

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XL

2021

The appearance of this volume has been made possible by the support of

Bar-Ilan University
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Open University
Tel Aviv University
University of Haifa

PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
<http://www.israel-classics.org>

Manuscripts in the form of e-mail attachments should be sent to one of these e-mail addresses:
scripta.classica.israelica@gmail.com or isaacb@tauex.tau.ac.il. For reviews, contact
yulia@bgu.ac.il. Please visit our website for submission guidelines. All submissions are refereed
by outside readers.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the following address: The Editors,
Scripta Classica Israelica, c/o Department of General History, Ben-Gurion University of the
Negev, P.O.B. 653 Beer Sheva 8410501, Israel.

Price \$50

© 2021 The Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies
All Rights Reserved

Camera-ready copy produced by the editorial staff of *Scripta Classica Israelica*
Printed in Israel by Magnes Press, Jerusalem

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE
PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief: BENJAMIN ISAAC

Editorial Board:
AVI AVIDOV
GABRIEL DANZIG
DANIELA DUECK

Editorial Assistant: Hila Brokman

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD
OF *SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA*

François de Callataÿ, Brussels and Paris
Hubert Cancik, Berlin
Averil Cameron, Oxford
Hannah M. Cotton, Jerusalem
Ephraim David, Haifa
Werner Eck, Köln
Denis Feeney, Princeton
Margalit Finkelberg, Tel Aviv
John Glucker, Tel Aviv
Erich Gruen, Berkeley
Benjamin Isaac, Tel Aviv

Ranon Katzoff, Ramat Gan
David Konstan, New York
Jaap Mansfeld, Utrecht
Doron Mendels, Jerusalem
Ra'anana Meridor, Jerusalem
Maren Niehoff, Jerusalem
John North, London
Hannah Rosén, Jerusalem
Brent Shaw, Princeton
Greg Woolf, London

THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION
OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

OFFICERS 2020-2021

President:	Jonathan Price
Secretary:	Lisa Maurice
Treasurer:	Shimon Epstein

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Adi Erlich
Merav Haklai
Lisa Maurice
Andrea Rotstein
Iris Sulimani

HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Hannah Cotton
Ranon Katzoff
Ra'anana Meridor

CONTENTS

	PAGE
JAMES M. REDFIELD, <i>Briseis: The Woman as a Speaking Sign</i>	1
CARLO DELEE DONNE, <i>Tackling Conventions: Plato's Barbarians between Language and Ontology</i>	15
JOHATHAN J. PRICE, <i>The Originality of Appian of Alexandria</i>	31
BENJAMIN ISAAC, <i>Caesarea: Before and After the Corpus of Inscription (CIIP)</i>	49
ALEXANDER ANDRASON AND MÓNICA DURÁN MAÑAS, <i>The Syntax of Interjections: Evidence from New Testament Greek</i>	57
CAROLINE PETIT, <i>Greek Particles in Galen's Oeuvre: Some Case Studies</i>	95
ROEE DROR, <i>Renderings of Idiomatic Topographical Terms in the Septuagint</i>	125
WERNER ECK AND YOTAM TEPPER, <i>A Stamp with Latin Inscription from Sobata/Shivta in the Negev</i>	145
RIVKA GERSHT AND PETER GENDELMAN, <i>Marble Cuboid Weight Carved with Eros from Khirbet Ibtin</i>	151
RONIT PALISTRANT SHAICK, <i>The "Marsyas of the Forum" image on Roman city coins of the Southern Levant</i>	169
JOSEPH GEIGER, <i>GLAJJ: Two More Addenda</i>	203
 BOOK REVIEWS	
Rainer Friedrich, <i>Postoral Homer: orality and literacy in the Homeric Epic</i> (by Margalit Finkelberg)	205
Gabriel Danzig, David Johnson and Donald Morrison (eds.), <i>Plato and Xenophon. Comparative Studies</i> (by Livio Rossetti)	207
Peter Riedlberger, <i>Prolegomena zu den spätantiken Konstitutionen. Nebst einer Analyse der erbrechtlichen und verwandten Sanktionen gegen Heterodoxe</i> (by Robert M. Frakes)	210
Attilio Mastrocinque, Joseph E. Sanzo, and Marianna Scapini (eds.), <i>Ancient Magic: Then and Now</i> (by Ortal-Paz Saar)	213
Oren Margolis, <i>The Politics of Culture in Quattrocento Europe. René of Anjou in Italy</i> (by Tamara Lobato Beneyto)	216
 OBITUARIES: GIDEON FOERSTER (by Orit Peleg-Barkat)	 219
 DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS	 225

Greek Practice in Galen's Œuvre: Some Case Studies¹

Caroline Petit

Abstract: The present study offers an analysis of selected Greek particles in Galen's œuvre. Galen's preserved works make him by far the most prolific author of his time; he therefore represents a mine for investigations into the Greek language of the Roman Empire. Galen was a keen philologist, who produced vast amounts of commentaries and works of philological interest, the majority of which are now lost: studying Galen's style is a gateway to reconstruct Galen's rhetorical and stylistical profile. Given the vast quantity of texts at our disposal and their sheer diversity, the particles and particle clusters under scrutiny are comparatively few; I have privileged examples of particles and particles clusters that Galen uses to emphasise his point, conclude his arguments and communicate his intentions to his audience. Some appear to be signature phrases. Emphasised particles and particle clusters include: ἄρα, τοιγαροῦν, ἀτὰρ οὖν καί.

Keywords: Greek, Galen, particles, Atticism, Second Sophistic

Introduction: Greek Particles and Galen

The use of particles is a distinctive feature of the ancient Greek language. When studying any individual Greek author, particles act as stylistic fingerprints; together with other linguistic features, such as participles and verbal aspects, they provide us with interesting material to analyse, for example, points of view and perspective in Greek narratives.² Examining the use of particles can prove useful for the study of other text-types as well. It has long been recognized that particles are a marker of style: in the case of Aristotle, for example, Eucken has shown significant variations in the use of the particle ἄρα across the corpus, according to text-type and – most likely, according to him – authorship.³ Better known is the significance of particles in Platonic works, as shown by Édouard Des Places, and furthered in more recent studies;⁴ more generally, it is commonly accepted that particles are crucial for the understanding of the subtle

¹ This paper emerged from my Wellcome-funded project on Galen's Greek at Manchester (2007-2010). I greatly benefited from David Langslow's expert guidance during that time. This material might well have remained unpublished, were it not for some stimulating conversations with Simone Mucci, PhD candidate at the University of Warwick and a keen philologist. I would like to thank Simone Mucci and the anonymous reviewers of the journal for their detailed reading and pertinent observations. Any remaining errors or approximations are mine alone.

² See for example G. Wakker (1993) and (1997b); also, several studies on particles in S. Bakker & G. Wakker (2009).

³ R. Eucken (1866), 50-51.

⁴ E. Des Places (1929); Sicking & Ophuijsen (1993).

articulations of dialogue in Greek, especially in drama.⁵ In the preface to the first edition of his seminal work, *The Greek Particles*, J. D. Denniston acknowledged the relatively narrow scope of his book, by stating that he had not taken into account works and authors later than 320 BC. In his view, however, the existence of numerous *indices* to virtually all Greek authors made it easy to supplement his work in this area: particles, in theory, could easily be studied in almost any author.⁶

Unfortunately, among the authors who have *not* received thorough *indices* to date, lies Galen. Like many imperial Greek prose writers, Galenic texts have undergone comparatively little philological work. The copious body of works transmitted under the name of Galen is accessible through a non-critical, old-fashioned edition, although a regular but slow release of new editions gradually makes up for this astonishing gap.⁷ Linguistic studies on Galen are few; the same applies to post-Hippocratic medical works generally.⁸ The only study explicitly devoted to particles in Galen is a patchy series of perfunctory articles by R. J. Durling, who was not a linguist; they nevertheless form a starting point for whoever endeavours to study this subject.⁹ Decent *indices* to use for such a purpose are in short supply: as a matter of fact, useful *indices* appear in the various texts of Galen published in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* series, supplemented by a number of old German dissertations. Not all editions provide readers with complete or even partial indices.¹⁰ Using the *TLG*, on the other hand, can be fairly misleading, since the text provided is usually that of the Kühn edition, even when a critical text is available. Regrettably, searching Galen's texts through the *TLG* for the study of specific words, especially particles, is therefore no easy task. For that reason, I have focused on works available in critical editions, whilst not ignoring the rest of the corpus. Wherever possible, when I present passages from works available only in Kühn, I mention any significant variation in the manuscripts. Attention to the textual transmission of the texts under study is all the more crucial, since particles, being often monosyllabic entities or abbreviated by copyists, are especially vulnerable during the copying process.

Although the present study is limited to a few case-studies, it is hoped that the selected features will help illuminate Galen's rhetorical and argumentative strategies and inspire more work on particles in Galen and other imperial prose writers. The main

⁵ G. Wakker (1997a).

⁶ J. D. Denniston (preface to the first edition, 1934), v.

⁷ The standard reference edition remains C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, Leipzig, 1821-1833 (henceforth abbreviated as K.). During the 20th century, many modern editions of individual texts have appeared in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, Leipzig-Berlin, and the French Budé series (*Collection des Universités de France*). I usually cite Galenic works by their standard Latin title but refer to any available critical editions in addition to Kühn.

⁸ Linguistic studies on Galen include (but are not limited to) W. Herbst (1911); A. Wifstrand (1964). R. J. Durling, (1979); (1980); (1981); (1982); and (1986). Durling's studies have paved the way towards his *Dictionary of Medical Terms in Galen* (1993). In contrast, Hippocratic philology has thrived; the *Index Hippocraticus* by J.-H. Kühn and U. Fleischer is a priceless tool that has no equivalent in Galenic studies.

⁹ R. J. Durling (1988), and (1995) - the latter being a one-page article.

¹⁰ Unfortunately the Galen volumes in the Budé series do not offer any detailed indices.

focus of this paper is argument; for even when he is being powerfully rhetorical, or displaying his storyteller's skills, Galen's main line is usually argumentative. For example, telling the famous story of the lovesick lady in Rome – a story immediately followed by a similar, though shorter, story about a morally tormented slave – Galen has one special aim in mind: to *demonstrate* the validity of his inquiry method on the one hand, and at the same time, incidentally, to show that those who claim love can be diagnosed through the pulse are simply wrong.¹¹ In that passage as in many others, the constant, careful use of deductive particles underpins Galen's aims and line of thought, even as he is seemingly being casual and entertaining his audience.

The use of the same particle can serve different purposes in different contexts. For example, the particle ἄρα can be used as a deductive device in syllogism. Alternatively, it can introduce a sense of distance *vis-à-vis* the reported speech of a forerunner whom Galen thinks was wrong, or simply show Galen's irony in a rhetorical question. Galen's use of particles may not seem distinctive at first sight; but the number, range and frequency of the particles he uses make him stand out among so-called technical prose writers. Unlike Galen, most Imperial and Hellenistic Greek medical authors do not concern themselves with particles, especially not rare, sophisticated ones like τοιγαροῦν, or clusters of several particles (Galen often uses more than three). Galen thus consciously sets himself apart from standard technical prose writers. But the problem of particles in Galen's texts has further implications in the history of interpretation of his works, and the relative lack of appreciation of his style. Translations of Galenic works display varying degrees of awareness of particles' function and meaning, with translations of a single text differing wildly from one another in a given passage. While some translations movements, such as that exemplified by Niccolò da Reggio in 14th c. Naples, emphasised literal comprehension over stylistically acceptable versions and attempted to render the Greek original word for word (including particles)¹² in Latin, others paid little attention to the exact wording in Greek and offered global translations (such is the case of most modern-day translations). Latin offered an ideal receptacle for Galen's Greek texts, due to the proximity of the two languages; but translating Galen into Syriac and Arabic involved a much greater effort in order to adapt the original in a radically different linguistic framework. Hunayn ibn Ishaq exemplifies the completion of proper Arabic versions of Galenic texts – but what became of Galen's complex usage of particles in the translations of Hunayn's school? Galen's style was often vilified for being verbose and unclear – a surprising criticism, concerning an author who put clarity at the heart of his legacy. I argue that the lack of interest in, and understanding of, his use of particles is a non negligible aspect of the problem. Far from obscuring Galen's thought, particles play a role in organising his argument and in establishing a constant connection with the reader.

¹¹ Galen, *De praecognitione (On Prognosis)* 6 Nutton (CMG V, 8, 1, 100-104); on this passage see Petit (2018), 120-124.

¹² S. Fortuna and A.M. Urso (2009).

Interpreting Particles

Particles are understood here in a narrow sense; other non-declinable items like adverbs, subordinate conjunctions and prepositions are not part of this study.

The study of Greek particles has undergone a long period of neglect since the publication of Denniston's classic second edition (with *index locorum*) in 1954. As A. Rijksbaron rightly explains in his introduction to *New Approaches to Greek Particles* (1997), the excellence of the book simply discouraged scholars to publish any detailed particle study up to the seventies.¹³ New, challenging studies on Greek particles in classical authors have been published over the last twenty years.¹⁴ Little or nothing, on the other hand, has been done on Greek works of the Roman period, despite the importance of the question of particles in the broader theme of Atticism in imperial Greek. But broadly speaking, particles are at the heart of a lively interest among present-day linguists: a major study by Caroline Kroon on Latin discourse particles is now used as a reference also by Hellenists.¹⁵ In fact, it may be necessary to go through the key distinctions made by Kroon, even if it is not our purpose to study in depth the model she develops and illustrates for Latin discourse particles.

Particles, Kroon rightly states, have been studied along different lines; *syntactic* and *semantic* approaches provide significantly different accounts of particles – but, as she explains, the more straightforward and familiar semantic view (which is that of dictionaries, for instance) is not fully satisfactory when it comes to modal (or attitudinal) particles (for example the Greek ἄρα). Since the latter usually have various functions, which can hardly fit one, unique description, one is usually forced to allow a variety of different meanings for each modal particle.¹⁶ This contrasts, however, with a long-standing tendency among linguists to assume one single basic meaning for each type of word, especially particles, from which every particular ‘meaning’ stems. Both ‘polysemy-’ and ‘monosemy-’ based approaches therefore show their limits. Kroon convincingly argues that discourse theories allow a better understanding not only of modal particles but also of connectives. Moving away from the frameworks developed by Schiffrin or the Geneva school, Kroon develops her own model for Latin particles in the light of recent discourse analysis. It is beyond the limits of this study to describe at length Kroon's framework for connective particles: her line of argument, it must be noted, underpins much recent work on Greek particles, just as it underpins the present study. A multidimensional approach to particles is certainly the key to a better understanding of their meaning and function, and, as Kroon puts it, ‘for revealing the full force of individual particles’.¹⁷ I append at the end of this study a table that sums up

¹³ The next major study in this area after J. D. Denniston's is C. J. Ruijgh (1971).

¹⁴ See, however, Martín Páez (2012).

¹⁵ C. Kroon (1995) – on which see the thorough review article by D. Langslow (2000) and the concise paragraph devoted to the model developed by Kroon in Rijksbaron (1997), 3.

¹⁶ ‘These may be defined as particles with which a speaker or narrator may signal his own attitude towards the proposition he is presenting’ (Wakker 1997b, 215). These particles have been called sentence or grade particles (Sicking, van Ophuijsen), Abtönungspartikel (H. Weydt) or modal particles (Bakker, Wakker, Kroon). Wakker prefers “attitudinal” particles.

¹⁷ Kroon (1995), 56. A recent example of a study of a Greek particle in this framework is provided by G. Inglese (2018).

some of my findings using Caroline Kroon's terms of analysis. The table is meant to tentatively provide a bigger picture (however provisional) of Galen's particle usage, in addition to the case studies presented here.

Beyond particles, Galen displays rhetorical and linguistic skills and knowledge that make his works stand out in the field of ancient medical – and, more generally, technical – texts.¹⁸ In many respects, Galen stands closer to the great models of the past he so admires (classical authors such as Plato, Thucydides, or Demosthenes) than to his fellow practitioners of the Roman Empire (Rufus of Ephesus, Soranus, or the various smaller works attributed to Galen that do not live up to his writing standards). The question of Galen's style goes beyond the problems of Atticism in the Antonine age; rhetoric provides a more productive framework.¹⁹ In fact, Galen wrote extensively on questions of linguistics and philology, drawing on his extensive classical background, notably Attic comedy.²⁰ Among his contemporaries, Galen's tendency to use particles in a sophisticated way evokes Aelius Aristides, the sophist, or Lucian. But a good deal of the particles used in the context of demonstration can also be found in polemical writings such as those of Sextus Empiricus.²¹ Thus in order to offer a nuanced picture of Galen's variety in particles usage, it is necessary to consider the context of each work, and even of every passage under scrutiny. For all their valuable insights, R. J. Durling's sketchy attempts at describing particles in Galen show no sign of such awareness, and little grasp of context generally.²²

In the following case-studies, I attempt to demonstrate the power and subtlety of Galen's rhetoric and logic in the light of recent scholarly input on Greek particles. Presentation of findings encounters various problems: a strictly semantic presentation risks obscuring the functional value of particles, while a purely functional grid would look artificial and disconnected from the very specificity of the author under scrutiny, Galen. Thus I have adopted a hybrid solution, approaching some particles used by Galen under such labels as connection, inference and interaction. This hardly prevents entirely from overlap, but it allows me to highlight several important particles or particle clusters that illustrate Galen's linguistic mastery.

1. Connecting

The art of coordinating the propositions of an argument is nowhere more varied and colourful as it is in Greek. The number of connective particles and their potential combinations with many others naturally prove a great use to a dialectician. However, not all Greek writers make full use of their potential. Similarly, it would be a mistake to consider all particles/ particle-clusters as carrying a special nuance. In fact, it is sometimes difficult or impossible to work out the 'meaning' of such and such a

¹⁸ Petit (2018), 37-73.

¹⁹ For an overview of the problem of Galen's style, language and rhetoric, see Petit (2018), 1-32.

²⁰ See most recently Coker (2019).

²¹ The dates of Sextus Empiricus are unclear, but scholars agree on a floruit in the late 2nd to mid 3rd c. AD. Cf. D. K. House (1980); J. Jouanna (2009).

²² See note 4.

combination of particles, especially when one relies exclusively on semantics, trying to combine the separate ‘meanings’ of the particles, in a desperate attempt to understand the genuine signification of a term made of several elements. Indeed, it is likely that some *recherché* combinations are intended more for their display of word choice and of style than for what they ‘mean’ in the broader argument. As it happens, Galen is particularly keen on using clusters of up to four particles. From the very loose *δέ* to more specialized (*μήν* in the second premise of a syllogism and similar contexts) or sophisticated (*ἀτάρ*-based) combinations, Galen uses many connectives in his arguments.

The use of *ἀτάρ οὖν καί* and *ἀτάρ οὖν οὐδέ*

I would like to draw attention to an almost unique particle cluster used by Galen among connective devices: *ἀτάρ οὖν καί*, which is also found with a negative *οὐδέ* instead of *καί*. Its meaning is not straightforward, for trying to work out what *ἀτάρ*, *οὖν* and *καί* can possibly *mean* together – all three being connectives – and which is predominant in the cluster is, I think, the wrong approach; its importance lies in its rarity. A frequent particle in Homer, *ἀταρ* is rare in most classical authors, except Plato and Hippocrates.²³ That it may have been perceived as a Hippocratic feature appears from the comparatively strong use of *ἀτάρ* made by Aretaeus of Cappadocia, a medical author from the imperial era who consciously and somewhat artificially imitates Hippocrates. Aretaeus enjoys this otherwise rare connective very much and often pairs it with *δέ*. But Galen does not use it in the same fashion.

Before Galen, as far as we can tell in the current state of the Greek corpus, the combination was used by Aesop and Plato. In Aesop, it stands systematically at the opening of the moral of the fable and appears to be used with a conclusive ‘meaning’, since it draws the lesson from the story. As for Plato, its meaning in all four occurrences is, at first sight, slightly less obvious. At any rate, it is rather adversative and concessive (a possible translation could be ‘and nevertheless’) than conclusive, as it is in Aesop. In Plato’s *Republic* 367e for example, Socrates expresses his admiration for Glaucon and Adeimas, who have just spoken at length:

Καὶ ἐγὼ ἀκούσας, αἰεὶ μὲν δὴ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ τε Γλαύκωνος καὶ τοῦ Ἀδειμάντου ἠγάμην,
ἀτάρ οὖν καί τότε πάνυ γε ἥσθην καὶ εἶπον· ...

‘Having listened, and despite the constant admiration I always had for Glaucon and Adeimas, this time however, I have to say, I felt it very strongly, and I said: ...’

Socrates wants to express special admiration for the two brothers at this very moment, without denying that he has always felt this way (whether he is sincere or not does not really matter here). In this context, *ἀτάρ οὖν καί*, for all its rarity and sophistication, certainly emphasizes this very unique feeling much better than a more conventional

²³ See however Inglese (2018), exploring the particle in Homer, Aristophanes and Euripides.

ἄλλὰ or ἄλλὰ καί. The other three places in Plato induce similar interpretation.²⁴ The ἀτὰρ οὖν καί combination must be connected with the use of μὲν δὴ in the first part of the sentence; the correlation between the two leads to an emphasis on the second part of the sentence. We can use the Platonic reference as a paradigm towards the analysis of Galen's own use of the particle cluster.

When Phillip De Lacy came across ἀτὰρ οὖν καί in Galen's treatise *On Semen*, book I, he immediately thought of this passage from the *Republic*, as shown by his apparatus.²⁵ However seductive the idea of a conscious Platonic reminiscence is, Galen seems – at first sight, at least – to follow different aims and rules. He uses the cluster repeatedly (roughly once in each work, slightly more in major – and carefully written – treatises such as *De Usu Partium*), so that we can't neglect this feature. However, the existing translations hardly take it into account at all, or when they do, the translations are quite varied, and, wherever it occurs more than once, it is translated in different ways in the very same text.²⁶

Alone among translators and commentators of Galen, V. Nutton devotes a couple of lines to ἀτὰρ οὖν καί in the notes of his edition of *On Prognosis*²⁷ to emphasize its originality: he calls it 'another display of the flowers of Galen's learning'. Nutton doesn't propose a general interpretation of the particle cluster, though. In the passage of *On Prognosis*, my impression is that Galen simply uses it as a smart, more impressive alternative to the well-known phrase ἄλλος... τε καί:

παρῆσαν δ' ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ γενήσεσθαι δείξει καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν τινες, ἀτὰρ οὖν καὶ Ἀδριανὸς ὁ ῥήτωρ, οὐπω σοφιστεύων, ἀλλ' ἔτι συνῶν τῷ Βοηθῷ· καὶ ὁ Δημήτριος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἑταῖρος Φαβωρίνου, δημοσίᾳ λέγων ἐκάστης ἡμέρας εἰς τὰ προβαλλόμενα κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν τῆς Φαβωρίνου λέξεως.

The prospect of the demonstration attracted some others, including especially Adrian the orator – he was not yet a sophist but still attached to Boethus – and Demetrius of Alexandria, a follower of Favorinus, who used to lecture daily on suggested themes in the style of Favorinus' speeches.²⁸

Obviously, using ἀτὰρ οὖν καί here instead of τε καί emphasizes the importance of the characters Galen mentions here in the audience of his public demonstration. In this context, the connection with the Platonic ἀτὰρ οὖν καί is to draw attention to something

²⁴ Plat. *Pol.* 269d; *Char.* 154b; *Hipp. Maj.* 296a. The first two are strengthened, so to speak, by the addition of δὴ.

²⁵ See P. De Lacy, *Galen. On semen*, CMG V, 3, 1, 1992. However, he doesn't comment on this Platonic reminiscence in his notes.

²⁶ To take but one example, in M. T. May's translation of Galen's *De Usu Partium* (2 vols, Ithaca 1968), the phrase is either not translated, or translated in the following ways: 'but here', 'and', 'well then', 'moreover', 'indeed', 'hence', 'furthermore'. This illustrates the difficulty to render particles generally, and rare particle clusters in particular, in modern English translations.

²⁷ V. Nutton, *Galen. On Prognosis*, CMG V, 8, 1, 190. See also his introduction, p. 62, where the feature is listed among 'hyper-Atticisms'.

²⁸ Tr. V. Nutton (slightly modified), *op. cit.*, 97.

or someone special at a highly significant moment. In the former case, as in several others, *ἀτὰρ οὖν καί* is used as a connection that draws attention to something really special in the speaker's opinion, and that answers to a first element (*μὴν, ἄλλος*). Parallel cases can be found, for example in *De Usu Partium* II, 186 Helmreich = K. IV, 7; *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, VI, 8, 35 De Lacy (CMG V, 4, 1, 2, 415); *De Semine* I, 11, 15 De Lacy (CMG V, 3, 1, 106). To sum up, *ἀτὰρ οὖν καί* resembles a very strong *καί*, with a Platonic twist. Although this may sound like a rather underwhelming way to describe this cluster, it would not be very cautious to offer anything more definitive at this stage.

In line with the connective emphasis provided by *καί*, we find a similar phrase with a negative form (*οὐδὲ*):

De Usu Partium III, 10 (I, 176-177 Helmreich = K. III, 240-241)

μικρὸν καὶ ἄτιμον ὁ ποὺς μέρος τοῦ ζώου, τίς δ' οὐ φησί; μέγα δὲ καὶ κάλλιστον ἀπάντων τῶν κατὰ τὸν κόσμον ὁ ἥλιος, οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἀγνοοῦμεν. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο σκόπει, ποῦ μὲν ἐχρήθη τετάχθαι τὸν ἥλιον ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ, ποῦ δ' ἐν τῷ ζώῳ τὸν πόδα. μέσον μὲν ἐκείνον εἶναι τῶν πλανωμένων ἀστέρων ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, κάτω δ' ἐν τῷ ζώῳ τὸν πόδα. πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; ἄλλην αὐτοῖς θέσιν τῷ λόγῳ δοὺς σκέψαι τὸ συμβαῖνον (...). τηλικούτῳ γὰρ ὄντι καὶ τοιοῦτῳ χώρῳ οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ βελτίονα καθ' ὅλον ἐξεύροις τὸν κόσμον. ἀτὰρ οὖν οὐδὲ τῷ ποδὶ χώρῳ οὐκ ἂν εὔροις ἐν ζώου σώματι τῆς νῦν οὔσης βελτίω.

Who will deny that the foot is a small, ignoble part of an animal? And we know full well that the sun is grand and the most beautiful thing in the whole universe. But observe where in the whole universe was the proper place for the sun, and where in the animal the foot had to be placed. In the universe the sun had to be set in the midst of the planets, and in the animal the foot must occupy the lowest position. How can we be sure of this? By assuming a different location for them and seeing what would follow (...). For you could find no better place in the whole universe for a body of the size and character of the sun, and in the body of an animal you could find no better place for the foot than the one it occupies.²⁹

In the last few pages of chapter 10, book III, where this passage is taken from, Galen is trying to show that Nature has prepared everything for the best when assigning locations to bits of the universe – the sun up in the sky, and the feet at the bottom of animal bodies. Galen exploits at length the comparison between the highest and lowest part (respectively of the universe and of the animal body) in order to show Nature's perfect arrangement: this is one of the aims of the treatise as a whole, and a recurrent pattern in its many chapters.

As expected, the *ἀτὰρ οὖν οὐδέ* connection emphasizes here the second element of the comparison, the foot, about which he has spoken at length in the rest of the chapter, which deals mainly with the legs. Throughout the last few lines, the two elements were opposed through a basic *μὲν/δέ* correlation; why does *ἀτὰρ οὖν οὐδέ* suddenly appear? I think it is a means to emphasize the real conclusion Galen wants to reach; using the sun as a comparative device, he demonstrates in the first place that the sun is perfectly

²⁹ Tr. M. T. May, vol. I, 190-191.

located. Then, because the foot is like some polar opposite of the sun (in terms of beauty and dignity), an assumption Galen has proposed earlier, the foot has to be considered as perfectly located as well. At least, this is what Galen wants the reader to concede. But in fact, it was simply Galen's premise, expressed at the beginning of this passage through a rhetorical question ('who will deny...?'). Galen's demonstration is therefore not a real one; rather, he is arguing that his proposition ('the foot couldn't be in a better place') is simply *obvious*. And I think this is at the heart of the function of *ἀτὰρ οὖν καὶ* οὐδέ: repeating the same idea, Galen emphasises it as obvious without further demonstration.³⁰ Should one wish to render this nuance in English, I'd suggest 'and indeed, as it seems'. But such renderings may be useful only at the stage of a working translation. A comparable use of *ἀτὰρ οὖν οὐδέ* can be found at *Ars Medica*, XIII, 6, p. 314 Boudon = K. I, 340: again, all the existing translations diverge, and none renders the specific value of the adjunction introduced by *ἀτὰρ οὖν*. Other interesting examples are to be found in treatises that are lacking a reliable edition.

In another striking pattern, connected with the previous, *ἀτὰρ οὖν* is accompanied by the verb *φαίνομαι*. Here the *ἀτὰρ οὖν* connection is used to emphasize visual or intellectual evidence, which for Galen, especially in the field of anatomy, is a vital clue. That's probably why this pattern is so frequent in the *De Usu Partium*, Galen's masterpiece on the structure of the human body. In a way, this final pattern helps us understand better the bigger picture, because it is somehow more explicit.

De Usu Partium, XVI, 10 (II, 415 Helmreich = K. IV, 316)

νυνὶ δὲ κάτωθεν μὲν ἄνω τῆς κοίλης φλεβὸς ἀναφερομένης, ἄνωθεν δὲ κάτω τοῦ τε στομάχου καὶ τῆς τὸν θώρακα τρεφούσης φλεβὸς οὐκ ἦν προσῆκον οὐδὲ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀσφαλείας ὑπεριδεῖν, ἀλλὰ σκεπάσαι καὶ συνδῆσαι καὶ ὑποστορέσαι αἱ φρουρὰν καὶ πρόβλημα ποιήσασθαι τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῖς ἐκάτερον. ἀτὰρ οὖν καὶ φαίνεται ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα καὶ μηδὲν μηδὲ τοῦλάχιστον ἐρραθυμημένον τῶ τῶν ζώων δημιουργῶ.

As it is, however, with the vena cava passing up from below and with the oesophagus and vein that nourishes the thorax passing down from above, it was fitting not to overlook the safety of those parts either but to cover and unite them, support them with padding, and give them bones as protective barriers. Indeed, those things have obviously been done, and nothing, not even the least detail, has been neglected by the Creator of animals.³¹

The translator has rightly laid emphasis on the sentence introduced by *ἀτὰρ οὖν καὶ*, where the cluster works closely with the verb *φαίνεται* in order to suggest strongly that the fact is *obvious* for all to see. Similar examples can be found in *De Usu Partium* at K. III, 271, 639, 665, and 727.

From all those different contexts, it appears that the function of *ἀτὰρ οὖν καὶ* is to draw attention to the proposition that it links with the section that precedes it immediately in the text. It differs from a simple *καὶ*, in that it is a rare phrase occurring only in a few classical authors, especially Plato. To what extent does the Galenic *ἀτὰρ*

³⁰ For example, *De Causis Pulsuum* 9, 12, K., where Galen explicitly stresses that the contents of the proposition have just been demonstrated (ὡς νῦν ἀποδέδεικται).

³¹ Tr. M. T. May, vol. II, 709.

οὖν καί differ from the Platonic one? Despite the slight distinctions I have attempted to make in terms of context, both authors use it in a similar fashion and with similar aims. In other words, ἀτὰρ οὖν καί has the same function for Plato and for Galen. It is in turn different from the way Aesop uses it. I therefore think it is not too far-fetched to see it as a Platonic feature of Galen's style.³²

2. Deducing

Many of the connectives used by Galen fall into this category. The physician of Pergamum is particularly keen on promoting a rational form of medicine in which the quality of reasoning and demonstration is as important as facts, experience, and good practice. Galen repeatedly affirms his faith in his apodictic method, and exhorts his students or fellows to apply it with similar rigour and energy. He himself owes everything, he claims, to his excellent training in mathematics as a youth, for philosophy and medicine alone would have led him to Pyrrhonism.³³ As a result, Galen's style is heavily marked by recurrent emphasis on conclusions, usually based on logical deductions (*apodeixis*). It is therefore no wonder if we find so many ways in Galen (and indeed not always particles) to bring about deductive reasoning.

Inferential ἄρα

Being keen on philosophy and familiar with the resources of dialectics, Galen, in the wake of Plato and Aristotle, uses syllogisms quite frequently in his arguments. Syllogism is a strictly formalized form of argument; a stereotypical feature of syllogism in Greek is the conclusion, in which not all deductive particles are permitted. As van Ophuijsen has very insightfully shown for Plato, the key syllogistic deductive particle is ἄρα.³⁴ Other common deductive particles like οὖν and δὴ, *pace* Denniston, do not function in the context of a syllogism.³⁵ Similarly, both Aristotle, and Galen make great use of a form of syllogism, the conclusion of which, called συμπεράσμα, starts with ἄρα (in the second position).³⁶

The conciseness and strong unity of syllogism speak for themselves; a staple of philosophical discourse, syllogism is also a particularly powerful device. A famous page of Galen displays syllogisms at length: in the treatise *On the constitution of the art of medicine*, Galen criticizes the atomists. This passage is particularly significant to

³² As I tentatively suggested in Petit (2018), 71-72.

³³ Galen, *Ord. libr. propr.* 1, 1-13 Boudon-Millot (p. 88-91); on the importance of proof and syllogism in Galen, see J. Barnes (2003) and (1991).

³⁴ Van Ophuijsen, in Sicking and van Ophuijsen (1993).

³⁵ Denniston had argued in his time that Plato used any of the three.

³⁶ This use of ἄρα is not confined to philosophers; but it is marked as philosophical, as the numerous occurrences in Galen, Sextus Empiricus and Aristotle show. Besides, the number of occurrences in Galen would doubtless be even greater if we had preserved all of his logical treatises, especially the fifteen books *On Demonstration*. About this lost treatise, see Chiaradonna (2009). As it happens, Lucian uses it very consciously in a parody of philosophical talk; whenever Lucian pastiches the style of philosophers, he uses that very pattern in order to show its inanity. See *Jupp. Trag.* 51, 9 and *Vitarum auctio* (passim); also *De parasito*, 8, 22.

reconstruct the ‘lost theory of Asclepiades of Bithynia’ (Vallance). The object of the argument is pain and the material unity of man:

On the Constitution of the Art of Medicine, VII, 6-8 Fortuna (CMG V, 1, 3, 74-76)

φησιν οὖν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης· ἐγὼ δὲ φημι, εἰ ἐν ἧν <ὁ> ἄνθρωπος, οὐδέποτε ἂν ἤλγεεν, ὀρθότατα λέγων. τὸ γὰρ ἐν ἀμετάβλητον εἰς ἕτερον, οὐκ ἔχον γε εἰς ὃ μεταβάλῃ. τὸ δ’ ἀμετάβλητον ἀναλλοίω[ν]τον καὶ ἀπαθές, τὸ δ’ ἀπαθές ἀνώδυνον. γίνεται τοίνυν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων προτάσεων συμπέρασμα, τὸ ἐν ἀπαθές ὑπάρχειν· ἐφ’ ᾧ πάλιν ἕτερος ἐρωτηθήσεται λόγος τοίοςδε. εἰ ἐν ἧν τῷ εἶδει τὸ στοιχεῖον, οὐδὲν ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν οὐδέποτε ὀδυνήσεται· ἀλλὰ μὴν ὀδυνᾶται· οὐκ ἄρα ἐν ἐστὶ τὸ στοιχεῖον. ἐπεὶ δ’ ὑπέκειτο περὶ σαρκὸς ποιῆσθαι τὸν λόγον, ἐπ’ ἐκείνης ἐξεταζέσθω. εἰ ἐν ἐστὶ τῷ εἶδει τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς στοιχεῖον, οὐδέποτε ἢ σὰρξ ὀδυνήσεται· ἀλλὰ μὴν ὀδυνᾶται· οὐκ ἄρα ἐν ἐστὶ τῷ εἶδει τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς στοιχεῖον. ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ καθ’ ἕτερον ἐρωτηθήσεται τρόπον. εἰ ἀπαθές ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς στοιχεῖον, οὐκ ὀδυνήσεται· ἀλλὰ μὴν ὀδυνᾶται· οὐκ ἄρα [ἐν] ἐστὶν ἀπαθές. εἰ δὲ καὶ πλείω λέγοι τις εἶναι τὰ στοιχεῖα μὴ μέντοι γε ἀλλοιούμενα, καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ἐρωτηθήσεται κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον. εἰ ἀπαθῆ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα, οὐκ ἀλγήσει· ἀλλὰ μὴν ἀλγεῖ· οὐκ ἄρα ἐστὶν ἀπαθῆ τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς στοιχεῖα.

Hippocrates says this: *And I say that, if man was one, he wouldn't suffer pain*³⁷ – most rightly! For what is one is unable to change into something else, not having something to change into. And what cannot change cannot be altered and is impassive, and what is impassive cannot feel pain. From the above premises, it results that what is one is impassive. About which, in turn, one can ask in the following way: if the element was one in species, no part, in all beings, will ever suffer pain. But they suffer pain. Therefore the element is not one. And since the talk was about flesh, let's inquire about it: if the element that makes up flesh was one in species, flesh will never suffer pain. But it does suffer pain. Therefore the element that makes up flesh is not one in species. And the same will be asked in yet another way: if the element that makes up flesh is impassive, then it won't suffer pain. But it does suffer pain. Therefore it is not impassive. And if someone says that there are more elements, which are not altered, the same thing will be asked to him just the same: if the elements that make up flesh are impassive, they won't suffer pain. But they do suffer pain. Therefore the elements that make up flesh are not impassive.³⁸

Galen stresses the correctness of the Hippocratic statement he has given at the beginning. Contemplating the quality of Hippocrates' reasoning (which he explains in logical terms), he illustrates it through syllogistic examples. Indeed, instead of one example in the form of a syllogism, Galen gives *four* for his reader to ponder. If a single syllogism is powerfully convincing, then what of four syllogisms? This is a powerful page, where particles, especially (but not only) ἄρα, play a crucial part: they form the core structure of syllogism. Galen therefore displays his dialectical mastery (multiplying syllogisms) while using basic rhetorical strategies (such as repetition and anaphora) simultaneously. All in the service of Hippocrates, whose truthfulness he wants to emphasize. Beyond syllogism and arguments that are inspired by the syllogism, Galen sometimes uses the connective ἄρα in other contexts, hence giving a philosophical or

³⁷ Hipp. *Nat. Hom.* 2, 3 Jouanna – CMG I, 1, 3, 168.

³⁸ A translation of the last portion of text is available in J. T. Vallance (1990), 35.

dialectical twist to his text.³⁹ But ἄρα also has additional values best described as ‘interactional’ (see below).

Let us consider an additional phrase used by Galen, where ἄρα appears in combination with ταῦτα, the demonstrative pronoun, used in its so-called ‘adverbial’ sense. The actual meaning (‘that is why’) and function (deductive) of this phrase does not really pose a problem, although it has not been studied in any depth.⁴⁰ At any rate, it is worth stressing its relatively abundant occurrences in Galen.⁴¹ Further analysis in other writers will shed more light on the use of similar combinations in imperial Greek. I shall give but one example for ταῦτ’ ἄρα, at the beginning of *De Elementis secundum Hippocratem* 1, 4 De Lacy (CMG V, 1, 2 p. 56 = K. I, 414).

κἄν εἰ μὴ τέτταρα δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ πλείω κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἀναμίξαις ἀλλήλοις, ἐν εἶναι σοι καὶ ταῦτα φανεῖται πάντα καίτοι γ’ οὐχ ἐν ὄντα. ταῦτ’ ἄρα καὶ ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἐπισκεπτόμενος ἀνθρώπου φύσεως στοιχεῖα τῶν μὲν ὡς πρὸς τὴν αἰσθησιν ἀπλουστάτων τε καὶ πρώτων καταφρονεῖ, τὰ δ’ ὄντως τε καὶ φύσει ζητεῖ.

And if you mix together in the same way not four only, but many more, all these too will appear to you to be one; and yet they are not one. For this reason Hippocrates too, when inquiring into the elements of man’s nature, disdains those parts that are simplest and first relative to the senses and seeks those that are so in truth and by nature.⁴²

As already noted by Durling, this phrase is especially frequent in *De Usu Partium*, a teleological treatise: in fact, I think deductive features in general deserve to be studied in Galen (for the reasons already suggested), especially in his (indeed teleological) masterpiece *De Usu Partium*.

The use of *τοι, γάρ, οὖν*

Another interesting deductive particle (obviously based on three separate ones: *τοι, γάρ* and *οὖν*) is used by Galen in yet another type of context. Here, Galen is one of the few to make use of this somewhat heavy (should it count as sophisticated?) particle (‘therefore then’). Indeed, apart from Eusebius of Caesarea, no other ‘late’ or classical author uses this particle as much as Galen (171 occurrences). Galen favours this apparently logical connective in at least two specific contexts: for example, he uses it (a) when he wants to exhort readers or students to do something (imperative) or (b) when he reaches a particularly crucial conclusion – then, he uses imperative, future indicative or verbs like *χρή* or *δεῖ* followed by infinitive. The particle is thus strongly associated with a volitional context. In such cases, Galen puts the verb first, then the particle. For the

³⁹ Sometimes Galen uses the connective ἄρα with irony: see the second section of this paper on modal particles.

⁴⁰ I didn’t find any relevant literature on the subject.

⁴¹ Durling (1988), 183 had already drawn attention to the frequency of ταῦτ’ ἄρα in Galen’s works. In addition, examples of ταῦτά τοι (a parallel phrase?) can be found at *De Sanitate Tuenda* 3, 7 Koch (K. VI, 199 = CMG V, 4, 2, p. 88) and 4, 10 Koch (K. VI, 300 = CMG V, 4, 2, p. 132).

⁴² Tr. Ph. De Lacy p. 57.

first type of context, see for example *De anatomicis administrationibus* K. II, 626; *De differentiis februm* K. VII, 355; *De plenitudine* K. VII, 534 (V, 12 Otte, p. 40). But Galen also uses it when he wants to stress an affirmation, for example the correctness of Hippocrates' judgment, or Plato's agreement with Hippocratic dogmas. In this type of context, he puts forward the adverb (e.g. εἰκότως, ὀρθῶς) instead, then the particle. For this second type, see for example Galen's *De rebus boni malique suci* 10, 5 Helmreich, K. VI, 800 = CMG V, 4, 2 p. 419; *De sanitate tuenda* 5, 2 Koch, K. VI, 361 = CMG V, 4, 2 p. 159. In fact, Galen sometimes puts the particle first in the sentence; even if he only does so rarely, in so doing he reflects the similarly alternating tendency of other authors of the period (for example Lucian). But in most cases, he places τοιγαροῦν second in the sentence: he therefore follows Hippocrates, but he differs from many others, including Plato. Of course, putting the particle in the second position allows him to emphasize the first word (be it verb, adverb or adjective) easily: this use of the particle is more compatible with common rhetorical strategies of emphasis. The same remark applies to his use of other particles, such as ἄρα. Finally, Galen sometimes has this odd pleonastic formula opening a sentence: διὰ ταῦτα (or τοῦτο) τοιγαροῦν ('and that is why therefore then')!

I shall now turn towards 'modal' or 'attitudinal' particles, as they highlight another, complementary aspect of the pattern.

3. Interaction

Modal particles are a delicate subject, for the actual value of modal particles is particularly difficult to assess in all contexts with due homogeneity and coherence. I focus here on ἄρα (again), because it is one of the few really ambiguous modal particles (with δὴ) and because, once again, Galen seems to stand out among medical writers (with the notable exception of Hippocrates) when using it. Also, it was one of Eucken's key findings that the particle is found with considerable discrepancy in Aristotelian works.⁴³ A key aspect of Galenic prose (and one explaining in part Galen's long-term success and incredible fate) is constant involvement of the reader. I mean that Galen is careful – even when he may seem to prattle and to dissert at unsuitable length on a given subject – to never give the reader a feeling of being left out. Galen involves his reader in the demonstration (or personal story, or case-study, or diatribe, etc) through a number of features: person, tense and mood, real or fictive addressee, rhetorical questions, (no less rhetorical) apologies, explicit or non explicit allusions to classical texts – and the so-called modal (or attitudinal) particles. In short, Galen creates a permanent (if fictitious) *dialogue* with the reader.⁴⁴

In the following passage of the treatise *On Simple Drugs*, book I, Galen argues about how to determine the power of water:

⁴³ See note 2.

⁴⁴ On the various aspects and the significance of dialogism in Galen, see Petit (2012).

On Simple Drugs bk. I, 4 = K. 11, 389.

ἐμβάλλομεν γὰρ τηνικαῦτα τῶν ἀλῶν τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἄρα τὸ διαλλάττον ἐστὶν τῆς δυνάμεως, ὥστε τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ αὐτὸ τὸ γλυκὺ δηλονότι, τὸ μήτε ψυχρὸν ἐπιφανῶς μήτε θερμὸν, ἀλλ' οἶον τὸ καλούμενον εἰληθερές, εἰ προσφέρεις ἐρυσσιπέλατι, βλάβην οὐδεμίαν ἐργάση περὶ τὸ σῶμα τάνθρώπου.

For sometimes we add salt to water, and it changes its power to such an extent that fresh water, which in itself is neither clearly cold nor hot, but rather such as we call *sun warmed*,⁴⁵ won't do any harm to the man's body if you apply it onto an erysipelas.⁴⁶

Galen has just explained that (soft, drinkable) water is, in itself, cold – but if you add something to it that turns it into salty water (*vel sim.*), then its power also changes and it becomes hot, or indeed very hot. It is not a simple drug any more, Galen argues, but a compound one, with a different power. In this context, the use of the particle ἄρα makes a connection with what has just been argued. Galen puts forward a concrete example to back up his argument, and connects the two, first with γὰρ, then by inserting ἄρα in the main clause. The former is straightforward (it connects our sentence with the end of the former one, where Galen was introducing the example); the latter is more subtle: it is easy to recognize the deductive value of the particle, but only outside the context of a syllogism (and not as a connective). In this case we can talk of a ‘retrospective discovery’. By adding ἄρα, Galen both makes a connection with the whole argument and suggests that the evidence is coming through independently from his speech: evidence speaks for itself. As G. Wakker puts it, ‘ἄρα may also simply have the effect that the speaker disclaims responsibility for the truth of the proposition, even though he does not express disbelief. He dissociates himself from the truth of the proposition by explicitly indicating that, on the basis of the previous information and of the situation at hand, he cannot but conclude that a given fact is the case’.⁴⁷ As often in Galen's demonstrations, facts, not just well-devised arguments, dominate. Galen's clever use of the particle ἄρα is at the heart of this strategy. Many passages could be cited to reinforce this impression; for example, Galen often uses ἄρα in subordinate conditional clauses with a similar intention, as in:

On Simple Drugs, book I, 34 = K. 11, 441

(N. B. the manuscripts used here are M= *Marcianus App. cl.* V, 6 et U = *Urbinas gr.* 67).

⁴⁵ This is a rare word, and a conscious Hippocratic reminiscence (*Hipp. Morb. II, 27, 2*); but the adjective under this form has been dismissed by the most recent editor, J. Jouanna to be replaced in the Hippocratic text with a conjecture-based εἰληθερές. Whether we should adopt this conjecture is unclear, for the manuscripts of Galen agree, and several non-corrupt Hippocratic manuscripts agree with Galen. The word also appears in the *Glossary* (I was not able to consult the new critical edition by Lorenzo Perilli, *CMG* V, 13, 1 (2017) during the revision of this paper).

⁴⁶ My translation. There are no significant variant readings in the manuscripts for this sentence. For an overview of the textual transmission of this text in Greek, see Petit (2020).

⁴⁷ Wakker (1997b), 232.

εἰ δ' ἄρα καὶ μὴ τοῦτό τις, ἀλλὰ τὰ κολλητικὰ πάντα στυπτικὰ λέγοι, δειχθήσεται κἀνταῦθα πολλὰ κολλῶντα χωρὶς τοῦ στύφειν. οὐδέτερος οὖν ἀληθῆς λόγος ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδιορίστως λεχθεὶς, οὐθ' ὅταν ἅπαντα φάσκωσι τὰ στύφοντα κολλᾶν ἔλκος, οὐθ' ὅταν πάντα τὰ κολλώμενα διὰ τῶν στυφόντων κολλᾶσθαι.

1 δὲ ἄρα M || λέγοι U: λέγει M || 2 λόγος ἀληθῆς M || 4 τῶν om. M.

But suppose even that one does not say this, but says that all wound-healing drugs are astringent; it will be demonstrated in the same book⁴⁸ as well that many drugs actually heal wounds without being astringent. Therefore neither of these propositions is true as such and without qualification: when they say that all astringent drugs can heal a wound, nor when they say that all healing wounds do heal through astringent drugs.

Here Galen advocates against those who associate too easily the wound-healing and the astringent powers of drugs; he does so not so much because of the idea itself but rather because they fail to *demonstrate* it. Their assumptions cannot be proven: they are simply false. In this fairly rhetorical passage, Galen postpones his own demonstration of their error and failure, but clearly puts a distance between their (wrong) speech and his own by inserting ἄρα after the subordinating conjunction. As recently shown by G. Wakker in a different context, ἄρα in reported speech tends to indicate that the main speaker takes no part in the reported assumptions; ‘in conditional clauses (both in Thucydides and Herodotus), and perhaps also in other subordinate clauses (Herodotus only), she explains, ἄρα reflects the point of view of the original speaker. In dependent declaratives the interpretation depends on the position of ἄρα: when the particle directly follows the embedding device, it belongs to the perspective of the reporter; in other cases it belongs to the perspective of the original speaker. All in all, then, the interpretation seems guided more by the type of clause in which ἄρα figures (as well as by the position of ἄρα within the clause) than by other factors that have to do with the ‘involvement’ of the reporter, such as the oblique optative and indirect reflexive pronouns’.⁴⁹ The exact function of the potential optative here (unless one decides to go for the present given by manuscript M) would perhaps deserve to be discussed; but ἄρα certainly adds emphasis to the hypothesis that Galen is dismissing. Galen uses in a similar fashion a few other particles in combination with ἄρα, for example ποτ' ἄρα in hypotheses, or in subordinate clauses indicating fear.⁵⁰

In all those cases, and they are numerous, ἄρα and the subordinating conjunction may apparently build up one linguistic unit; and one could argue that it is by no means an original Galenic feature. Indeed, it is a classical feature found in many texts,

⁴⁸ *De Methodo Medendi*, mentioned earlier in the text by Galen.

⁴⁹ Wakker (1997b), 238.

⁵⁰ One should add the unique example of ἢ ποῦ ἄρα in the first few lines of the *De Methodo Medendi*; Kühn's text must be corrected in three separate words instead of two, but this is another classical reminiscence of the cluster found at Thucydides, V, 100 (see Wakker, 1997b, 230); Plat. *Gorg.* 448a 4, and Iamblichus (*Myst.* 5, 4, 32). However, Galen's works have rather less ἄρα-combinations than his contemporary Aelius Aristides. For examples of εἰ ποτ' ἄρα or μὴ ποτ' ἄρα, see *Exhortation to study the arts*, 9, 9 (Boudon p. 100); *On mixtures*, K. I, 636, 3 = Helmreich p. 79, 24.

including Demosthenes and Hippocrates. However, a quick look through the texts of his fellow doctors in the *TLG* shows that even this apparently straightforward combination of ἄρα with subordinating conjunctions is not found in any other imperial medical work. Again, by using fine Greek features (namely particles) in a classical way, Galen like Hippocrates before him singles himself out in the field of medicine – and conversely fits rather well among the literary works of the time. Among Antonine prose writers, only Aelius Aristides is as keen as Galen on exploiting all the potentialities of the particle ἄρα.

Perhaps a clearer example of the distance suggested or implied by ἄρα when reporting the opinions of others, is found in another rhetorical passage of *Simple Drugs*, book II:

On Simple Drugs, book II, 1 = 11, 461-462 K.

Κάντεῦθεν ἀρξάμενοι, δολιχὸν ἀποτείνουσι τὸν λόγον. καὶ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν Ἀναξαγόραν ἐπικαλοῦνται μάρτυρα, περὶ τῆς χιόνος ἀποφηνάμενον ὡς οὐκ εἶη λευκὴ. οὗτος ἄρα, φασί, φυσικὸς ἀνὴρ ὑπὲρ τὴν αἴσθησιν ἔστιν καὶ καταφρονεῖ μὲν τῶν ταύτης φαντασμάτων, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν λόγον ἀνέρχεται, καὶ τούτῳ τὴν τῶν ὄντων θηρᾶται φύσιν. ἐμὲ δ' εἰ χρὴ τὸ παριστάμενον εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἐλευθέρων τε καὶ παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον ἀλήθειαν σπουδάσαντα, μελαγχολίας ἐπέκεινα προεληλυθέναι νομίζω τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα ληροῦντας. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀνατρέψουσι τὰ διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἐναργῶς φαινόμενα, πόθεν ἄρξονται τῶν ἀποδείξεων οὐχ ἔξουσιν.

1 τὸν λόγον ἀποτείνουσι M || 3 οὗτος U: οὕτως M || ὑπὲρ U: ἔχον M || ἔστιν U: del. M || 5 φύσιν U: γνῶσιν M || ἐμὲ U: ἔγω M || 6 ἐλευθέρων M: ἐλευθερίον U || 9 ἔξουσιν U: ἔχουσιν M.

And starting with such a premise, they expand at length.⁵¹ Some of them even call on Anaxagoras as a witness about the snow; for he has shown that it is not white. This man of science, they claim, is above sense perception and despises the false impressions it generates, but turns to reasoning only, and through it (only) pursues the nature of things. But if I have to speak my mind, as a honest man and someone who has been seeking for truth all his life, I think that people who speak such rubbish are utterly mad. For if they overturn the phenomena which sense perception provides them with, they won't have any premise to start with.

At the beginning of book II, Galen complains about the ‘sophists’ who are responsible for the length of his treatise – because he then *has* to refute them, for the sake of truth and clarity. His main target in this relatively long exordium is the people who claim not to trust sense perception but use reasoning exclusively. Galen stands for the opposite (and reasonable) approach that we have no choice but to trust sense perception in the first place, then turn to reasoning when it comes to things that are hidden from us and stand beyond our perception. Addressing the reader in a deliberately vehement fashion,

⁵¹ Following De Lacy in his edition of *De semine* (CMG V, 3, 1 p. 154, 10), one should perhaps emend the text in δολιχὸν ἀποτείνουσι τοῦ λόγου (cf. Plat. *Prot.* 329 a 7). It is indeed very tempting to see a Platonic reminiscence in the use of this phrase, applied to sophists. De Lacy translates ‘they stretch out a great length of argument’.

Galen ridicules those who claim to abstain from using their senses to find out about nature. The presence of ἄρα in the reported speech of those ‘sophists’ who claim to follow Anaxagoras in their wrong (pretentious) approach to things is by no means artificial: it stresses Galen’s discrediting of his adversaries’ proposition. Although it can hardly be rendered in English, except perhaps by intonation, ἄρα in this type of context is of course deeply ironic. Galen bitingly concludes that madness (*melancholia*) is the only possible explanation for the bizarre arguments of his opponents. Such sarcastic pieces are not rare in Galen, who enjoys tearing his enemies to shreds, particularly at the beginning of a book, as an appetizer, so to speak.⁵²

The use of ἄρα is but one of the manifold rhetorical and linguistic devices displayed by Galen in similar contexts; rhythm, vocabulary and syntax contribute equally to the same powerful impression on the reader. But in the same way as Demosthenes’ biting irony displays frequent occurrences of the modal ἄρα, Galen’s diatribes against other medical writers, whom he dismissingly calls ‘sophists’, are rarely found without a sarcastic ἄρα; for, in a similar fashion, one can interpret as sarcastic some occurrences of ἄρα in rhetorical questions where the logical ‘meaning’ could be preferred at first sight; or rather, the logical ἄρα is used in a sarcastic way in order to stress the incongruity of the proposition⁵³. Indeed, in a written text, particles play a crucial part in carrying the speaker’s intentions and feelings. Galen is perfectly conscious of the potential of modal particles and exploits them to the full. Study of other particles (for example δὴ and its numerous combinations, and more importantly τοῖνον) would doubtless yield similar results.

Conclusion

This study of selected particles and particle clusters in Galen, however provisional, has yielded a number of interesting results. Galen uses certain connectives with special care and sophistication: the case of ἀτὰρ οὐν καί, in particular, points to a really original stylistic feature in Galen and a conscious nod to Plato. Particles such as ἄρα are used by Galen in their full range of functionality, in the fabric of argumentation (syllogism and related forms of argument) and as a sign of dialogism. A close study of τοῖνον demonstrates that Galen uses it in some specific contexts (exhortation, strong conclusions). Galen’s use of particles can therefore be illuminated and better understood through attentive study. It opens perspectives for the analysis and the mapping out of his texts. And it can reveal previously muted layers of intertextuality. Let this be an encouragement for further study of particles in Galen, as well as in his many contemporary prose writers.

Galen’s use of particles is revelatory of Galen’s talent and of his authorial ambition. Particles, at a primary level, allow him to make a statement of moderate Atticism, or at least show some concern for linguistic correctness and elegance; they enable him to display his extensive classical culture (as we have seen, through fine allusions to Plato’s language in particular). They also play a crucial role in his argumentation. Of course, they represent more than that – to an extent, they are Galen’s own voice. The intention,

⁵² On polemical discourse and sarcasm in Galen, see Petit (2018), 90-111.

⁵³ Such is my explanation for ἄρα at *Const. Art. Med.* p. 64, 29 Fortuna, and several occurrences in *Nat. Fac.* (e.g. II, 8, K. II, 107 = Helmreich *SM III*, p. 179).

the tone, the irony conveyed by modal particles make Galen come alive. Meanwhile, particles act as a guide through his texts, to illuminate their intricate logic. In authors other than Galen, medical prose can appear plain, didactic and colourless. With Galen on the contrary, narratives, demonstrations, refutations and most other text-types are sophisticated, sometimes to the point of excess (discouraging some modern readers along the way). Durling may have been correct when he suggested that Galen's use of particles evolved to something close to mannerism, although confirming his intuition would require further research.⁵⁴ There is a kind of *recherché* attitude in Galen's use of particles. It is thus fair to say that they contribute greatly to his authorial voice and showcase the precision and vividness of his style. Galen's use of language and style, together with a certain mastery of rhetoric, certainly enhanced his career prospects in Rome.⁵⁵ More importantly, they are a potential gateway into the subtleties of imperial Greek prose that he so elegantly embodies.

University of Warwick

Bibliography

- Bakker, E. J. ed. (2010) *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Oxford
- Bakker, E. J. ed. (1997) *Grammar as Interpretation. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Context*, Leiden
- Bakker, S. J. & Wakker, G. eds (2009) *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, Leiden
- Barnes, J. (2003) 'Proofs and Syllogisms in Galen', in J. Jouanna (ed), *Galien et la philosophie. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 49, 1-29
- Barnes, J. (1991) 'Galen on Logic and Therapy', in R. J. Durling and F. Kudlien (eds), *Galen on the Method of Healing*, Leiden: Brill, 50-102
- Chiaradonna, R. (2009) 'Le traité de Galien *Sur la démonstration* et sa postérité tardoantique', in R. Chiaradonna and F. Trabattoni (eds.), *Physics and Philosophy of Nature in Greek Neoplatonism*, Leiden: Brill, 43-77
- Coker, A. (2019), 'Galen and the Language of Old Comedy: glimpses of a lost treatise at PA 23b-28' in C. Petit (ed), *Galen's περί ἀλμπίας (De indolentia) in Context: A tale of resilience*, *Studies in Ancient Medicine* 52, Leiden: Brill, 63-90
- Denniston, J. D. (1954), *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed., Oxford (first edition 1934)
- Des Places, E. (1929) *Etudes sur quelques particules de liaison chez Platon*, Paris
- Durling, R. J. (1995) 'ἀτὰρ οὐν καί in Galen and in his predecessors', *Glotta* 73, 76
- Durling, R. J. (1993) *A Dictionary of Medical Terms in Galen*, Leiden
- Durling, R. J. (1988) 'Greek particles and particle clusters in Galen', *Glotta* 66, 183-189
- Durling, R. J. (1986) 'Prepositional Idiom in Galen', *Glotta* 64, 24-30
- Durling, R. J. (1982) 'Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Writings, Part III', *Glotta* 60, 236-244
- Durling, R. J. (1981) 'Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Writings, Part II', *Glotta* 59, 108-116

⁵⁴ Durling (1988, 183).

⁵⁵ Cf. L. Kim (2010), 478.

- Durling, R. J. (1980) 'Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Writings', *Glotta* 58, 260-265
- Durling, R. J. (1979) 'Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Pharmacological Writings', *Glotta* 57, 218-224
- Eucken, R. (1866) *De Aristotelis dicendi ratione*, Göttingen
- Fortuna, S. & Urso, A.M. (2009) 'Burgundio da Pisa traduttore di Galeno: nuovi contributi e prospettive, con un'appendice di P. Annese', in I. Garofalo, A. Lami, A. Roselli (eds), *Sulla tradizione indiretta dei testi medici greci. Atti del Seminario Internazionale (Siena, 19-20 settembre 2008)*, Pisa, 141-177
- Herbst, W. (1911), *Galenus Pergamensis de Atticissantium studiis testimonia*, Leipzig
- House, D. K. (1980) 'The life of Sextus Empiricus', *Classical Quarterly* 30, 227-38
- Inglese, G. (2018), 'Connectives and Discourse Markers in Ancient Greek. The Diachrony of atár from Homeric Greek to Classical Attic', *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 93-123
- Jouanna, J. (2009), 'Médecine et philosophie: sur la date de Sextus Empiricus et celle de Diogène Laërce à la lumière du *Corpus galénique*', *REG* 122-2, 359-390
- Kim, L. (2010), 'The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic', in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Oxford, 2010, 468-482
- Kroon, C. (1995) *Discourse Particles in Latin. A study of nam, enim, vero and autem*, Amsterdam
- Kühn, J.-H., and Fleischer, U. (1986-1990), *Index Hippocraticus. Fasc.1-4*, Groningen
- Langslow, D. (2000), 'Latin Discourse Particles, 'Medical Latin' and 'Classical Latin'', *Mnemosyne* 53-5, 537-560
- Páez, M. (2012), 'Bibliography about Greek Particles (1935-2010)', *Syntaktika* 42, 3-43
- Petit, C. (2020), 'Les manuscrits grecs du traité des Simples de Galien', *Archives Internationales d'Histoire des Sciences* 70, 76-113
- Petit, C. (2018), *Galien de Pergame ou la rhétorique de la Providence. Médecine, littérature et pouvoir à Rome*, Mnemosyne Supplements 420, Leiden : Brill
- Petit, C. (2012), 'Galien et le "discours de la méthode": rhétorique (s) médicale (s) à l'époque romaine', in J. Coste (ed.) *La rhétorique médicale à travers les siècles. Actes du colloque de Paris, Académie de Médecine, Octobre 2008*, Genève: Droz, 49-75
- Rijksbaron, A. ed. (1997), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, Amsterdam
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1971), *Autour de 'te épique'. Etudes sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam
- Sicking, C. M. G. & Van Ophuijsen, J. (1993) *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage. Lysias and Plato*, Leiden
- Vallance, J. T. (1990) *The Lost Theory of Asclepiades of Bithynia*, New York
- Wakker, G. (1997a), 'Emphasis and Affirmation. Some aspects of μήν in Tragedy', in Rijksbaron ed. (1997), 209-231
- Wakker, G. (1997b), 'Modal Particles and Different Points of View in Herodotus and Thucydides', in Bakker ed. (1997), 215-250
- Wakker, G. (1994) *Conditions and Conditionals. An investigation of ancient Greek*, Amsterdam
- Weydt, H. (1969), *Abtönungspartikel*, Berlin
- Wifstrand, A. (1964), *Eikota: Emendationen und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit, VIII. Galenos zum dritten Mal*, Lund

APPENDIX: GALEN'S USE OF SELECTED PARTICLES

The table below is a provisional picture of selected particles and particle clusters in Galen, illustrating their function(s) and indicating, where relevant, comparative usage in other authors. The passages in Galen are cited in the latest critical edition available or in Kühn where there is no other choice. Based on the terminology and framework proposed by Caroline Kroon in *Discourse Particles in Latin*, the following categories have been adopted:

Particle or particle cluster: in alphabetical order, particles and clusters of particles (the latter being equivalent to new particles)

Frequency: Galen, like every Greek author, shows preferences in using particles; in this column I include some remarks on the frequency (high or low) of some particles in Galen, by contrast with other prose writers, but no statistics.

Context: I specify what can be said of the context in the terms established by C. Kroon – usually *monologic*, and either strictly *monological* or *diaphonic*

Type and Function of the particle: I analyse the function (connective, attitudinal, ...) of each particle and the level of discourse (representational, presentational, interactional) where the particle acts in a given (con)text

Text-type, genre, form: here I introduce formal characteristics of the texts under study

Example: references to selected relevant passages (for illustration). In bold, the passages discussed in the article. The references are to editions cited in the main article.

Particle	Frequency	Context (discourse type)		Type and function of the particle	Text type, genre, form	Example
		monological dialogical	monological monological			
ἀποα	Relatively high ca. 500		Diaphonic	A modal particle that works at interactional rather than at presentational level; yet, emphasizing coherence ('we cannot but conclude that' van Ophuijsen 1993, 83)		
			Monophonic			
		yes (any type of clause)		Disclaiming responsibility	reported speech (polemical)	<i>Simpl. Med.</i> , 11, 461-462 K.
		Yes. Assertions (apodosis)		(with reference to something that has been agreed beforehand)	Argument	<i>Simpl. Med.</i> , 11, 389 K.

116 GREEK PARTICLES

			assertions (apodosis)		'inferential'	Syllogism (argument)	<i>Const. Art.</i> <i>Med.</i> 7, 6-8 <i>Fortuna</i>
			hypotheses (subordinate clause; conditional): ei ἄρα		With ref. to an element previously agreed	Argument	<i>Simpl.</i> <i>Med.</i> 11, 441 K.
ἄρα οὖν	high; Platonic		Yes; questions (rhetorical and not)			Polemical; rhetorical	<i>UP</i> III, 13 = Helmreich vol. I, p. 182, 8
ἀράρ δέ	very low or indeed absent (Hippocratic; contrast Aretaeus)			yes	Connective; presentational		
ἀράρ οὖν (καί)	high (Platonic feature?)			Yes; usually announced by μέν or ἄλλος τε	Connective with special emphasis (sort of strong καί); presentational?	Narrative (enumeration) argument	<i>Præcogn.</i> 5, 11 Nutton <i>De Semine</i> I, 11, 15 <i>UP</i> III, 10 =

118 GREEK PARTICLES

γε					Limitative; presentational		
γε μήν							
γούν							
δέ				yes	Connective; presentational		<i>UP</i> III, 13 = Helmreich vol. I, p. 181, 3
δέ δή			yes	yes	Connective, presentational and interactional	Argument	<i>De Semine</i> I, 5, 5 De Lacy; <i>Opt.</i> <i>Doctrina</i> 4, 4 Barigazzi
δέ δῖρον	Platonic?		yes	yes	Connective with emphasis; presentational and interactional	Argument	
δή			yes		Emphasis on coherence: 'as we both can see' van Oph. 1993, 83; interactional (see collocations)		
δῖθεν	Relatively high esp. by comparison						<i>Opt.</i> <i>Doctrina</i> 1, 2

	with Attic writers and Atticists in Galen's time (absent from Aelius Aristides; frequent in Lucian)						Barigazzi. <i>Praecogn.</i> 9, 2; 13, 5 Nutton
ὄφρα	Relatively high; Platonic – various collocations (see γάρ μέν and δέ)				Interactional; 'the dictum is offered as being self-evident, yet it is at the same time implicitly acknowledged that its self-evidence is only surmised and might be called in doubt' Sticking 1993, 63	Argument	<i>De Semine</i> 1, 4, 17; 1, 5, 22 De Lacy
καί				yes			
καί γάρ							
καί δὴ			yes	yes			
καί δέ καί			yes				

120 GREEK PARTICLES

καὶ μήν			yes		Presentational and interactional	Argument	<i>De Semine</i> I, 5, 6 De Lacy
καὶ τοίνυν			yes				<i>UP</i> III, 13 = Helmreich vol. I, p. 186, 16
μέν					Introduces -first point of an argument, -first example, -first event,... (functions with δέ). Presentational		
μέν γάρ					Id., with explanatory function. Presentational		
μέν ὅτι					Id., with emphasis on obviousness (see ὅτι). Presentational and interactional.	Argument	<i>UP</i> III, 13 = Helmreich vol. I, p. 180, 22
μέν ὅτι οὖν					Connective with emphasis; presentational and	Argument	<i>Opt. Doctrina</i> 2.2

μέλν οὐν				yes; opening of a section	interaccional (see δὲ ὅπρου)				Barigazzi
μήν			yes. In all sorts of grammatical positions.		'seems to be at home in expressing the contrary of what the person addressed might either wish or suppose'; it 'marks a distance between interlocutors' (Sicking 1993, 54); interaccional	Argument			<i>De Semine</i> 1, 4, 8 De Lacy
οὐν	very high ca. 12,000			Yes. Opening of utterance.	Presentational; connective; 1. inferential 2. transitional	Argument Narrative			
πρὸν	high; Platonic.		Yes. Questions, hypotheses (εἰ πρὸν),		Interaccional; 'with πρὸν a speaker presents his statement as a	narrative			<i>Præcogn.</i> 3, 1 Nutton

122 GREEK PARTICLES

			comparisons, G.abs., ...		surmise whose accuracy he does not vouch for so that disputing it need not impair the basis for an understanding between the two partners in the conversation' Sicking 1993, 59 (see $\delta\eta\rho\upsilon$ and its collocations).		
$\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}$ ἄρα ($\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}$ ἄρα)	High, esp. in <i>UP</i>		yes	yes	Both presentational and interactional?	argument	<i>Elem. Sec. Hipp. 1, 4 De Laey</i>
$\tau\omicron\upsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$	high		yes		Interactional; 1. stress an affirmation	Argument (stress rightness of Hippocratican ideas; Plato's agreement with Hippocrates)	<i>Bon. Mal. Suc. 10, 5 Helmreich; San. Tu. V, 10 = 6, 361 K.</i>

					2. volitional context (see <i>τοίνυν</i>)	Instruction (anatomy)	<i>Anat. Adm.</i> 2, 626 K.		
			yes	Interaccional; Sicking 1993, 31. cf. <i>καίτοι</i> and <i>μέγιστοι</i> (49) 1. Emphasis on the speaker's account – thesis or story ('now you take it from me that' van Oph. 1993, 83)	Argument	<i>De Semine</i> I, 12, 3; I, 13, 12; I, 13, 13 De Lacy			
					Narrative	<i>Loc. Aff.</i> V, 9 = 8, 363 K.			
<i>τοίνυν</i>	very high		Yes; imperative or hortative subjunctive	2. 'volitional' context	Instruction: handbook of anatomy (dissection);	<i>Anat. Adm.</i> 2, 218 K.			
					Argument (fict. addressee)	<i>De Semine</i> I, 5, 17 De Lacy			
					prescription: letter	<i>Puero epileptico cons.</i> 11, 362, K.			