietatem accett \(\eta\) | compatiuntur | -mor P1 | et] om. P1 | quia] qua P1 | cognitione] -em P1 | curari non possunt bene Ox | bene] om. OM\(\phi\)u | curari] curare P1

\(^{28}\) singulas The reading of P1 sineolas presumably reflects an uncial model. The translation of κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν μὸναν as secundum causas singulas may seem rather free: we would perhaps expect rather solus for μὸνα, as in a similar context at 2.236.6 (for the text, Latin and Greek, see 4.10.6 above). The meaning of the original is, however, well conveyed here (‘according to each individual cause on its own’), and singuli (always plural) is common in the Latin Alexander in perfectly classical uses, so that I do not think we have to suppose the (Romance) use of singularus = solus (cf. REW 7945 singularus *‘allein’). The fondness of our translator(s) for the word is seen in its gratuitous use twice within a line, again with causae, at 2.236.7 (causarum singularum . . . singulararum causarum; for the text see 4.10.6 above), where there is nothing corresponding in the Greek.

On abinuicem, etc. for Greek ἀλληλονος, etc., see Hofmann and Szantyr, 177–8.

\(^{29}\) sed quoniam This apparently simple sentence is replete with difficulties. At first sight one would take quoniam = quod or quia, in place of accusative + infinitive, a use well known in Late Latin (cf. Hofmann and Szantyr, 628). Furthermore, here the sed puts one in mind of the Late Latin non quoniam . . . sed quoniam (see Hofmann and Szantyr, 588), and in view of the Greek (ὁς ὄδο δοξοδοσον) one might hazard that we have lost a negative in the Latin. However, in spite of my translation I am as yet unable to parallel this use of quoniam in the Latin Alexander, and I have every sympathy with the maker of θ for ditching sed quoniam! Might quoniam be for ότι of the next clause (transposed in the translator’s Greek text, or anticipated by the translator)?

\(^{30}\) et quaequam . . . compatiuntur Although the Greek is not difficult, the translator appears to have made a complete hash of the second part of this sentence, where the subject should remain ‘coughs’. Of course, we can only guess at what his Greek text contained, and indeed at his Latin Version, which evidently caused such confusion in the tradition. On any account, the original translation appears to have meant something like, ‘and that some of the coughs the bodyparts themselves suffer, other bodyparts also suffer in sympathy’. Clearly, we must have et followed by two short words beginning with q- followed by quidem. Alternatives to the printed text include: (1) et quaeque quidem (quisquis), with quaeque as object of patiuntur; (2) et quaeque quidem (quisque), with quaeque as object of patiuntur (I owe this idea to Cloudy Fischer: for quisque . . . alias, see Hofmann and
2.1.3 It is further necessary to know that coughs differ one from another according to their individual causes but that they differ also according to their locations. In the case of some of them, the locations themselves are affected, while other locations also are affected secondarily.

2.1.4 Therefore there is not a single cause of coughing, but (there are) various (causes), and for this reason we must proceed with all diligence to find out the true reason for each single cough. We admit, and it is obvious, that they cannot be treated well without recognition (of the underlying cause).

II, 147, 7–13 Puschmann

Szantyr, 429); (3) et quia quae quidem, with quae as object of patiuntur (this probably stood in γ at least: at 2.1.4 P1 again has quia for quia; on this development, cf. Svennung, Palladius, 502). A fourth possibility suggested by the manuscript forms is (4a) et quia quamquidem, with quamquidem an emphatic equivalent of quidem = Greek μὲν attested in the Latin versions of Oribasius, Rufus, De podagra, and Hippocrates, De septimanis (cf. Hofmann and Szantyr, 486, Morland, Oribasius, 160f., Souter, s.v.) and αὐτὸ not translated, or (4b) et quia quaedam, with quaedam = αὐτὸ μὲν as at 1.124 = Π, 105, 23, although both variants are hard if not impossible to construe.

With etiam in the δε clause (alia etiam apparently for αὐτὸ), cf. adhuc (in sed adhuc apparently for τοιαδήποτε) at 2.9.1 below and note ad loc.

Propter quod Here, in view of the following of de qua re, and notwithstanding etiam, the natural way to take propter quod is as a coordinating (rather than subordinating) conjunction, ‘for this reason’. (For propter quod = propere a quod, cf. Hofmann and Szantyr, 246 (citing Chiron, Avell., Cassiod., Greg. M., Oribas.); Mørland, Oribasius, 180 (citing both the older and the younger translation of Oribasius) and Svennung, Palladius, 396–7.) Alternatively propter quod is resumed by de qua re.

Accedere The variant attendere in Ox and φ must be a correction of accedere (in D). M’s occurrere could reflect either an early gloss or the careless substitution of a synonym.

Ueritatem Both varietas and uritas occur only once each in Books 1 and 2 (in ms. A), urietas at 2.235 propter varietatem = Π, 501, 9 δίᾳ τὸ ποικίλον, uritas at 2.68 agnita urerita diaeta ad unamquamque distemperantiam est ordinanda, which corresponds rather roughly to Π, 399, 4–5 καὶ ταύτην ἀκριβῶς διεγκακότα οὕτω ποιεῖσθαι τὴν διάτατην πρὸς τὴν ὑπαγορευμένην ὑπὸ τῆς διαγνώσεως διαθέσιν. I favour ureritatem both because of its distribution (γ η B) and because of the collocation with cognoscere/agnoscere here and at 2.68. The variant ureretatem was probably prompted by uraria (immediately above), and must have been introduced more than once independently in the tradition.

Manifestum est quia Morland, Oribasius, 180 mentions manifestum est quia as a ‘feste Verbindung’ in the Latin Oribasius. In Book 1 of the Latin Alexander I have counted five examples of manifestum est quia (1.36, 45, 110, 125, 131), five of manifestum est quod (1.35, 109 twice, 114, 145), and five of manifestum est with accusative + infinitive (1.93, 126, 128, 139, 140) (plus one possible example of manifestum est ut at 1.131), which suggests a greater variety of construction than Morland reports for Oribasius.
2.2.1 Quod si de calida distemperantia pura uel simplici\textsuperscript{36} generata fuerit tussis, sentiunt\textsuperscript{37} enim merito\textsuperscript{38} calorem, quasi\textsuperscript{39} per aliquas qualitates taliter tussientes, et respirantes desiderium habent frigidī aerīs.\textsuperscript{40}

2.2.2 Etiam iuuantur magis si aeris ad se trahant frigidōm\textsuperscript{42} plus quam\textsuperscript{43} si aquam +← frigidam → bibant. Et uultus eorum rubrīs\textsuperscript{44} apparat, et caput +← similiter +→.

\textit{tit. om. MaL2} | De - cognitione | om. P1 | De tussi (tusse B) | OxP3B | Si tussis fiat D | quae - generatur om. | O | quaer | Que in initio capituli P1 que fit Ge si B | Quemque et in initio capituli M | om. D | de | ex | DP2 | om. Mu | P3\textit{'} | add. m2 | [generatur] | generata tussis sit M est G1 fiat B | om. P1 | DGe

Quod si - distemperantia om. P1 | Quod si | Quod etsi ed. | Quod C | distemperantia pura | p. d. | Mu | pura | sola Ox φ | pura sine humore D | uel | ns P1 | simplici | -e P1 P3 | generata fuerit tussis | f. g. t. A B g. t. f. M | sentiunt (-iant P1) | enim merito (-eto P1) | γ | η | sentiunt et merito P2L2B | et merito sentiunt φ | merito sentiunt et Ge | merito sentiunt G1P3Ma | et in | \textit{inicio} | sentiunt [obesse D' | calorem merito D | calorem] | -e P1O | colorem C ante merito habet D | quasi per | quas per | M quem super | P1 | quia | per G1P3Ma | quia expang. | P3 m2] | [aliquas qualitates (-is P1)] | qualitates aliquas Ox | φ | qualitates P3Ma | [taliter] | et aliter C aliter P1 | tales P3Ma | φ | [tussientes] | -is P1 | et | sed et | Ox | [respirantes] | -is P1 | habent | om. | P1M | frigidī | frigida M | aerīs | acres M | frigidī aeris habent P3MaD | φ

Etiam P1M AO P2L2B | et | cett. om. D | [iuuantur (iubantur M)] | iuuantur quia D | si | sibi M om. | P1 | aeris (-es M)] | uberis (ub - an ali -?) | P1 | frigidī aeris C | ad se | om. | P3Ge | [ad se] | trahant | trahant ad | se Ox | as | se | aeris | attrahit G1 | [trahant] | trahunt Mu G2L1 | attrahit (atr - Ge) G1Ge | trahit P1M | thraent D | frigorem | frigorem ed. | frigores O | per | frigores M | qualitatem C | plus quam | quam M | G1P3MaDGe | φ | | aquam frigidam | aqua frigida P1O | [rubrus (-um M) | apparat (-i P1) | P1M | AMu -ri -ent O | G1CPL2B2Ge | rubei D | rubeus | P3MaOx | φ | | post | similitud | 

\textsuperscript{36} pura uel simplici For this translation of \textit{ψυλός}, see 2.1.2 above and note ad loc.

\textsuperscript{37} sentiunt ... calorem, quasi ... tussientes I take \textit{tussientes} as dependent on \textit{quasi} rather than directly on \textit{sentiunt}. In the Latin Alexander \textit{seniendo} is common with accusative + infinitive (cf. 1.35: ‘Si ergo grauitatem sentiat sibi in capite fieri’; 1.62, 1.69, 1.117, 1.128; 2.3.2: ‘habere se sentiunt’; 2.7.4, 2.8.2, 2.10.1, 2.192, 2.204, 2.247), but I find no instance of \textit{sentio} + nominative participle. This Greek construction can be paralleled in Late Latin prose, especially from Tertullian on (Hofmann and Szantyr, 364), but is regarded as highly literary. For \textit{quasi} + participle, cf. 1.29: ‘et quasi imbecillior effectus humor’ (I, 477, 21 \χαι \ολο\ ν ὡσθενηστῶ\ ρα γενομένη), 2.152: ‘quasi ... commotus’ (II, 441, 3), 2.219: ‘quasi eum clisterians’ (II, 363, 22). There is a question-mark also over the Greek construction, as I cannot parallel \textit{σησθῆναι} + (reflexive) nominative participle in the Greek Alexander (and note in passing the remarkable reflexive construction at II, 417, 24 τὸ ... ἐκτυπὸ ῥομαικτέρων τὸν κομμόντος αἰσθάνεσθαι ‘the feeling of the patient that he is stronger’).

\textsuperscript{38} enim merito In the Latin Alexander, \textit{merito} stands regularly (in ms. A, once in Book 1 and five times in Book 2) for Greek \textit{eἰκότος} (which here would be an improvement on \textit{τός} in the Greek text!): cf. 1.136 = II, 125, 15; 2.49 = II, 311, 15; 2.194 = II, 489, 24; 2.204 = II, 335, 7; 2.214 = II, 359, 3; 2.257 = II, 535, 17 (at II, 321, 4 and II, 441, 20 \textit{eἰκότος} is not translated in the Latin).

\textsuperscript{39} As \textit{enim} is in both γ and η, it must have been in the archetype. Tentatively, I take it as standing for Greek μέν. At this point I can compare only 2.204 ‘Merito enim\textsuperscript{40} enim accident dolores nimii ... Difficultis autem est ad cognoscendum’ II, 335, 6–10 καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐπιθερίεν τὰς ὀξὺς σφοδρὲς εἰκότος τὸ κόλα ἐπηρέαζε ... τὸ δὲ δυσσάλονστηνον ...; and Dioscorides 1.9, p. 9, 10 M. ‘sed ut scias utroque discernere, \textit{eיניm} fragilior est ... , \textit{oxinimini} uero durior ... est’ (quoted by Svenneng, \textit{Palladius}, 482 n. 2 without comment, and referred to by Hofmann and Szantyr, 509 d rather oddly as ‘\textit{enim} im Nachsatz’).

\textsuperscript{40} For this translation of \textit{έμεν}, see 2.1.2 above and note ad loc.
2.2.1. Concerning the recognition of a cough which arises from a hot imbalance

But if coughing arises from a hot imbalance pure and simple, they naturally feel heat, as if they are coughing in a way determined by particular qualities, and as they breathe they have a desire for cold air.

They are also helped more if they draw in cold air than if they drink cold water. And their face appears red, and the head likewise.

II, 147, 14–19 Puschmann

Diaýgnosis tis diá thermiý diáskrasiai bíchós
Psiálhís tôn on vàjís tis thermiý diáskrasiai aiðhánontai mév íswos diá tinoi polúttitou toisástis, óion diáskrasiai thermiý, bíssontes,41 kai ánropéneí ép%m%wmuúsi ψυχρόν ἁέρα. (2.2.2). kai ωφελούνται μάλλον υπό τής εἰσπνοις ἥπερ ὑπό τῆς τού ὀδός τόσος, καί τά περί τὸ πρόσωπον ἑρυθρά + μάλλον → ὀράται καί τήν κεφαλήν.

---

39 quasi Presumably quasi is for Greek οἶνον, as at I.29 (quoted in the note on sentiunt). Here, however, οἶνον + noun appears to have its usual meaning ‘such as’ (introducing an example of a type), while quasi + participle (if this construal is correct) must mean ‘as if’ (or conceivably ‘because’; Hoffmann and Szantyr, 675 δ).

40 desiderium habent frigidi aeris I cannot parallel desiderium habeo + genitive in the Latin Alexander. Compare the translation of the very similar Greek phrase at 2.7.3 ‘ut frigidum desiderent aerem intrinsecus ad se trahere’.

41 δία . . . βήσοντες Note the reading of Greek ms. L reported by Puschmann: διά την ποιότητα τοιαύτην διάσκρασιν βήσοντες.

42 si . . . frigoreum Considerably more elaborate than υπό τής εἰσπνοις. At 2.29 Ιστος ταύταιν ἱνεργιάτιον frigida aspiratio’ (= II, 263, 12–13 ή μέν γὰρ διὰ πνεύματα δήποτε οὗ τῶν ψυχρῶν ὠφελεῖται, όσον υπό τῆς τοῦ περιχώρων εἰσπνοις), there are serious discrepancies between Latin and Greek versions, but εἰσπνοις is evidently rendered with aspiratio.

ad se trahant For ad se trahere ‘inhale’, cf. only 1.42 ‘et iube ut ad se trahat spiritum’ (quoted above in note 40) = II, 151, 7–8 διότι ψυχρόν ἐπιθύμειν ἁέρα ἀναισθεῖν.

aeris . . . frigoreum Literally ‘coldness of air’ for ‘cold air’. For genitive + de-adjectival abstract in place of noun + adjective, cf. 1.111.1. ex frigoris causa = II, 77, 8 διά ψυχράν αἰτίαν.

43 plus quam The manuscripts which omit plus all derive directly or indirectly from Μ except Μ, and, if the change is not polygenetic, could all reflect a common ancestor of Μ and γ. The collocation plus quam is common, especially in Book 2, and its separation from magis here renders it only mildly pleonastic. I have found only one example of plus magis juxtaposed, regarded by Mørland, Oribasius, 175 as characteristic of both older and younger Oribasius translations: 2.15 ‘et appetunt cibum et potum plus magis quam competit’ (apparently mistranslating II, 245, 17–18 καὶ ὁρεῖνται μᾶλλον στίσον ἢ ποτάν).

44 uultus . . . rubrus Here Greek μάλλον is apparently not translated.

Perhaps surprisingly (cf. André, Anatomie, 36), uultus (seven times in Books 1 and 2: 1.26, 1.76, 1.121, 1.143, 2.2, 2.3, 2.70) is almost as frequent as facies (eight times: 1.7, 1.26, 1.69, 1.86, 1.133 twice, 2.72, 2.117). In A uultus is always singular. If the substitution of the plural here occurred only once in the tradition, then it was in ε. O finding it in Θ. The manuscripts frequently vary between rubras and rubreus. γ and η tend to have the former, which I incline to prefer also because it is the well-attested later Latin form of ruber, while rubreus is a different, and much rarer word. Ms. A has the classical form ruber only at 2.121 fn. twice (perhaps significantly in a chapter not from Alexander). Cf. the comparative rubrior at 1.128 (II, 119, 26 ἐρυθρότερον).

Note the Greek phrase τά περί τὸ πρόσωπον (in contrast with simple τήν κεφαλήν): is the Latin translator right to render simply ‘face’, or is there more to it? (Cf. 2.3.1 below.)
Quod si haec fuerint passi et sola distemperantia fuerit, nihil spuunt manifestum quod uideatur.

Si autem et quod expuerint, salsa in eis apparat qualitas, aut fumoso colore aut subcolericum est, et hoc ualde modicum et tenue apparat.

haec haec P1 | fuerit passi AMuP2 | fuerit passus P1M O passio cett. | et P1M AOP2 | et ex Mu ex cett. | spuent P1M AOMu P2D | ex(sp- cett. expuerint C | uideatur | -etur P3f (corr. m2) φ


---

45 Quod si . . . distemperantia fuerit The Latin suggests that there is material missing from the Greek, and that the translator had in front of him something like ei mē oūn oūtōs eit <κείτ> μήν χιλ. <είτ> ποίνης. Alternatively, the Latin is overtranslating and haec fuerint passi is simply rendering Greek οὐτος (an idea I owe to Michael Reeve).

46 fuerint passi Presumably, passio is a correction based on passi on the assumption that the first fuerit(n) is otiosoe. It may also reflect a formulaic phrase, for the sequence xen fuerit passio (with hyperbaton) is strikingly common in ms. A, which here has fuerint passi: cf. e.g. 1.57 ‘Quando autem arguta (augmentata ed.; οὐχιδειί) fuerit passio’ (I, 517, 12); 1.70 ‘Si autem diuturna fuerit passio’ (I, 553, 21–2); 1.77 ‘quibus ex sola plenitudine sanguinis melancholica fuerit’ (I, 517, 12); 1.77 ‘quibus ex sola plenitudine sanguinis melancholica fuerit’ (I, 597, 2–3); 1.91 ‘Quod si diuturna facta fuerit passio’ (not in Greek II, 29, 2–3); 2.80 ‘Quod si iam diuturna fuerit passo facta’ (not from Alexander); 2.81 ‘si malitiosa fuerit passio’ (not from Alexander); 2.116 ‘si iam timpanitis facta fuerit passio’ (not from Alexander). The frequency of this pattern could explain the substitution of passio for the participle (as parallels for the latter I have found only 1.68 ‘Quod si stomachus fuerit passus’ (I, 549, 22); 1.77 ‘cum unum membrum fuerit passum’ (not in Greek)). Since in spuunt a few words later the tradition unanimously has the plural, I am not tempted by fuerit passus (in γ and O) as a singular form, but I wonder whether the ending might not reflect a late nominative plural form in l-o-i.s.

47 distemperantia As if δύσπροοτα alone stood in the translator’s Greek text.

48 uideatur Note the subjunctive in γ.

49 quod Late Latin quod for indefinite pronoun quid.

50 expuerint The alternation at so short an interval between 2.2.3 spuunt and 2.2.4 expuerint, both for Greek αντίπαξ, is on the face of it striking. In fact, at this date, the two forms represent mere phonetic variants, with and without prothetic vowel, of a single stem (e)spu- or (i)spu-). It would be interesting to see whether the selected form correlates with the sound at the end of the preceding word (here: no prothesis after a resonant [nihil spiu-] vs prothesis after a stop [quod expu-]; but contrast 2.5.1 quod spuirta).

51 in eis Presumably, αύτοις alone stood in the translator’s Greek text. The unambiguous reference of in eis to the spittle prompted the relatively early change (in θ') of eis to eo; conversely, D corrected the antecedent quod to plural que.
2.2.3 But if they have this condition and there is only an imbalance, they bring up nothing that can be seen.

2.2.4 But if they really do bring something up, its quality seems salty, it is either smoky in colour or slightly bilious, and it appears very little in quantity and thin.

II, 147, 19–22 Puschmann

ei μὲν οὖν οὕτως εἶ ἡ μόνη υπὸ λόγου ή οὔδ’ ὀλός. (2.2.4). εἴ δὲ καὶ ἀναστύουσιν, ἀλμυράν αὐτοῖς ἔχον ποιότητα τὸ πνεῦμονον φαίνεται ἣ καπνώδες τῇ χροϊᾷ ἢ υπόχολον καὶ τοῦτο σφόδρα ὀλίγον καὶ λεπτὸν·

52 subcolericum For subcolericus of a colour, cf. 1.19 -ο colore. Greek χωλετικός seems not to be used as a colour-term, the Greek for ‘yellowish’ being the (originally possessive) compound υπόχολος, so that subcolericus is an essentially Latin formation, one which shows that Latin adjectives in sub- ‘slightly, somewhat’ are not mere calques on Greek forms in ὑπο-. The greater productivity of the Latin type is seen in Alexander also in stipticus: substipticus (2.103, 164) = Greek στυπτικός: υποστύφον. Other sub- formations in the Latin Alexander include 1.17 subalbidus, subrubrus, 1.26 subtumidus, 1.72 subnubilis, 1.95 subflauus, 2.70 subsimilis. On the formation, see Svennung, Wortstudien, 125f., Langslow, Medical Latin, 336–8, with further references.

53 ualde Apart from ualde (in A, ten times in Book 1, seventeen times in Book 2), the Latin Alexander employs a range of intensifiers, notably nimis (in A, twenty-seven times in Book 1, forty times in Book 2; see Mørland, Oribasius, 162; Hofmann and Szantyr, 163), but also satis and adverbial multum and nimium. Soundings suggest that our translator was not dependent on a list of fixed translation-equivalents, but used each intensifier freely and variably for a range of Greek forms: for instance, ualde translates πάντα (e.g. 1.57 = I, 515, 19) and λίσσα (e.g. 1.115 = II, 91, 6), as well as σφόδρα (here and e.g. 1.144 = II, 233, 21), while nimis renders πάντα (e.g. 1.23 = I, 469, 3), σφόδρα (e.g. 1.60 = I, 531, 24), and ἄγαν (e.g. 1.23 = I, 469, 10), which in turn may be rendered also by satis (e.g. 1.29 = I, 477, 22).
2.2.5 Sic enim erit cognoscenda calida distemperantia a praedictis signis.

2.2.6 Nihil igitur minus et a praecedenti qualitate calidi aeris, sicut etiam quam plurime, et nimium si sit calidum balneum et diaeta calida, et ex furore magis quam ex sollicitudine praecedente, hoc contingere solet.

enim] om. OxP3B | erit] om. MuC | cognoscenda (-gnusc- P1) | agnoscenda (P3MaD) | cognoscetur | st. s. | antica calida tussis habet A | calida (olerica Mu) distemperantia | -ide -tie A G1P2L2B distemperantia P3'Ma | post dist. add. in marg. calida P3 m2 | a] ex D | praedictis] -dis- Mu'

igitur] enim L2 | ad igitur gloss. habet cognoscenda erit ed. | minus] inuenus P1 | post minus addunt: cognoscenda erit G2L1 contingit tussis P2MaDGe contingit tussis et fit ex B | et | ex DOxGe et ex (ex s. s.) P2 fit ex G1L2 om. OP3'Ma φ quam in marg. P3 m3 | a P1M | praecedenti AMuCP2BD] -nte cett. | super/ad praecedente habent i. si praecedat ψ | qualitate (-tem P1) -dis O | calidi aeris (calidi om. L2)] -o -e O -um -em P1M calida ex his C | sic | sic P3 fit sic Ox | quam plurime | quam plurimum add. in marg. P3 m2 | et (add. in marg. P3 m3)] continget et D | si sit sic P1 | calidum balneum | calidus balneus (ual- M) P1M balneum calidum ψ | diaeta (diae- P1)] die P3'/ (corr. m3)] et | ex | etiam ex C | quam ex sollicitudine praecedente | p. q. ex s. Mu | sollicitudine soli- P1 | praecedente (-em P1)] -ium | φ | hoc P1M Mu] hec cett. | solet M Mu P3] -ent cett. et P3'

54 enim With praedictis signis, this is in a sense a conclusion, and it is hard to see any regular force of enim here. I incline, however, to regard it as a slavish translation of τάπ rather than as an instance of 'end-of-recipe' enim (cf. Langslow, 'Particles'), although the latter use of enim is well attested in the Latin Alexander.

55 distemperantia Note the absence of the cough (βήγα) from the Latin. The fact that Α inserts qualitas and θ changes cognoscenda to cognoscencia could be taken to imply that δ had the genitive calide distemperantiae, and it is tempting to supply <tussis>

56 praedictis Latin praedicta vs Greek παρόντα! Adjectival and substantival use of praedictus is common enough in the Latin Alexander, but I cannot parallel its use with signa (cf. supraddicta signa at 2.58, 2.133, 2.142). It bears noting that if the Latin had praesentibus signis, the enim introducing this sentence would be more natural, not to mention the logic of the passage and the connection with 2.2.6. The one comparable use of praesens in the Latin Alexander (and incidentally the one parallel for the use of Greek Παρόντα in the present passage) is in a quotation from Hippocrates: 2.158 ‘Oportet ergo peruidere ut dixit Hippocrates et praesentia et futura et praeterita’ (cf. II, 461, 4–5).

57 igitur Greek ζε here is clearly adversative, given the contrast between παρόντα and προηγησαμένοι. In Imperial and Late Latin igitur frequently renders ζε in both its adversative and its weaker connective functions (see Mørland, Oríbasius, 158–9; Hofmann and Szantyr, 513). The usage of our translator(s) remains to be established, but cf. 2.4.2 below.
2.2.5 Thus will a hot imbalance have to be recognized from the aforementioned signs.

2.2.6 Furthermore, this regularly occurs also from a preceding quality of hot air, as is very often the case, and from too hot a bath and a hot diet, and from a preceding state of high emotion (furore) more than from anxiety (sollicitudine).

II, 147, 22–6 Puschmann

οὕτω γὰρ ἐστὶ τὴν διὰ θερμῆν δυσκρασίαν βήχα ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων σημείων διαγινώσκειν. (2.2.6). οὐδὲν δὲ ἦτον καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προηγησαμένων ἐξ ἐγκαύσεως, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, καὶ θερμῶν βαλανείων καὶ διαίτης θερμῆς καὶ ἐπιθυμίῶν μᾶλλον ἢ φροντίδος τούτο συνέβη γενέσθαι.

praecedenti The epithet praecedens is idiomatic of antecedent causes in late medical Latin, (as is προηγησαμένος in Greek: see LSI, s.v. προηγήσαμαι, 4.f., and cf. Alex. Trall. I, 463, 13; I, 489, 7; II, 191, 2 and often); note already Cels. pr. 70 ‘causa quae ante praecesserat’, compare Oribas., Syn. 9.12.1 Aa p. 296 ‘sine aliqua praecedente causa’ (ἀνευ τοῦ προηγησασθαι), and see ThLL, s.v. ‘praeceido’, 401, 37ff. Of many similar instances in the Latin Alexander, cf. e.g. 1.40 ‘ex praecedentibus causis’, 1.83 ‘ex tristitia et sollicitudine praecedente’ (= I, 605, 23), 1.111 ‘praecedente frigido uento’ (= II, 77, 9), Cf. antecedens in Cass. Fel. and Cael. Aur.

Note the (chiastic) repetition of praecedens after sollicitudine, at the end of the list of possible causes, and compare the (similarly chiastic) repetition of apparet in 2.2.4: neither προηγησαμένος nor διαίτης is repeated in the Greek. Are the repetitions in the Latin accidental, or are they a deliberate point of style? Fraisse, Lxvii, observes a similar feature in the prose of the fifth-century African medical writer Cassius Felix, and the phenomenon promises to repay further attention.

etiam Does etiam reflect ἐτι in the translator’s Greek text (for ἐτι in Puschmann’s)?
2.3.t. De tusse quae, ex frigida distemperantia fit

2.3.1 Tuissiunt etiam plurimi ex frigida distemperantia existente in thorace pura uel simplici qualitate. Hi ergo magis pallidi sunt in uultu et in capitae, et neque sitim habent neque salsum expuunt.

2.3.2 Et laeduntur ex frigidis et iuuantur ex calefactionibus, et acidonicum magis quam amaritudinem +— habere se sentiunt.


ex] et M [et iuuantur - et] et calefactionibus iuuantur et Ox [calefactionibus (calf- M calefat- A)] calefacientibus (-fat- DC) DC ed. et acitionum magis quia magis citionum Mu [acidonicum (acit- A acet- OP2BCG1L2D aced- Ge cit- Mu)] acidinoso P1 acetosum (-am Ma) P3MaOx φ acidum M; s. s. habent: acetosum B .i. acetosum saporem D .i. saporem acetosum MaGe uel aedonicum Ox [magis quam] tam quam P1 quam OP34 ante acetosum add. magis P3 m3 magis citionum quam Mu quidem et M [habere se sentiunt] habere (abere P1) sentiunt P1M Mu se sentiunt habere P3MaOxG2 sentiunt habere L1 sentiunt ed.

60 quae The headings of 2.4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are with si- rather than relative clauses. B and φ seem to anticipate the shift by having si here.

61 Tuissiunt The readings of γ and Ω, and the correction by θ9 (why change Tuissiunt?) suggest the existence of an old variant with a stem tusse-: a form of the noun? or was ὑπησσας taken as a future (tussient)?

62 plurimi It is unlikely that plurimi is meant to be for Greek ὑπος. This clause-opening is common in Greek medical prose from the Hippocratic corpus on, recurs several times in the Greek Alexander, and is otherwise always correctly translated with a form of Quiccumque + autem (so e.g. I. 525, 21 = 1.58 Quia autem, II. 101, 6 = 1.123 Quibuscumque autem, II. 553, 16 ὅτι ὑπον = 2.26 Quibus autem). An alternative — if on the face of it rather far-fetched — account would be to see plurimi (for quarn plurime?) as misplaced from 2.3.2 for ὧς ἀρχι τὸ πολὺ, which is not there translated (and cf. 2.2.6 quarn plurume).

63 existente existens serves as the present participle of the verb to be in the Latin Alexander (cf. note 186 below); on existo = sum, cf. Hofmann and Szantyr, 395, and the ThLL, s.v., 1873, 318L. (on the use of the participle in particular, 1875, 33ff. Usually, but to judge at least from Puschmann’s text by no means invariably, it stands opposite a form of Greek ὑπον: so e.g. at 1.72 ‘in uescia ouis aut caprae urina adhuc plena existente’ (I. 563, 22–3); 1.57 ‘caput ipsum calidum existens’ (I. 517, 10 τῆς κυδαλῆς, . . . θεμητή σκέφής; 1.76 ‘Horum enim existente plenitude’ (I. 593, 12 σκέφης). 1.113 ‘humor enim . . . frigidior simul et spissior existens’ (II. 79, 15 σκέφης); 1.114 ‘Mediocribus autem flegmonebus existentibus’ (II. 81, 18); 1.114 twice (II. 239, 27, 28). At 1.108 ‘ex flegmone intrinsecus et extrinsecus existente in meatu’ it translates II. 71, 5 συντόπης; cf. 2.1.2 existit = συντόπης (above).

64 Here there is no participle in the Greek, although the Greek arguably needs it more than the Latin. Other instances where there is no corresponding word in Puschmann’s text include 1.57 ‘Ego uero sic sanau aliqum ualde freneticum existentem’ (I. 515, 19–20); 1.83 ‘Fit enim haec passio ex tristitia et sollicitudine praeceedente aut anima alia aliqua passione existente’ (I. 605, 24); 1.114 ‘iuuenibus et calida temperantia existentibus’ (II. 83, 18); 1.125 ‘In profundo autem existentibus (sc. parotidibus)’ (II. 109, 14–15); 1.146 ‘igneo satis iam non existente flegmone’ (II. 241, 3–4 ξεος τῆς πάνω ἐκ τῆς φλεμονῆς). The last example shows particularly well the use of existens as a Latin form independent of the Greek.
2.3.2 AN EDITION OF THE LATIN ALEXANDER ON COUGHING

2.3.1 Concerning coughing which occurs as a result of a cold imbalance

2.3.1 Again, very many people cough as a result of a cold imbalance located in the chest and of a pure and simple quality. These then are more pallid in the face and head, and neither are they thirsty nor do they bring up salty matter.

2.3.2 And they are harmed by cold substances and benefited by warming applications, and they feel that they have a sharp taste rather than bitterness.

II, 149, 1–6 Puschmann
Περὶ βηχῶς διὰ ψυχρὰν δυσκρασίαν γινομένης
Ὅσοι δὲ βήσοντι σιλας τῷ ψυχράν δυσκρασίαν ἔν τῷ θώρακι διὰ (κατὰ τὴν Λ.) ψυχρὰν ποιότητα, μάλλον ὀχρότεροι εἰσίν ὦτοι τὰ περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. καὶ οὕτω διηνάδεις εἰσίν οὕτε ἄλμυρὸν ἀναπτύουσι. (2.3.2).

καὶ βλάπτονται μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν, οὖνανοίνει δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν θερμανόντων, καὶ οξίδος μάλλον ἡ πίρκιας. + ὡς ἑπὶ τὸ πόλι, + αἰσθάνονται.

64 pura uel simplici The repetition of διὰ ψυχρὰν in the Greek is much less satisfactory than the Latin epithet. Might the second ψυχρὰν be for φιλῆν?
65 in aultu et in capite For aultu = τὰ περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, cf. 2.2.2 above.
66 necque . . . neque I have yet to investigate the usage of our translator(s) with regard to nequel nec, siuelsau (cf. e.g. 2.5.2 below), atqueal. Here manuscript support for the longer forms is obviously overwhelming. Even in sub-literary texts neque survives especially in responsion, as here (see Hofmann and Szantyr, 451–2).
67 salsum Were it not for the simple Greek form ἄλμυρον, one would incline to prefer the reading of P1 salsidinem as the lectio difficilior, which cannot possibly be the invention of the maker of P1! Even with the Greek, however, salsido deserves further consideration because it illustrates the fairly common substitution of abstract noun for adjective (type frigido for frigidum). With the reading of P1 here compare ms. A at 2.174 ‘saldidinem uel acredinem’, where Puschmann’s text has simply II, 207, 26 ἄλμυρον!
68 calefactionibus An example of concretum pro abstracto with an ‘instrumental’ case-relation between concrete and abstract senses, i.e. ‘things by means of which heating occurs’ (Langslow, Medical Latin, 171–2). Good medical Latin (cf. collutio, purgatio), even if less true to the Greek than calefactionibus, and paralleled at 2.208 calefactiones = II, 345, 1 θερµατιβας; for this concrete sense, cf. Theod. Prisc. 2.29, 94 p. 194, 4, and the ThLL, s.v., citing only veterinary and medical authors, from Chiron to Oribasius (but omitting Alexander), apart from four examples from jurists and two from Christian ecclesiastical writers. The substantival participle appears to be used at 2.238 = II, 503, 28, but otherwise calefaciens is always adjectival (with res, adiutorium, medicamen, etc.).
69 acidonicum Note the very similar contrast at 2.70 (= II, 399, 26) ‘neque amaritudinem in ore sentiunt sed magis acidonicum sentiunt’, where ms. A attests the form I adopt here. The word is found in other late medical texts, including Rufus and Oribasius (see Mørland. Oribiasius, 130, who derives it from acidus). I hesitate to segment this word: *acido, -onis would fit nicely into a derivational type which seems to recur in late Latin medical texts, and which is clearly important in Proto-Romance — namely, the formation of new n-stems in -o, -onis. The Latin Alexander appears to attest fleghmo ‘an inflamed tumour, boil’ (2.7; cf. Greek φλάχμον) and possibly fymo ‘a growth’ (2.9.1 and note ad loc.; cf. Greek φυμα, -ατοι), Pelagonius and Oribasius, acro, plural acrones ‘the extremities’ (cf. Greek ἄκρον, ἀκρον) and Oribasius also testo ‘testicle’ (of animals; cf. André, Anatomie, 178) and Adams, Sexual Vocabulary, 67, who mentions also coelo = coelos ‘testicle’ and posterio = posteriosa. Then there are two derivatives common to Alex. Trall. and Oribasius and certainly built on new n-stem nouns: sablon-oaus ‘sandy’ (sabl(u)lo ‘sand’), sapon-rients ‘soap-seller’ (sapos ‘soap’, a Germanic loanword). Svennung, Wortstudien, 97 n. 1 takes acidonicus from acidus, by colloquial lengthening of the suffix (-icus → -onicus?). (At II, 309, 23 Greek ἄξις is rendered by acida ructatio (2.48.).
70 habere se sentiunt One of the very few places where the descendants of φ disagree. I take it that L1 omits se before sentiunt by mistake; ed.’s omission of φ’s se . . . habere on the other hand could be deliberate.
Et praecessit magis frigdor quam calor, et balneo non in tempore competenti et potionibus et cibis usi sunt frigidis.

Sic enim ex frigida distemperantia generata cognoscitur tussis.

praecessit] precedit (add. i. precessit) ed. precedet M | frigdor] frigor ed. | balneo] balneum OP3 (al. ‘balneo’ P3 m2 in marg.) ulaneum M balneis Ma balneorum (fortasse pro balneo non) Mu | non om. Mu | tempore competenti c. t. MaOx φ | competenti usu (usu add. m2) tempore (expunct. m3) P3 | potionibus] -em M putionis P1 | et2] aut P1 | cibis ... frigidis] -us ... -idus P1 -is ... -idos M -o ... -ido D | usi sunt] usis P1 ut sunt M

ex | om. P3’ add. m2 | frigida distemperantia] -is -iis Ox | generata cognoscitur tussis A] c. g. t. plerique c. t. g. Ma t. g. c. OxGe t. esse g. c. φ

praecessit The unusual use of the perfect here seems to be confirmed by usi sunt at the end of the sentence. There is a possible parallel for praecessit at 1.90 ‘Praecesserunt etiam et acres cibi’ = II, 25, 18 (προηγούνται), where the perfect may be triggered by the immediately preceding relative clause ex his quae praecesserint translating the Greek aorist participle.

Alternatively, given that for Greek γράπτεται we expect the noun usus (as at 1.79 = I, 597, 24–5, 1.81 = I, 603, 5, 1.91 twice = II, 25, 26 (with a past participle!)) and 29, 2, 1.97 = II, 41, 14, al.), we might suppose that the corruption of usus to usi sunt prompted the correction of an original precedent (cf. precedent M) to precessit; ed.’s reading precedent probably has nothing to do with M’s reading but is rather a ‘correction’ of the precessit in his exemplar (hence the note i. precessit, which most unusually is not shared with G2 and L1).

eos The pronoun evidently refers to the patients in the Latin, but in the Greek τοῦτος can only refer to the morbid conditions. This is not an important discrepancy, as alternation, even confusion, between patient and disease is frequent in ancient medical texts. Cf. 2.2.4 eis and note.

frigida The Greek (with Ἱθόρρην) is summing up 2.2 and 2.3 together, and contrasting (with μέτα ... δέ) cold/hot with (2.4) dry/wet. The Latin, as it stands, concludes 2.3 only, and we may have lost aut calida.

generata cognoscitur tussis I follow A’s word-order, although most of the manuscripts have cognoscitur generata tussis, partly in order to keep the participle with its prepositional phrase, but mainly because hyperbaton is so much a feature of the style of the Latin Alexander. The Greek appears to lack γινώμεναι corresponding to Latin generata.
2.3.3 And they have experienced in advance cold rather than heat, and they have taken a bath at an unsuitable time and cold drinks and foods.

2.3.4 In this way a cough arising from a cold imbalance is recognized.
2.4.t. De tusse si ex sicca aut\textsuperscript{75} humida distemperantia fuerit facta

2.4.1 Si autem ex siccitate aut humectatione\textsuperscript{76} distemperantia\textsuperscript{77} fuerit generata, operatiuis\textsuperscript{78} similiter cognoscitur qualitatisbus.

2.4.2 Differunt\textsuperscript{79} igitor\textsuperscript{80} quod magis operatiuæ\textsuperscript{81} habit manifestas significationes,\textsuperscript{82} materiales\textsuperscript{83} autem [si accesserit tussis]\textsuperscript{84} amitrota\textsuperscript{85} est et non oportet <t>alia\textsuperscript{86} iterum dicere.


siccitate] -em P1 [aut] et P1 humectatione ( -em P1] humec[tionib?] us O humiditate G1Ox \phi humectatione cognoscitur Mu\textsuperscript{t} et distemperantia fuerit generata (f. g. om. M) g. f. d. Ox f. g. tussis D d. g. f. \phi operatiuis] -as M operatiuis .i. actius \phi ad similiter habent in marg. .i. similiter cognoscitur (cognoscitur tussis G2L1) ex passu quantitatis sicut ex actuis \phi [cognoscitur] -gnusc-P1 [qualitatis] et qualitatisbus M

Differunt (Different P1) Disturrit A\textsuperscript{t} [igitur] autem in eo C [quod] quia \phi qui O [magis operatiuæ] operatiue magis \phi super magis habet uerba quam humiditas et siccitae P3 m4 [operatiue ( -e Ox(?)) B(?)] \phi -am M -i P1 -as ett. [habent manifestas] manifestas (magini- L) habent C \phi habent abit P1 [manifestas] -a P1 -am M cal. et frig. s. s. P3 m4 [significationes] -is P1 -em M cognitiones C P2 -es uel cognitiones B uel cognitiones s. s. Ma [ante materiales trad. 2. 5. f. 1. materiales scrisipsum] -is ett. -iter Ox [si] sic Mu\textsuperscript{t} [amitrota scrisipsum (fort. cf. a materia est M)] -a plerique (amet-P1 anyt-P2 amicr- G2L1) amitro terea O amicio tera ed. amitrota Ge a materia M om. Mu (post a. habent est MD P3 add. m3) P2 et om. OMU [oporet]-it P1 <t>alia iterum (<t>alia Fischer) alia iterum PIMA O(': alia illeg.;) iterum alia MuCP2L2B0XGe P3 (iterum m2 add. in marg.) iterum taliter \phi iterum G1 aliter Ma [dicere] om. Ge\textsuperscript{t} dici P3Ma \phi (ad dici habent s. signa (signa s. G2) quibus (e quibus L1) cognoscur si materialis est \phi)

\textsuperscript{75} sicca aut humida The agreement of A and M in favour of et rather than aut is outweighed by the overwhelming support for aut in 2.4.1 and by Greek η in both places.

\textsuperscript{76} humectatione A favourite word of the Latin Alexander, selected despite the anisomorphism with siccitate, which perhaps prompted the late correction humiditate in G1 and Ox (and hence \phi). humectatio occurs five times in each of Books 1 (21bis, 42, 63, 69) and 2 (42, 50bis, 152, 200), the underlying verb four times in Book 1 (29, 59, 80, 145) and twenty-four times in Book 2 (25, 29bis, 40bis, 41, 47, 49, al.), including several times in Philogrius but never in Plutusenus; the adjective occurs only at 1.109, 2.72 and 2.82. Both noun and verb are used nearly always of the (Hippocratic) state of the body or the humours, the verb of bringing this state about by means of foods or medicaments. There are parallels for the medical use in Cael. Aur., Chron. 3.2.18 and Theod. Prisc., Log. 27 p. 124, 11 (Theodorus also attributes the adjective); humectatio is a variant for humidatio at Orbsus., Eup. 2.1 Aa p. 485. (Otherwise, for the abstract noun, Georges cites Cassiod., Var. 10.26.2, and Isid., Orig. 4.7.4, and Souter, Iren. 1.30.3 and ‘sec. v. on’). In Classical Latin umectare is attested on the one hand in Lucretius, Vergil (once in the Georgics and twice in the Aeneid), and on the other in the (technical) prose of Columella, the Elder Pliny (of eyes watering at Nat. Hist. 11.145) and Aulus Gellius. The adjective umectus, on the other hand, is found both early (in Cato and Varro) and late (in Apuleius, Gellius, Palladius, and Macrobius).

\textsuperscript{77} distemperantia Again (cf. 2.2.5 and note), the absence of the abscence of a reference to coughing (this time in the Greek), too, an absence which evidently prompted D’s correction of distemperantia to tussis.

\textsuperscript{78} operatiuæ Apart from one example in an excerpt from Augustine (Divers. quaest. 63), operatur is apparently (ThLL, s.v.) found otherwise only in the Latin Oribasius (frequency: see Svennung, Wortstudien, 103; Mørland, Oribasius, 123-4) and the Latin Hippocrates (De aere 24 fin.). The word is used fifteen times in the Latin Alexander.
Concerning coughing if it arises as a result of a dry or a wet imbalance

2.4.1 If, however, it is as a result of dryness or wetness that an imbalance has been caused, it is recognized likewise from its active qualities.

2.4.2 They differ in that the active tend rather to have clear signs, while the material ones have more indistinct signs. And it is not necessary to say this again.

II, 149, 10–14 Puschmann

Περὶ βεηχὸς διὰ ξηρὰν ἢ υγρὰν δυσκρασίαν γινομένης
Αἱ δὲ κατὰ ξηρότητα ἢ υγρότητα δυσκρασίαι ταῖς δραστικαῖς ὁσακτοῖς
dιαγινώσκονται ποιότησι. (2.4.2), διαφέρουσι δὲ τῷ (correxii ex toû) μᾶλλον
tάς δραστικάς ἐχειν ἑναργέστατα σημεία, τάς δὲ υλικάς ἀμιδρότερα, καὶ
οὐ χρή ταυτά πάλιν λέγειν.

79 Differunt Presumably, the unexpressed subject are qualities of distemperantia rather than types of cough?
80 igitur Note igitur again (cf. 2.2.6 above and note) for Greek δὲ, which must be at least weakly contrastive
(ὁσακτοῖς διαγινώσκονται vs διαφέρον). 81 operatiue I have adopted the correction of B, Ox and φ. 82
significationes All the Latin manuscripts which transmit the heading 2.5.t. De tussis si ex humoribus fiat have
it at this point, between significationes and materiales. It must belong at the start of the next sentence.
83 materiales For materiales = υλικός, cf. 2.74 ‘Materiales autem aliae qualitates id est siccae et humidae
distemperantiae’ = II, 409, 12 τὰς ὑλικὰς ποιότητας ὀιον ἑροτήτας καὶ ὑγρότητας. 84
[si accesserit tussis] I take it that this addition, which I have bracketed although it was evidently already in
the archetype, was prompted by the reading of 2.5.t. before materiales.
85 amitroteras There may conceivably be support for the feminine accusative plural in M’s a materia est. More
probably, however, the transmitted forms (nearly all) in -a are in agreement with tussis in the Latin addition si
accesserit tussis (see note 84). ἀμιδρός ‘faint’ is transliterated also at 1.59 ‘Pulsus etiam raros et breues et amidros
habent’ (= I, 529, 11 καὶ τοὺς σφυγμοὺς ἀρατοὺς καὶ μικροὺς καὶ ἀμιδρόφος [σχυσούν]) and 3.41 (I, 345, 25);
cf. 3.45 (I, 347, 21) where ἀμιδρός is confused with ἀμφότερος and translated absque mensura. That the word was
less than familiar is seen clearly at 3.48 ‘pulsus . . . parus autem et amidros in ethica febre’, where the Latin version
adds the note: ‘Amidros autem pulsus dicitur defectus, qui solutam habet iurtutem et percussionem facit
imbecillem’. (The marginal gloss at this point — of Jacques Despars(?) — reads ‘i. imbecillis seu debilis. Gal. in
lib. de differentiis febrīum’.) 86 <taliallia For talis = hic, cf. Hofmann and Szantyr, 205–6, and Svennung, Worstudien, 129–30 (the latter
mainly on hic talis = is in Oribasius, which I have not found in the Latin Alexander).
2.5.t.  [De tusse si ex humoribus fiat]

2.5.1  Supercurrente\textsuperscript{87}igitur materia efficitur tussis, et quod\textsuperscript{88}spuitur plenitudo, certa et manifesta apparat, quia ex reumatismo ex alio in alium transmittitur\textsuperscript{89}locum, et\textsuperscript{90}exinde nascentiam tussis habet.

2.5.2  Vnde et ex quibus transmittitur locis, haec utique omnia\textsuperscript{91}contemplari oportet et attendere seu de capite fluit qui\textsuperscript{92}mouet tussem, siue\textsuperscript{93}ex altero membro, et quals suscipit \textit{locus}.

\textit{De - fiat} transposui ex 2.4.2 om. P1 P3L2Ma Ox [tussu] tussi G1 φ [si] qui M [humoribus] hu. C [tus] sit O


Vnde - locis om. P3Ma Vnde et om. G1L2B D rasura P2 [et] om. Ox et O(?) | ex de M habet litteram i super litteram x Ox [haec utique omnia] om. ODOx [haec (haec P1)] hec enim Ge [utique (utei- P3')] omnia (omnia et Mu) P1P3'AMu utique ante omnia P3 (ante add. m2) omnia utique (itaque L2) M G1CP2L2B Ge φ [contemplari] -are P1 [oportet] -it P1 [attendere] adt- P1M [post attendere habet ex quibus transmutatur locis P3 m2 add. in marg. [fluit P1M D] -et(?) O -at cett. fuerit Ox [qui (que P1)] quod G1CP2L2B MaDOx humor qui P3 (humor add. m2) Ge φ [mouet tussem (umuitussim P1)] t. m. D [siue] seu Ox [ex] de Ox [altero] alio L2 [qualis P1M AMu D] quale P2CL2BMaOxGe φ [post quale add. membrum φ] quals quod O quale quod G1P3' (post quale add. est P3 m2) [suscripit] -cepit P1 Ox -cipiat Ge φ [locus DOx] solum M solus cett.

\textsuperscript{87} Supercurrente  See note on 2.1.2 humores superfluentes.

\textsuperscript{88} quod  (Cf. 2.4.2 quod ‘in that’). My impression is that causul quod is not very common in the Latin Alexander. The tradition has normalized it with, successively, \textit{eo quod} (P2) and \textit{ex eo quod}.

\textsuperscript{89} transmutitur  Presumably, P3 (followed by φ) misread \textit{transmutitur} as ‘\textit{transmutatur} and corrected the latter to \textit{transmutatur}. It is remarkable that none of them corrected \textit{transmutatur} in the light of 2.5.2 \textit{transmutit tur} ten words later.

\textsuperscript{90} et (before exinde)  An easy omission, especially before \textit{ex-}, \textit{et} may have been lacking already in the archetype. Its distribution in the tradition could imply that it is a correction in φ (or even that it had survived in γ').

\textsuperscript{91} haec utique omnia  It is striking that a classical particle such as \textit{utique} should be common in the Latin Alexander and in both older and younger translations of Oribasius (Mørland, \textit{Oribasius}, 161–2). Mørland states that in both Oribasius translations \textit{utique} stands in the majority of cases for Greek όχι. I have tried to show in detail elsewhere (Langslow, ‘\textit{utique}’) that the use of \textit{utique} is more complicated than Mørland implies, that his summary statement applies better to Alexander than to either the older or the younger Oribasius, and that there are differences in its use between the two Oribasius translators and between them and the translator(s) of Alexander. Common to all three texts, however, are the use of \textit{utique si} ‘especially, even if’ for Greek όχι, and, remarkably, the erroneous use of \textit{utique} to render και, the first syllable of όντως, which is what we must have here.

On the assumption that \textit{utique} here stands for Greek όχι (by a false segmentation of όντως), I prefer the word-order of P1 AMu MaP3 (\textit{haec utique omnia}); it is also more likely that \textit{haec} and \textit{omnia} were secondarily brought together than that they were secondarily separated.

\textit{omnia}  Did the translator’s Greek text have \textit{παντα}? Or does \textit{omnia} reflect \textit{παντα-} rather than \textit{και-} (in \textit{καινεωθα})? In the latter case \textit{utique} would be hard to explain.
Concerning coughing if it arises from humours

If, then, there is an overflow of material, coughing is brought about; and, because there is an abundance of spitting, it appears certain and manifest, because (?) as a result of a flux it is transmitted from one place to another, and from there the cough has its origin.

Whence and from which places it is transmitted, all of this in particular it is necessary to consider, and (it is necessary) to observe whether that (humour) which sets the coughing in motion flows from the head or from another body-part, and which part receives it.

II, 149, 14–19 Puschmann

On the strength of the transmitted forms, especially the correction (perhaps by ν, if not polygenetic) of qui to quod, I think we must understand (from 2.5.1?) rather than read humor (added in λ or in P3 and Ge independently).

Here at least the tradition is virtually unanimous on the respective forms (as it happens, seu before consonant, siue before vowel).

For the collocation, cf. 2.39 qui suscipit locus (II, 285, 13). Our translator must have had something like the text of Greek ms. M before him (perhaps without μᾶλλον). I have put locus in italics, because the evidence we have indicates that it must have been corrupted in the archetype; we have no reason to suppose that D and Ox had access to another, superior copy in which they would have found locus: I take it rather that κ conjectured locus on the basis of the context (cf. locis at the start of this sentence).
2.5.3 Etenim\textsuperscript{95} pulmo suscipit primum,\textsuperscript{96} est autem quando\textsuperscript{97} et thorax et latera uel praecordia et alia altera\textsuperscript{98} patiuntur membra.

2.5.4 Et hoc per partes\textsuperscript{99} cognoscendum est, simul autem et curationes uniuscuiusque dicendae sunt, et omnino nihil praetermitti debet de tussu sed magis perquirire,\textsuperscript{100} ut facile curatio urgente caus\textsuperscript{101} adhibeatur.

\textsuperscript{95} Etenim This conjunction is used at least nine times in Book 1 and twenty-three times in Book 2, usually for και γαρ in Puschmann’s text (e.g. 1.55, 57, 63, 74), occasionally apparently for καὶ (e.g. 1.21, 27), almost invariably in clause-initial position, which supports the reconstruction here.

\textsuperscript{96} suscipit primum The translator’s Greek text must have had διεξεταὶ πρῶτος (with or without πολλακις); and see the next note.

\textsuperscript{97} est autem quando Presumably, our translator’s Greek text had ἐστὶν δὲ ὡς, and since this is reported as well by Puschmann for Greek mss. L and M, ἐστὶν εἴτε must be a late innovation, albeit an attractive one (of Zipser’s π;), a simple TLG search finds seventy-three examples of εἴτε in the Greek Alexander, as a rule (as here) clause-initial and without a connecting particle. Ox prepares for est autem quando by beginning the sentence with Et quandoque ‘sometimes (on the one hand)’! On est quando per ἐστὶν ὡς see Hofmann and Szantyr, 520, and now Adams, Bilingualism, 496, on its use by Anthimus.

\textsuperscript{98} alia altera Cf. 1.69 ‘ab alio altero membro’ (I, 551, 15 ἀλλα). The pleonastic alius alter is otherwise attested only in Solinus and both versions of the Latin Oribasius (Merland, Oribasius, 138–9; Hofmann and Szantyr, 208).

\textsuperscript{99} per partes The phrase per partes is well attested in the Latin Alexander as the equivalent of κατὰ μέρος ‘severally, in turn; gradually, bit by bit’. Cf. 2.9.1, 2.11.7 below, and e.g. 1.140 = II, 141, 23 (of blood-letting); 1.148 = II, 243, 14 (of purging); this is further illustrated by the mistranslation at 2.163 ‘si per partes auferatur sanguis’ = II, 191, 5 ἓ ἐστὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀδόξησις, where κατὰ μέρος must be right but has been misread as (or corrupted to) κατὰ μέρος and so translated. In the present passage, partes could be taken to refer to body-parts, but this is an accident of the context and I have not so translated it; at 2.101 (Philumenus) ‘body-part by body-part’ is per partes membrorum, with an additional word for body-part.

\textsuperscript{100} perquirere All the attestations of the active form may have their source in β, partly by way of γ’, so that this is probably a case of a straightforward disagreement between β (perquirere) and δ (perquiri). I provisionally prefer the active as in a sense the lectio difficilior so soon after praetermitti, and for lack of a good parallel for the impersonal passive. For the active form in a similar context, cf. 2.57 ‘iterum contemplari operet et perquirere’; and, with a curious change of construction, 2.39 ‘Contemplandum est ergo omnis corporis habito et alia signa inquirere’. Note that, while debet can on the face of it be taken impersonally with both praetermitti and perquirere, the Latin Alexander seems not to use impersonal debet, so that we must take nihil as subject of debet and reckon with a slight anacolouthon before perquirere.

\textsuperscript{101} urgeat causa For the use of the ablative absolute, cf. 2.1.2 qualitate assumpta and note. For causa ‘disease’, cf. 2.36.1 ‘Cardiaca passio stomachi causa est’ (II, 279, 18 παθός).
2.5.3 For the lung receives it first, but sometimes the chest and the flanks and/or the praecordia and some other parts suffer.

2.5.4 And this must be diagnosed each type in turn, but at the same time, too, the treatments of each single condition must be stated, and absolutely nothing must be omitted on the subject of coughing, but it ought to be looked into all the more closely, so that treatment can easily be applied when the disease is acute.

II, 149, 19–23 Puschmann

καὶ γὰρ ὁ πνεύμων ἀδικεῖται πολλάκης· πρῶτος γὰρ ἔστιν, εἴτε ὁ θώραξ ἢ πλευρὰν ἢ τὸ διάφραγμα ἢ ἄλλο τι μόριον (2.5.4) εἰπωμένον οὖν καὶ τῶν τάς κατὰ μέρος διαγνώσεις, ἁμα δὲ καὶ τὰς θεραπείας, ὡς πανταχόθεν ἀπαράλειπτον εἶναι τὸν περὶ τῆς βηχοῦ λόγον καὶ μᾶλλον εὐφώσκειν ἀπαν εὐχαρίς τὸν εἰς θεραπεῖαν ἐπειγόμενον ἱατρόν.
2.6.t. De tusse si ex capite fluat humor

2.6.1 Si igitur de capite defluat\textsuperscript{102} humor, necesse est ut per uam in\textsuperscript{103} tracheam\textsuperscript{104} arteriam irritationem quandam moueant cum sonitu in faucibus existente.\textsuperscript{105}

2.7.t. Signa si de capite in pulmonem fluat

2.7.1 Quod si\textsuperscript{106} in pulmonem\textsuperscript{107} fluat, difficilatias subsequitur\textsuperscript{108} spirandi, et febris acuta appareat,\textsuperscript{109} interdum autem\textsuperscript{110} et lingua aspera et mela rubra, et grauitas sentitur ← in pectore →.


Quod si\textsuperscript{106} Quod si amplius Ge φ [pulmonem] -e M G1P2L2 P3 pleumone P1 | fluat] -it P1M Mu fluat de capite B fluat hu. O x | subsequitur] sequitur Ox L2 sola sequitur O Ma | spirandi P1 AMuC P2] -i an - o M ] inspirandi cett. respirandi Ox in spirando ed. [febris] -es M | acuta] acuta Ma -e M | apparet] -it P1 -ent M [autom] om. P3Ma [et] om. P3Ma [lingua aspera] -am -am P1 | mela P1A] male Mu mala cett. (punct. sub priore a P2) addunt uerba i. maxilla φ i. maxille sunt Ma maxilla B .i. gena O | rubra P1M AO DOx P3 m2 in marg.] rubre Mu rubea G1CP2L2BG e φ rub (rubea (?)) P3\textsuperscript{110} nigra (s. s. uel rubea) Ma

\textsuperscript{102} defluat Note the discrepancy between ex capite fluat in the heading and de capite defluat in the text. Given fluat in the title, I tentatively regard defluat as the lectio difficilior, the agreement of P2 and γ as decisive in favour of deflu-, and the simplex as a (polygenetic?) correction based on the title.

\textsuperscript{103} in It is tempting to supply <aut> for Greek η, but the Latin version is rather different from the Greek, and makes good medical sense as it stands.

\textsuperscript{104} in tracheam Given that C and O each had an accessory model from which they could have recovered in tracheam (see 4.8.4), intra could have been in η, and need not imply a common ancestor for A and Mu lower than η.

\textsuperscript{105} cum sonitu in faucibus existente The phrase sonitus in faucibus existens must translate γαργαρησιμόν (transmitted by Greek ms. L) or a similar word, and refer to a sound made while breathing; sonitus is used of ringing in the ears at 1.117, 118. I hesitate to give existens more force than ‘being, existing’; on the use of existens, see the note on 2.3.1 existente above.

\textsuperscript{106} Quod si The addition of amplius (in Ge and φ) is typical of a late recension seeking to smooth the argument. The Latin is fuller and smoother than the Greek here. Is this because the Greek tradition has faithfully preserved the notes of a busy doctor (cf. Section 1.3)? Or were words lost in the branch of the tradition used by Puschmann?

\textsuperscript{107} pulmonem I am uncertain whether to prefer accusative or ablative. The form pleumone in P1 resembles Greek πλευμεν ‘lung’, but late borrowing of the Greek word is apparently not otherwise attested (cf. André, Anatomie, 119–20). On the other hand, P1 offers the same form pleumone in the very next sentence for 2.7.2 flegmonem (see note ad loc.), which could not be right here.
2.6.t. Concerning coughing if humour flows from the head

But if humour should flow from the head, it is bound to cause a certain irritation over the uvula into the trachea, with a noise present in the throat.

2.7.t. Signs if it flows from the head into the lung

But if it flows into the lung, there ensues difficulty with breathing and an acute fever appears, and sometimes also the tongue (is) rough and the tonsils red, and a heaviness is felt in the chest.

Π, 149, 24–151, 3 Puschmann

Διάγνωσις, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιρρέει
Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς εἴη τὸ ἐπιρρέον, ἀνάγκη κατὰ (περὶ Μ) τὴν σταφυλὴν ἢ τὴν τραχείαν ἄρτηριαν ἐρεθισμὸν τινα (καὶ γαργαρισμὸν add. L) γίνεσθαι. (2.7.1.). Φλεγμονὴς ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι σημείωσις
∆ύσπνοιαί δὲ καὶ πυρετὸς ἡδύς ἐπιφερόμενος (ἐπιφανενόμενος Μ), ἔσθ’ ὅτε δὲ καὶ γλώττα τραχεία καὶ μῆλα ἐρυθρά καὶ βάρος συναισθήσεις +— —+

108 subsequetur The variant sola sequitur presumably rests on the graphic similarity between ‘b’ and ‘la’, and arose independently in Ma and O (cf. conversely subinfrigdat for solum infrigdat in P1 at 2.236.5). In the Latin Alexander subseguor regularly translates παρακολοοθεῖον (1.33 = 1, 483, 18; 1.57 = 1, 519, 3) or ἐπακολοοθεῖον (1.119 = II, 97, 2; 1.122 = II, 99, 9 (v.l. παρ- in ms. Μ)).

109 appareit Again, our translator’s text must have been closer to Greek ms. M (with ἐπιφανενομενος) than to Puschmann’s.

110 interdum autem ... rubra This looks like a word-for-word translation of the Greek nominal sentence, with interdum for ἔσθ’ ὅτε (cf. 2.1.1 est quando and note ad loc.) and autem for δὲ. The Latin version has three additional finite verbs (subsequitur, appareit and sentetur), but there is no trace of est at this point. autem does not properly introduce the clause with sentetur (and is probably for that reason omitted by Θ’ai).


et post] postea Ox | haec] hoc D | si] om. D | nihil] quicquam Mu | dignum] eger(un)t Mu om. φ super dignum habet unde leuior fiat P2 | nihil dignum] om. P3[113] nihil digno add. in marg. m2, dignum corr. ex digne m3 | sputent] spuet Ma spuet (putet Mu) AMuC G1P2L2 spuet B | uix] et uix M | uix dignum P3Ma φ (punct. sub digne habet P3) | respirantes (entes P1 -ant ex M)] respirans AMuC G1P2L2B | flegmonem ... factum] necesse est de his omnibus signis suspicari flegmonem in pulmone (-em L2) esse factum G1L2 | flegmonem] pleumone P1 pulmone M | necesse est habet post signis Ma| suspicari] -are (-ecare ad haec signa) | nos] n. s. P3 (nos add. m3) φ | esse factum] f. e. Mu P3 (esse add. m2)


[111] post For post 'besides', Georges cites Calp., ecl. 10.22, Hofmann and Szantyr, 243 cite Gaius, dig. 30.65. Cf. 2.7.3 ad haec for πρὸς τοίτοις.
[112] sputent Whether indicative or subjunctive, singular (as in δ) or plural (as in γ and γ'), we have here a form of sputare (rather than spuere), and the Latin has active for the Greek passive. (Cf. 2.7.4 sputant, 2.8.3 sputetur, 2.11.1 sputato.)
[113] flegmonem Apparently, a new n-stem in -o, -onis, attested also at Veg., malum. 248.1. Cf. 2.3.2 acidonium and note.

Are the errors in M and P1 new related? Both have a word for 'lung', but each could have arisen very differently, P1's pleumone for flegmonem (but cf. 2.7.1 where P1 has pleumone for pulmone), M's pulmone by anticipation of pulmone in the next line. Alternatively, they could reflect a word for 'lung' (pulmone or pleumone?) in γ. Note that both P1 and M (and therefore γ) have flegmonem for flegmonem at 2.7.3.

[114] in Once here, and twice in 2.7.3, we have Latin in for Greek περί + bodypart.
[115] sitis sit nimia Presumably, sit was omitted in γ and γ'. M supplied indicative est after sitis nimia; φ supplied sīr before sitis nimia.
[116] et frequenter Latin et frequenter was surely prompted by the form in the translator's text corresponding to Puschmann's θυάξηται (cf. θυάξηται Μ): perhaps θυάξηται τε?
[117] sentiatur Subjunctive (with P1, η, and most of the tradition), as this is a further symptom in the Greek. φ (presumably following P3) and θ (conceivably following γ': cf. M) by using the indicative effectively make it a result, which we do not want until the diagnosis, beginning et adhuc.
[118] calor ... multus The Latin calor multus makes better sense than Greek αἰσθησις πολλῆς: we should perhaps correct πολλῆ to πολλῆς.
2.7.2 And besides these (signs), if they should spit nothing of note while breathing with difficulty, we are obliged from all these signs to suspect that inflammation has arisen in the lung.

2.7.3 But if there is also excessive thirst, and frequently in addition to these signs a great heat is felt in the chest, i.e. with the result that they long to breathe in cold air, even more is it right to conclude that there is a blazing inflammation in the lung.

II, 151, 3–9 Puschmann

καὶ πρὸς τούτοις, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἀξίον ἀναπτύεται δυσπνοοῦντων αὐτῶν, φλεγμονὴν ἕξ ἀνάγχης ἐκ πάντων τούτων ὑποπτεύειν ἡμᾶς περὶ τὸν πνεῦμονα γεγενήθαι προσήκει. (2.7.3). εἰ δὲ καὶ δίψῃ σφοδρᾷ συνέχειτο πρὸς τοῖς σημείοις τούτοις καὶ θέρμης αἰσθησίς αὐτῶ γίνοιτο πολλῇ περὶ τὸν θάρακα, ὡστε ψυχρὸν ἑπιθυμεῖν ἄερα ἀναπνεῖν, ἐτι καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπονοεῖν δεῖ ζέουσαν εἶναι τὴν φλεγμονὴν περὶ τὸν πνεῦμονα.
2.7.4 Si autem et ceterum cipient nec nimim grauitet angustat\textsuperscript{124} sentiunt se habere ++ praecordiae loca ++, sed magis calida esse, erisipelas manifeste scito in pulmone consistere.\textsuperscript{125}

2.8.1 Manifestum est enim quod\textsuperscript{127} sit pus ex ipso colore solo et ex aliis signis\textsuperscript{128} ex quibus didicitur\textsuperscript{129} puris cognitionem: et ab odorre\textsuperscript{130} ex ustione facto\textsuperscript{131} et ab hoc\textsuperscript{132} quia soluitur missum\textsuperscript{133} in aqua et non proicitur\textsuperscript{134} quemadmodum\textsuperscript{135} flegma et crudus humor.

\textsuperscript{124} grauitet angustat In order to achieve a defensible text, I have adopted Cloudy Fischer’s correction of angustiam in the archetype to angustia and left praecordiae loca without a preposition. The alternative would be angustia ... in praecordiae loca, with M and P2; I have yet to investigate systematically case-usage after prepositions, but my clear initial impression is that the translator would here have used in + ablative (cf. the examples quoted below). In any case the patients, and not the body-parts, must be the subject of sentiunt se habere. Cf., from the present treatment of coughing alone, 2.3.2 ‘habere se sentient”; 2.10.1 ‘sentient conuagusta praecordia se habere’. Conversely, when the symptom is the subject, sentio appears in the passive: 2.7.1 ‘grauitas sentitur in pectorc; 2.7.3 ‘calor sentiatur multus in torace’; 2.8.2 ‘graudo sentitur fieri’.

Latin grauitet suggests either that the translator thought he was rendering βροχός (βροχός Puschmann), or that the original translation had the abstract nouns grauitas etuel angustia (which should then have had a passive form of sentio, as above), and we must have to reckon with a change of construction or serious corruption.

\textsuperscript{125} consistere Like existo, existent (cf. 2.3.1 and note ad loc.), consisto and consistens are favourite words of the Latin Alexander. For consisto = συνυπάρχω, cf. e.g. 1.52 ‘Vinde ergo consistit (sc. frenetis)’ = I, 509, 3 δέον δύναμαι συνυπάρχω; 1.53 = I, 509, 18; 1.85 ‘in eis (sc. oculis) consistentes passiones’ = II, 3, 3–4 τὰ ἐν ἀγαθῷ συνυπάρχοντα σαθή.

\textsuperscript{126} pus This heading looks like an invention of the Latin tradition: there is no break in the Greek text here. It is obviously based on recent headings, and attempts to combine pus, an accompaniment of inflammation and the main new topic, with humor, the subject since 2.5.t. The heading is unconvincing in that pus does not flow in thoracem! On the other hand, pus is absent only from M and C. It must have been in δ; without the evidence of P1 we cannot know whether it was in α.
2.7.4 But if they produce bilious sputum and do not feel that the area of the diaphragm is too heavily constricted, but rather that it is warm, then know full well that erysipelas is established in the lung.

2.8. Signs if in the midst of coughing pus flows into the chest, and humour

2.8.1 Now it is evident that it is pus both from the colour itself alone and from other signs from which we have learned the recognition of pus: both from the smell that is made when it is burnt and from the fact that it dissolves when put in water, and is not brought up like phlegm and raw humour.

II, 151, 9–15 Puschmann

ei δε χολόδες ἄναπτοντο, μὴ πάνυ δὲ βάρους ή στενοχωρίας συναισθησις γίνοιτο -- +, άλλα μάλλον θέρμης, ἐρυσίπελας εἶναι σαφῶς ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι γίνοσκε. (2.8.1). δήλον μὲν ἔστι τὸ πῦων καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς χρωμάς μονής καὶ ἐξ ἀλλόν δὲ σημείων, ἐξ ὧν ἐμάθομεν πῦουν διαγινώσκειν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀμής τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς καύσεως γινομένης καὶ τοῦ διαλύσεθαι βαλλόμενον ἐν ὕδατι καὶ μὴ υψίζάνειν (ἐφιζάνειν Λ Μ), δόσπερ τὸ φλέγμα καὶ ὁ ὄμος χμός.
2.8.2 Si ergo fuerit in\textsuperscript{136} thorace, manifestum est ex multis aliis signis, adhuc etiam et ex graudeine quae sentitur fieri\textsuperscript{137} in altera parte membrī\textsuperscript{138}, et supercurrēns\textsuperscript{139} ex subitaneis mutatis euersionibus\textsuperscript{140} et sonos aurium cum obclusione saepius patiuntur.\textsuperscript{141}

2.8.3 Haec enim sufficiat dixisse, si consistat\textsuperscript{142} in thorace et ibidem contineatur. Quod si ad ea\textsuperscript{143} quae dicta sunt praecedat pleuritis, nihil manifestum spuentes,\textsuperscript{144} et hoc ipsum uiolenter sputetur,\textsuperscript{145} manifestē\textsuperscript{146} confitendum\textsuperscript{147} est quia pus est quod in thorace contineatur.

fuerit] fuerit pus Ox [manifestum est (est om. D)] manifesta erunt P1M [ex] ex his et G1L2DGe φ his et P2 ex corr. ex his et ex O P3MaOx [multis alīis] a. m. G1 [etiam].etiam (s.s.) magis Ox [et ex AOMu P3Ma] et M ex cett. [grauedin] grauidinem P1 grauidem M [quae] om. M fieri (fieri P1) fiat P3'[fieri add. m2 in marg. : ante fiat add. si m3] ad in habent in marg. s. quando eger (epar. ed.) iacet supra partem sanam sentiat quasi pondus aggerauiri super eam φ [altera parte (-am -em P1)] alia p. φ [et] om. G1L2 [supercurrēns] habet litteras te super -ens P3 m3 (hoc est -ente?) s. s. pus φ [ex subitaneis AMuC G1P2B] subitaneae (-bet- P1) P1M O D subitas P3 φ subitat Ma [mutatis euersionibus] e. m. Mu [mutatis -as M P3Ma mutatur P1 mutat O DG2L1 immutat ed. om. G1L2 ad (im)mutat habent .i. inducit φ [euersionibus AMuC G1P2BOx] -es (is P1) cett. ad e. habent in marg. .i. nauseas uel subuersiones stomaci φ [sonos AMu DOx (sonus P1M OC)] sonum P3Ma sonitus G1P2L2B φ [obclusione (-em P1)] exclusione Ma [patiuntur (-ci- P1) P1M] patitur cett. eiciens pus s. s. φ


\textsuperscript{136} in Again, as in 2.7.2, for Greek πριπι; cf. also the next line in this section, 2.8.2 in altera parte membrī.

\textsuperscript{137} ex graudeine . . . fieri I fear that ex graudeine translates εκ του βαρος as a single group. It seems that the translator has misunderstood the substantival infinitive. He is floundering, and things get worse as he moves into the second substantival infinitive clause (beginning περιπεριονος αυτοι, the participle being governed by εκ του ουκουευ).

\textsuperscript{138} in altera parte membrī Latin altera surely indicates that our translator saw not στερνον but τετρον; membri must be for μερος (perhaps mistaken as a genitive). Presumably, in is again for πριπι (cf. 2.7.2 and the preceding line in this section, 2.8.2 in thorace).

\textsuperscript{139} supercurrēns I understand supercurrēns (sc. pus) as an object of patiuntur (just as in the Greek περιπεριονονας αυτοι is governed by ουκουευ). Of course, there is no warrant for pus in the archetype, but I am inclined to agree with the maker of φ that it is required.

\textsuperscript{140} euersionibus One is torn between ex- ablative, which must have been in δ, and the accusative subitaneas mutatas euersiones, which given its distribution need have been only in γ and γ'. I favor the former because it matches more closely the Greek, where this is not a symptom but a cause, and where the phrase is introduced by a monosyllabic preposition (albeit εν in Puschmann’s text!).

\textsuperscript{141} patiuntur Here and at 2.8.3 spuentes, β has the plural, δ the singular. I stick with the plural, as in 2.7.4, 2.8.1, but without much conviction.
If, then, it is in the chest, it is clear both from many other signs and also from a sensation of heaviness which is felt to arise on the other side of the body-part (?), and, as (the pus) flows over, as a result of sudden disturbances, they often suffer sounds in their ears and blockage of the ears.

Suffice it to have said this much for the case when it is present in the chest and contained there. But if, in addition to what has been mentioned, pleurisy should precede, with the patients spitting nothing evident, but what there is being spat violently, it is plainly to be acknowledged that it is pus that is contained in the chest.
2.9.t. De fyma\textsuperscript{148} in pulmone consistente\textsuperscript{149}

2.9.1 Quod si fyma meditauerit\textsuperscript{150} fieri in pulmone, erit omnino\textsuperscript{151} difficultas spirandi coangustatis praecordiis;\textsuperscript{152} nunc quidem desubito contingit, sed adhuc\textsuperscript{153} consueta agere ipsa consequitur actio, et, per partes\textsuperscript{154} accrescens, laeditur.\textsuperscript{155}

\textit{Tit. om. P1 MaL2 | De} Signa de BΦ P3 (Signa add. m3) Si de OX Signa si de C Signa si M [fyma scripsi] fimate OP3 fýgmon M fymone Ge fimone AG1 psýmone P2 simone Mu flegmone CBDOX φ [in pulmone] pulmonis C | consistente existente BG1P3Φ fiat M tussis fiat C fiat tussis add. P3 m3

Quod si Quod GeP3 (quod si P3\textsuperscript{')}) [fyma P1] sima Mu fimam A fimon OX O (add. i. flegmό) fýgmon M flegmon D fýmone P2 fimonem GI1L2 flegmonem CBΦ flegmonem si Ge s?imata M [meditauerit fieri (medetauerit fieri P1 editauerit et fuerit M)] euenerit fieri ceu. fuerit (-int Ma) O P3Ma DOx (fuerit post pulmone O P3Ma) | pulmone -em | P1 L2 [omni] omni modo L2BGeG2L1 [spirand] sperandi A\textsuperscript{'} [coangustatis (-iatis G2)] coangustata M angustata P1 que coangustatis (quī coangustat P3\textsuperscript{'} (-is add. m3)) O P3MaD [praecordiis] -ia P1M [nunc quidem scripsi] num quid P1 num quod M non quidem O G1P3MaD nam quod A n quod MuC non quod P2L2BOxGe non quia φ [desubito] subito C | contingent M O DOx -et G1P3Ma -at ceu. | adhuc adhuc si Ge ante adhuc add. in marg. dum P3 m3 | agere ipsa | ipsa agere Ox | consequitur | -atur L2BDGe consequi ed. uidetur Ma [et] om. Ge | partes -is P1 | accrescens (adcr. P1M acr. B) | -entes P3\textsuperscript{')}Ge | laeditur [-it O G1CL2BP3Ge -at Ma

\textsuperscript{148} fyma} The Greek term φύμα is preserved (presumably 1st-declension feminine) in P1 in 2.9.1 (and cf. sima Mu and fimam A, as well as the learned fίσματα in θ’ and fimate in the title in P3 and O). The word occurs in the Latin Orbisius (cited by the ThLL) and also in the Latin Galen, \textit{Ad Glau.} 2.1 'fima uero flegmone breuis et mollis id est que cito crescit et maturescet et saniem facit' [text of Montpellier 185] | \textup{11.77} Kühn \ldots πρὸς ἐκπλήθην ἐπιπάγμαν; cf. Gar. \textit{Pass.} 5.32; this reference, not in the ThLL, I owe to Cloudy Fischer. The n-stem fymon(\textit{n}), onis is also well attested in the tradition: it looks like a blend of fyma and flegmo(\textit{n}) (cf. M's fýgmon), but is perhaps already in \textit{θ}, and deserves to be borne in mind.

\textsuperscript{149} consistente} It seems that δ had consistente (agreeing with Greek συστάντος) and that θ' changed this to existente (on consisto, existo, cf. note on 2.7.4 consistente). The presence of \textit{fuit} in P3 and \textit{P3 corr.} suggests that it was in \textit{γ}'. Its presence with the addition of \textit{tussis} in \textit{C} may be another link between \textit{C} and \textit{P3} (cf. 4.7.5).

\textsuperscript{150} meditauerit} \textit{γ} has preserved what must be the true reading, with \textit{meditauerit} = Greek μεδίταταινου 'threaten', so that we should remove the negative supplied by Puschmann. In view of the simple \textit{fuerit(n)t} in \textit{O}, θ' and κ, it is likely that meditauerit was lost in \textit{θ}' and \textit{γ}' δ did its best to make sense of meditauerit with euenerit. Cf. Langslow, 'Alex. Trall.'.

\textsuperscript{151} omnino omnino} is common in the Latin Alexander, and translates a great deal of Greek intensifiers, including, apart from πάντως (here and e.g. 1.84 = I, 615, 7); πάντως (e.g. 1.33 'Istud enim omnino iuuat' = I, 485, 8–9 αύτη γάρ πάντως ἄφελεται; also 1.44 = I, 497, 9; 1.57 = I, 515, 15); παντερχόθεν (e.g. 1.33 'calefactis omnino' cf. I, 483, 24 θάλπινθα παντερχόθεν; παντελίας (e.g. 1.144 = II, 235, 15; cf. 1.123 'Si autem omnino iuuat non audient': II, 101, 1 παντερχόθεν βραβεῖ; παντερχόθεν (e.g. 2.29 = II, 263, 26); apparently also ἄγειν (1.56 = I, 515, 6); and at 1.57 = I, 517, 25 omnino stands opposite τηνύστασιν in Puschmann's text.)

\textsuperscript{152} difficultas spirandi coangustatis praecordiis} The order of the Greek words is reversed, and τηνύστασιν translated with an absolute past participle, which could conceivably stand in a causal relation to the \textit{difficultas spirandi}, but which I have translated as an ablative of attendant circumstances.

The reading of γ (co)angustata precordia could equally well be read as an absolute construction (feminine singular ablative or neuter plural or (with -a for -am) feminine singular accusative). Note the relative clause in O, Ma, P3 and D (presumably from \textit{θ}) beginning with \textit{que before coangustatis}.\textsuperscript{153}
2.9.1 Concerning a growth in the lung

But if a growth threatens to arise in the lung, there will be extreme difficulty in breathing, with constriction of the area of the chest: this sometimes happens suddenly, but also (sometimes?) it (the lung?) is able to perform its normal function, and is damaged as it (the tumour?) grows bit by bit.

II, 151, 23–153, 1 Puschmann

Περὶ φύματος ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι συστάντος
Εἶπερ εἰς φῶμα μελετήθην ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι, ἔσται μὲν πάντως στενοχώρια καὶ δύσπνοια ποτὲ μὲν ἀθρῶς συμβείνουσα, ποτὲ δὲ, τὰ συνήθη πράττοντος (πράττειν LM) αὐτοῦ δυναμένου, κατὰ μικρὸν (μέρος LM) αὐξανομένη.

153 nunc quidem ... sed adhuc This is unsatisfactory. I prefer to hazard nunc quidem (Greek ποτὲ μέν) than to obelize num quod (vel sim.), but I acknowledge that I am leaning perilously on Puschmann’s text. The variants num quod (M), num quid (P1) and non quidem (in O G1P3MaD, and hence probably in γ') are really very close to nunc quidem, especially given the following syllable de- (of desubito). I cannot exactly parallel nunc quidem for ποτὲ μέν in the Latin Alexander, but for ποτὲ μέν ... ποτὲ δὲ A has at 1.79 modo ... nunc (I, 597, 26–599, 1); other versions include quando quidem ... quando autem (1.127 = II, 113, 22; cf. quando ... quando at 1.137 = II, 127, 3) and interdum ... interdum (2.177 = II, 209, 26; 2.265 = II, 559, 24; 2.269 = II, 569, 6). This is then answered rather lopsidedly by sed adhuc ‘but also’ (which suggests ἐὰν δὲ rather than ποτὲ δὲ in the translator’s Greek text).

154 per partes The translator’s text probably had ἂν εἰς μέρος (like Greek mss. L and M here), which can perfectly well mean ‘little by little’; cf. 2.5.4 with note ad loc., 2.11.7.

155 consuetu agere ... laeditur This is next to hopeless! The Greek at least is clear (although Puschmann surely needs to read πράττειν with L and M: τὰ συνήθη πράττειν αὐτοῦ δυναμένου ‘while he (the patient) is able to carry out his normal business’). But for the Latin version we are reduced to emendation for ipsa consequitur actio — perhaps ipse consequitur [actio] — and we are still left with accrescens, which I have interpreted as an absolute participle with fyuma as unexpressed subject, and laeditur (not in the Greek), which seems to require the lung or the patient as subject (unless it goes with actio).
2.9.2  Et spuunt nihil, neque soni aliquid aut cencron patiuntur. Neque enim contingere poterit [ nisi ] ex indigesto et necdum permixto fymate.  


---

156 soni aliquid Although sonitus is the regular word for ringing in the ears (cf. 2.6.1 above), A attests several examples of sonus in the chapters of Book 1 devoted to the condition (1.117ff.; and 1.110).

For aliquid + partitive genitive = Greek τι + adjective, cf. 2.40 'aliquid ... caloris' = II, 287, 6 τι θερμόν, 2.267 'aliquid frigdoris' = II, 561, 27 τι μυκτεύχοι. It is noteworthy also that the form aliquem at any rate appears to be used by our translator(s) only as a pronoun, and not as an adjective as in sonum aliquem the reading of Ο and Ma.

157 cencron The Latin variants suggest Greek κίνχρος, which means 'millet', rather than κίνχρος 'roughness, hoarseness', which is very suitably rendered with raucus in the very next section (2.10.1). LSJ, s. vv., suggests some confusion between the two Greek words, attesting κίνχρον 'millet' but not κίνχρος 'hoarseness'.

158 poterit Cf. future δονήσατε. Latin poterit is attested here only in Ma and indirectly in P1 poterat. If poterit was in γ', Ma could have it from there via θ and θ', while everywhere else it was corrected to potest. Alternatively, we ignore the Greek future and take it that P1 and Ma miscopied potest. I have not checked every example, but in A poterit stands for δονήσατε at least at 2.157 = II, 461, 26; 2.254 = II, 529, 7 (cf. possis at 2.186 = II, 481, 15).

159 nisi Another glaring discrepancy between the Latin version and Puschmann's text, perhaps connected with a corruption of eti in the translator's Greek text.

160 et necdum permixto fymate: κα ται μηδε άποβεβλημενου το φλέγματος Both Greek and Latin versions are corrupt. If fyma is the right word in the Latin version, here the tradition is unanimous that it is masculine or neuter; contrast the feminine form I admitted in 2.9.1. The -us ending in M and P1 may reflect a Greek genitive singular ending, and given Α's -fimato we should perhaps reckon with the presence of the Greek form fimatos in the archetype (the γ forms look like a cross between fimatos and flegmonos). Such a form is not likely to be introduced into the Latin tradition, but only corrected away. Pending the collection of more secure examples, however, I leave the suspiciously classical-looking fymate for the moment.

Latin permixitus is common in the Latin Alexander. Generally it translates a form of μεγίνομι (e.g. I, 449, 24 μικτην; 455, 3 προσήρξει; 479, 7 άναμελήσατο) but at I, 467, 7 it renders συμπληρεμέναι, a form easily confused with -βεβλημενυν.

The stem άποβεβλημενυ occurs only here in the Greek Alexander. The reading of Greek ms. Μ μεταβεβλημενου seems much preferable, as it can be paralleled in the context of φλέγμονα being metabolized εἰς πύον (II, 69, 7; 381, 21; 479, 27; 481, 4). This context could well fit a φύομα (a species of φλέγμονα), which the Latin tradition seems to point to; this context also suggests the emendation φλέγμονας for φλέγματος (φλέγμα is quite out of place here).
2.9.2 And they spit nothing up, nor do they suffer any noise (in the ears) or hoarseness, for it cannot possibly occur while the tumour is immature and not yet thoroughly mixed.

II, 153, 2–4 Puschmann

καὶ οὔτε ἀναπτύουσιν οὐδὲν οὔδὲ ψόφον τινὰ οὐδὲ κέρχον ύπομένουσιν· οὔτε γὰρ συμβῆναι δυνήσεται ἡτι ἀπέπτου καὶ μηδέπος ἀποβεβλημένου (μετα- Μ) τοῦ φλέγματος.
2.10.t. Si tussis ex spissis et glutinosis\(^{161}\) humoribus qui in pulmone\(^{162}\) continentur et tenentur

2.10.1 Quando autem desubito qui laborant\(^{163}\) sentiunt coangustata\(^{164}\) praecordia se habere et absque febribus molestari et sit\(\textit{t}\) multa,\(^{165}\) habent etiam quendam raucorem\(^{166}\) cum tusse, interea\(^{167}\) et proiciunt humores manifestos\(^{168}\) quam pinguiissimos et glutinosos\(^{169}\) qui circumtenentur in pulmone + uel eius occupant cauernas + qui ibidem fluunt de capite aut ex alio aliquo\(^{170}\) membro.

\(^{161}\) spissis et glutinosis For the collocation with \textit{humores} in the context of coughing, cf. Orib., \textit{Eup.} 4.78 p. 599 La ‘Qui autem ex pinguis et glutinosus humores tusses generantur’ (4.77.7 p. 467, 21–2 διά πάρος ... κοι γλύργχον χυμόν). It is striking that the collocation (2.10.1) pinguiissimos et glutinosos occurs just a few lines later in the younger Latin Oribasius (pinguis et glutinosus humores). Note A’s learned improvement of \textit{et glutinosis} to \textit{gutinosisque}.

\(^{162}\) in pulmone It is at first sight striking that P1, G1 and P2 have \textit{fleumoneflegmon}, but we have seen repeated confusion in P1 (cf. 2.7.1 and note ad loc.), and \textit{flegmon} in G1 and P2 probably reflects only a single error (or marginal addition) in \(\theta^\prime\).

\(^{163}\) laborant The patient is singular in the Greek, but the Latin tradition is overwhelmingly in favour of the plural, witness \textit{laborant} (except M), \textit{sentient} (except M), \textit{habent} (except \(\gamma^\prime\), \textit{proiciunt} (unanimous).

\(^{164}\) coangustata Are the \(p\)-variants of the prefix (\textit{per-}, \textit{pрае-}), which enter the tradition with \(\theta^\prime\), to be explained palaeographically or as a result of anticipation of \textit{praecordia}?

\(^{165}\) sit\(\textit{t}\) multa, \textit{sed} The Latin archetype must have had \textit{sitis multa sit}. The very minor changes (undone thanks to the Greek text) yield a very different sense.

\(^{166}\) raucorem Why was \(\kappa\varkappa\varkappa\rho\gamma\nu\omicron\nu\) not so translated in 2.9.2? Was the translator thrown by Greek \(\kappa\varkappa\varkappa\rho\gamma\nu\omicron\nu\) there?

\(^{167}\) interea This use of \textit{interea} (apparently only here in the Latin Alexander) is not recorded by the OLD, although Georges attributes it to Silius Italicus, Cf. Thed. Prisc., \textit{Eup. faen.} 19, p. 22, 5.

\(^{168}\) manifestos It is tempting to write \textit{manifestum}, but the construction will not work, and we must accept that the Latin version as it stands resembles more a prognosis than a diagnosis.

\(^{169}\) pinguiissimos et glutinosos See the note on 2.10.t. \textit{spissis et glutinosis}.

\(^{170}\) alio aliquo I presume that, like M, \(\gamma^\prime\) (and hence \(\theta\)) had \textit{aliquo altero}. It seems that \(\gamma^\prime\) is often closer to M than to P1.
2.10.1 If coughing arises out of thick and glutinous humours which are contained in the lung

2.10.1 When the patients suddenly feel that the chest is constricted and troubled (although) without fever and without great thirst, but they have also a certain hoarseness with the cough, and from time to time bring up manifest humours, extremely thick and glutinous, which are contained in the lung or occupy its hollow spaces, and which flow there from the head or from some other part.

II, 153, 5–11 Puschmann

Περὶ γλυκῶν χυμῶν καὶ παχέων περιεχομένων ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι Ὁπετίκα δὲ ἀθρόως ὁ κάμιον αἰσθηται στενοχορίας ἐκτὸς ὑλῆσεως πυρετοῦ καὶ δίψης πολλῆς, ἔχει δὲ τίνα κέρχην μετὰ βηχώς, ἐσθ’ ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀναγοινὴν ύγροῦ, δήλου, ὡς παχύ καὶ γλυκόρων ἐστὶ τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι καὶ συρρέψαν ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἢ ἕν ἄλλον τινὸς μορίου.
2.10.2 Sit tibi manifestum ad cognitionem,\(^{171}\) ex uuae irritatione et gargalionis\(^{172}\) praeecedenti, a\(^{173}\) capitis uitio consistere\(^{174}\) superfluentem materiam in thorace.

2.10.3 Sic enim cognoscienda sunt\(^{175}\) diuersitates et proprietates uniuscuiusque tussis, et quaecumque circa\(^{176}\) thoracem et pulmonem passiones consistunt.\(^{177}\)


---

171 Sit ... ad cognitionem Presumably, this is a jussive subjunctive for the Greek future perceived as a command. Normally, sentence-initial sit translates εστι (e.g. 1.57 = I, 519, 10; 1.81 = I, 601, 11; 2.21 = II, 249, 16), γινθηκαί (2.38 = II, 283, 15). There is, however, a near-perfect parallel with the present passage at 1.94 'Sit autem tibi manifesta cognition' = II, 31, 5 έσται δε σοι δήλων. Contrast erit for έσται at 1.86 'erit tibi manifesta cognition' = II, 5, 20 έσται δήλων σοι.

The translator uses the phrase manifesta cognition several times (above, and also at 2.186 manifesta cognition est for the much more elaborate II, 481, 13–14 ὁπληρη την διάγνωσιν και ἄναιμοβιβολόν ἔχειν ἀποδείκνυσιν), but manifestum ad cognitionem appears to occur only here, and looks like a one-off literal translation of φανερόν εἰς διάγνωσιν, although a similar Latin construction translates something very different in Greek at 1.35 'Ad cognoscendum autem tibi manifestum est' = I, 487, 11 γνωριζετε σοι συμφόρησιν.

172 gargalionis A dissimilated form of Greek γαργαλιών (cf. Latin gargareo), which I take it was seen by our translator in his Greek text; γαργαλιών (in Puschmann's text) means 'tickling'. Given its collocation with uua, it presumably refers to a wider area of the throat than just the uvula. Cf. André, Anatomie, 68–9, citing the Latin Oribasius and the Latin Hippocrates.

173 praeecedentia a 'Univerbation' of the preposition a with the preceding praeecedenti (which agrees with irritatione) caused the simple change of uitio to uitia and instantly yielded an unintelligible text.

174 consistere There is nothing corresponding in the Greek here to this favourite word of the translator, a formally imposing synonym of esse. Cf. note on 2.7.4 consistere.

175 Sic enim cogniscienda sunt Cf. 2.2.5 'Sic enim errit cognoscenda'. Concluding sic enim occurs literally dozens of times in the Latin Alexander, introducing the end of diagnosis and therapy alike. The Greek at this point, however, leads us to expect rather a conclusion of the type Sufficient haec, as at e.g. 1.103 = II, 57, 8.

176 circa Above (2.7.2; 2.7.3 twice) we noted repeatedly in for περί. Now we have almost the converse in circa for κατά.

177 consistunt With the variants (in γ and Ma) on the stem conting-; compare M's constringere for consistere in 2.10.2.
2.10.2 It should be clear to you, for the purpose of diagnosis, both from irritation of the uvula and from the earlier presence of swelling of the throat, that it is through the fault of the head that there is superfluous material in the thorax.

2.10.3 This, then, is how one is to diagnose the different forms and properties of each particular cough, and all the diseases which occur in the thorax and lung.

II, 153, 11–15 Puschmann

ἔσται δὲ σοί φανερὸν εἰς διάγνωσιν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τὴν σταφυλὴν ἔρεθισμὸν καὶ γαργαρισμὸν προηγήσασθαί τινα, τὴν κεφαλὴν αἰτίαν εἶναι τῆς ἐπιρρεώσεως ὅλης τῷ θῶρακι. (2.10.3). ταύτα ἀρκεῖ πρὸς τὸ διαγινώσκειν τὰς διαφόρους ἰδέας τῆς βηχώς καὶ ὅσα κατὰ θῶρακα ἢ πνεύμονα πάθη συνίστανται.
2.10.4 Sunt autem et alia de quibus in sequenti dictur sumus,\textsuperscript{178} ubi de ulceratione et ruptione uenarum et diabroseos\textsuperscript{179} cogemur\textsuperscript{180} scribere.

2.11.t. De lapide sputato\textsuperscript{181}

2.11.1 Ego autem quod uidi necessarium existimaui non tacere, sed ut uobis exponam quae uidi et miratus sum.

Sunt autem om. OP3\textsuperscript{3} [dicturi sumus] dicemus OxGe φ [ulceratione] -em P1 ulcerato Ox [ruptione uenarum] u. r. L2 [ruptione (-em P1)] corruptione AG1 [diabroseos P3D (-broxeus M -brocius P1)] diabroceys O diabroceis (dya- P2) G1CP2B diabroceis L2Ge diabroceo (dya- ed. L1) Ox φ [cogemur scribere (cogimur scribere O cogimus scire uere M)] dicturi sumus GeOx φ dicturi sumus cogimur scribere P3 dicturi sumus uel cogimur scribere G1

De lapide sputato\textsuperscript{3} De lat\textit{es putato lapide} om. P1M CP2Ma (del. (an ornatum?) B)

autem om. C quod s. s. L2 [uidi (uide P1)] uidi et O iudicau C [necessarium] neccarium C [existimaui] estimaui Ox putaui M ut uobis et uobis M O P3'1.1 de uobis ut P1 uobis DB quae P1M AOMu P2P3Ox quod cett.

\textsuperscript{178} dicturi sumus The periphrastic future of \textit{dico} occurs in all four times in Book 2, never in Book 1. Twice it renders a past tense in Puschmann’s text, which may, if not accidental, hint at different versions of the work. Cf. 2.26 (II, 259, 3 εἰρήκαμεν); 2.153 (II, 443, 15 εἰ ἔπονεν); 2.240 (II, 507, 24 ἔτησεν οἱ).

The periphrastic future is otherwise attested at e.g. 1.31 ‘qui uomituri sunt’ (I, 481, 2 τῶν ... ἐμοίωνων); 2.35 ‘et quando dormitum iturus est’ (II, 275, 4 κοβθήκεν); 2.67 ‘qui hydropici futuri sunt’ (II, 393, 26 ὑδρατήσαμεν); 2.238 ‘qui et accepturus est potionem’ (nothing in Greek at II, 503, 23). It is evidently not dictated by a particular Greek form.

\textsuperscript{179} diabroseos The Greek genitive (διαβροσεως) was perhaps not understood and simply transcribed by the translator, being later made into an ablative by the Latin tradition, plural (e.g. \textit{diabroseis}) or singular (\textit{diabroci}). The ‘ablative singular’ in O (\textit{diabroceo}) may reflect knowledge of the Greek form in γ’. Might the variants with -c- (in P1 and η) reflect an original in Greek characters (with -c- for the lunate sigma)?

\textsuperscript{180} ubi ... cogemur A reference to 2.158ff. (II, 187ff.). The classical use of the future after \textit{ubi} is here very well attested (cf. \textit{ubi} + present in a similar postponement at 1.60 ‘Reseruamus enim inibi hoc dicere ubi de fracturis conuenit loqui’; cf. I, 535, 5–6). In Book 1 at any rate, \textit{ubi} ‘when’ with future reference is used by A only with the future perfect and always with reference to the doctor’s requirement in therapy: 1.44, 1.123 ‘ubi uolueris’; 1.127 ‘ubi aestimaueris expedire’; 1.1128 ‘ubi ti bi necesse fuerit’; 1.131 ‘ubi necesse habueris’; 1.144 ‘ubi amplius fuerit opus’.

\textsuperscript{181} De lapide sputato I translate this as an instance of the ‘ab urbe condita’ construction without at this point being able to give other, unequivocal examples of control of this construction in the Latin Alexander.\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{182} necessarium ... non tacere, sed ut ... exponam The Latin Alexander attests both accusative + infinitive and \textit{ut} + subjunctive after \textit{necessarium}, accusative + infinitive e.g. at 1.85 (II, 5, 16–17); 1.138 (not in Greek, II, 127); 2.13 (II, 163, 17); 2.249 (not in Greek, II, 521, 9–10); \textit{ut} + subjunctive at e.g. 1.27 (I, 475, 23); 1.103 (II, 55, 1). I have not found another passage where the two are used in successive clauses and this would be \textit{variatio} of a different sort from that illustrated in 5.3.3 above. We could read \textit{et exponam} (future indicative), but \textit{et} does not have good manuscript support here.
2.10.4 There are others, too, of which we shall speak later on, when we are obliged to write about ulceration (or trauma?), rupture of the veins and *diabrosis*.

2.11.1 Concerning the spitting up of a stone

2.11.1 I have, however, thought it necessary not to keep quiet about what I observed, but to describe for you what I observed and was amazed at.

Puschmann

εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα, περὶ δὲν ὑστερον λεχθήσεται, ἐνθα καὶ περὶ ἐλκώσεως καὶ ρήξεως καὶ διαβρώσεως ἀναγκαζόμεθα γράφειν. (2.11.1). οὐ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐθεασάμην, ἀναγκαῖον ἐνόμισα μὴ σιωπήσαι, ἄλλα καὶ ύμῖν ἐκθέσθαι· ἐδοξέ γάρ ἐμοὶ ξένον εἶναι καὶ θαυμαστόν·
2.11.2 Spuit quidam uir lapidem specialiter et hoc non forte pinguem humorem et glutinosum, sed existentem lapidem, nec asperum sed satis lenem et durum, et resistentem fortiter tactui, ita ut cadens in terra sonum faceret.

2.11.3 Iste uir per multum tempus molestias sustinens de tusse non poterat fortiter extussire, donec lapidem spueret.

2.11.4 Vsus est etiam et diaeta temperata et humida magis, et infrigdatus est mediocrer.

spuit] expuit D | quidam] quidem φ | uir om. Ox | specialiter | specialem C | et ... glutinosum P1M AMuC P2B | et hoc non forte et pinguem humorem et glutinosum DGe φ | et hoc fortet non ex pningui humore et glutinoso Ox non ut lapsi fortet sed ex pningui humore et glutinoso O | et non forte et pinguem et glutinosum humorem existentem | P3 ex non forte et pningui et glutinoso humore Ma et non forte et pingui humore et glutinoso Ox | et ex forte et ex pingui humore et glutinoso G1 | sed existentem lapidem o. add. in marg. | P3 m2 | sed] sit P1 om. GI1L2 | P3Ma | existentem lapidem | -e-e C | -e-m G | GI1L2 om. | P3\’ | nec asperum] necessarium M | nec ipsum lenem (lenem add. in m2) | P3 sed asperum CP2L2B nec G1 | sed] sit P1 et MC | nec P2L2Ox om. | G1 | satis lenem et durum | durum nec satis lenem C | lenem] leuem P2 asperum P3 | et] nec G1 | resistentem fortiter tactui | f. t. r. | Ge | resistentem | -nte P3 -ns P1M | fortiter tactui | t. f. | P2 | tactui | M act. | P1 ad tactum DOx | ita] ut | aut M | ut OMaD | in terra P1M AO P3L2Ma DOx | in terram cett. | non | P1M MuCG1P2L2B | sonus O | sonitum cett. | [faceret] -iat P1M

uir] ubi(’) | Ox | P3Ma | add. | P3 m2 | uir qui | M | per] om. | DOx | mutum tempus | multo ( -um P1) tempore P1M DOx | multa tempora O | molestias | -iam MO | sustinens | patiens Ge | sustinuit G1 | sustinerat DOx | pertulit Mu | de tusse quasi tit. | P1 corr. ex tussu Mu | [non] | et non P1M DOx | non poterat fortiter extussire | om. GI1L2Ge | [poterat] | corr. ex oportet Mu | extussire] tussire Ox | lapidem | om. C | spueret] expuerit P1 | ex(s)pueret O | GI1L2B | P3MaGeφ

Vsus] iussum | M | est] est ei | Om. | GI1P2L2BGe | etiam | autem φ | et | est G1 | om. | OGe | diaeta temperata et humida] diaetam -et | -am P1 | magis, et | magis | P1 | magis dari et | M | infrigdatus est mediocrer] m. i. e. C | i. m. e. Ge | infrigdatus | infrigdatus P1 ed.L1 | mediocrer | medicreren om.

183 specialiter Neither specialis nor specialiter appears to occur elsewhere in the Latin Alexander. I have assumed the classical sense (the adverb seems to be attested first in Cels. 5.24.4). species is a plausible translation of ἑκεῖ, but beyond that I cannot relate the Latin to the Greek. The translator may not have seen how ἐξπροῆκε is to be taken in this context. At 2.236 (= II, 503, 6) ἐξπροῆκε is rendered appropriately enough diligenter, but it is striking that the word is not translated or mistranslated at II, 515, 28; 527, 30; 549, 17.

184 hoc Latin and hoc suggests that the translator’s text contained (adverbial) κατά τοῦτο before ὁ χειρός; cf. 2.2.4.

185 forte This is neither a form of the adjective fortis ‘strong’ nor the derived adverb (which would anyway be fortiter: cf. 2.11.23) but the adverb forte ‘by chance, perhaps’ almost bleached of meaning and functioning as a particle serving to reinforce the negative. In Books 1 and 2 Ms. A has forte ten times, always after a negative, as here: seven times nisi forte for εὕκαμ μη, three times ne forte for μη. I take non forte here, then, to be for the strong negative only here in the Greek Alexander.

186 existens It is tempting to propose existens, to match Greek ὤρως morphologically. Alas, the two other occurrences of ὤρως in the Greek Alexander (II, 155, 13; 265, 3) are not translated in the Latin version; curiously, both are in the immediate context of a strong endorsement of Archigenes, whom Alexander greatly admired and frequently cites. According to the ThLL, s.v. ‘exsiteo’, 1875, 84ff., this adjectival use presents a unique example of existens meaning ‘fere i. e. uerus’; on the weaker use of existo = sum, see note 63 above. On λείει for levis (in the next line), see Löfstedt, Coniectanea, 79, 84–.
2.11.2 A man spat up a stone, specifically that is to say, not just some thick and glutinous humour but actually a stone, not rough but quite smooth and hard, and very firm to the touch, so that it made a noise when dropped on the ground.

2.11.3 This man, having endured annoyance from coughing for a long time, could not strongly cough out until he spat up the stone.

2.11.4 He used also a balanced and rather moist diet, and he was moderately cooled.
2.11.5 Erat enim sollicitus nimis et tenuis habitudine, ut etiam existimaretur pthisicus esse, et postea proiecit lapidem, non post multos dies ut pthisici solent ita defunctus est.

2.11.6 Redeamus igitur et de curis aliqua breuiter dicere non omittamus.

---

192 sollicitus nimis For sollicitus = ψυχνηστικός, cf. 1.76 = I, 593, 6; 2.69 = II, 399, 23; 2.252 = II, 523, 29. LSJ cites for ψυχνηστικός in the sense ‘nervous, worried’ only Gal. 10.538. There is nothing in Puschmann’s text corresponding to nimenim (we would expect e.g. Greek ἄγαγον, πάνυ or σφόδρα; cf. note 53 above).

193 pthisicus Note the prevalence of variants with hypercorrect y. Presumably, P1’s tussicum, tussici is prompted by the main subject of this chapter, coughing.

194 postea tentatively take postea to be the equivalent of postquam, as often in Late Latin, including in the Latin Oribasius (Mørland, Oribasius, 171; Hofmann and Szantyr, 599, with further references). I cannot find a parallel in ms. A, but that may merely reflect careful correction (as with the addition of et before non here).

195 defunctus est The Latin of 2.11.5–8 is in so many respects quite different from the Greek. The death in the Latin version of this patient, who survives in the Greek, is one of the most disastrous mistranslations encountered so far.

196 Redeamus Typically, after omitting a section of the Greek original, the translator inserts a transitional sentence of his own.

P1’s Videamus for Redeamus might indicate either that a capital was missing in his exemplar or that he was taking dictation. At all events, he attests a further subjunctive form.
2.11.5 For he was excessively anxious and of a slender physical condition, so that he was even judged to be a consumptive, and after he threw up the stone, a few days later, as consumptives usually do, he died.

2.11.6 Let us then resume, and not omit to say something about treatments.

II, 153, 24–155, 2 Puschmann

ην γάρ καὶ φροντιστικός καὶ λεπτός τὴν ἔξιν, ὡστε καὶ ἐοικέναι αὐτὸν τοῖς φθανόδεσι. καὶ εἰ μὴ τούτοις ἐχρησάμην, οἴμαι ὅτι ἀν ἀπώλετο παραπλησίως τοῖς φθόνοις νοσήσασι.
2.11.7 Ad autem facile inueniendum,\(^{197}\) per partes ad tussem adiutoria et\(^{198}\) expedientia et a multis probata\(^{199}\) scribam.

2.11.8 Vnde\(^{200}\) in sequenti generaliter curas et ipsas differentias ubis exponam, ut non alibi indigentes adiutoria requiratis.

---

\(^{197}\) *Ad autem facile inueniendum* This is more in hope than expectation! At least there are numerous parallels for *ad* + gerund: cf. e.g. 1.35 ‘ad cognoscendum’; 1.60 ‘difficiles ... ad excitandum’ (I, 531, 3 δοκιμάζοντος). 1.70 ‘iera multis dedic ad purgandum’ (I, 555, 24 εγώ και τῇ ισχαράθει). I suppose a slavish imitation of the Greek word-order and an erroneous pause after *inueniendum* (*εὑρίσκειν*). The change of *inueniendum* to *inuenniada*, to agree with *adiutoria(?),* might have prompted the introduction of *haec* (’for the purpose of finding them (cataphoric) easily, I shall write down ...’) — although the introduction of *sunt* would also have prompted the addition of *haec*, in order to make sense of *Ad. Sunt is in M and apparently θ’ (G1B), which did not know γ’ (although G1 may have had separate, indirect access to γ’), and could therefore be original, the first of two main verbs in this sentence, the second being *scribam*. On the other hand, *sunt* is not in νη nor in P1 (unless it is reflected in the -s of P1 *inueniendas*).

\(^{198}\) *et expedientia et ... probata* The first *et* is not in the Greek but is well supported in the Latin tradition, and again suggests a respectable level of Latinity in the original translation.

\(^{199}\) *a multis probata* The phrase *a multis probata* is apparently not in the Greek, unless it reflects a very corrupt Greek version of ὑπὸ τῆς δογματικῆς ὑποθευτομένην. Forms of *probo, probatus* are common in the Latin Alexander, often where Puschmann’s text has nothing corresponding. They often answer Greek πείρα or a related form (e.g. 2.25 = II, 255, 22 πειράματος; 2.46 = II, 307, 3 πολλάν πείραν δέθοικεν), but sometimes translate other words (e.g. 2.12 = II, 163, 14 δόκιμα).

\(^{200}\) *Vnde unde* is surprisingly frequent in the Latin Alexander, both in relative clauses and in indirect questions. For its (late) use as a sentence-connector ( = *quaonbrem*) at the end of a chapter, cf. 2.132 (Philagrius) ‘Quod si ei quaec diximus diligentius non adhibeantur, in scyron conuerterut: unde nunc a nobis erit dicendum’; 2.238 (at the end of a recipe) ‘Deponit enim bene sine molestia et acutum est nimirum, unde magis securos id dabis’. Sundelin, 26 cites two examples from Theod. Prisc. (1.7. 16 p. 17, 12; 3.5, 13 p. 233, 9); for references to its use also in Gaius, Tertullian and the *Didasc. Apost.,* and further literature, see Hofmann and Szantyr, 209.
2.11.7 For ease of reference, I shall describe one by one the remedies for coughing, (remedies) both quick-acting and widely approved.

2.11.8 And from there I shall next explain the different kinds of treatments to you in a general way, so that you will not need to look elsewhere for remedies.

II, 155, 22–8 Puschmann

πρὸς δὲ τὸ εὐχερὸς εὑρίσκειν τὰς κατὰ μέρος ὡλας τῶν βηχικῶν βοηθημάτων καὶ ἀρμόζειν δύνασθαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς διαγνώσεως ὑπαγορευμένην διάθεσιν, (2.11.8) ἀκόλουθον ὡς ἑνόμισα μετὰ τὰς διαγνώσεις καὶ τὴν καθόλου ἀγωγὴν καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς ὑμῖν ἐκθέσθαι τῶν βοηθημάτων μετὰ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς αὐτών συσταθείας, ὡστε μὴ παρὲ ἐτέρου δεῖσθαι μανθάνειν, ὡς ἄλλʼ ἐντεύθεν ἀναλέγεσθαι τὸ ζητοῦμεν.