

## GALEN'S *DE CONSTITUTIONE ARTIS MEDICAE* IN THE RENAISSANCE\*

During the sixteenth century Galen's *De constitutione artis medicae* (i.224–304 Kühn) enjoyed a great success: in about fifty years it received four different Latin translations and three commentaries.<sup>1</sup> Certainly this is also true of other medical classical texts, but such success is surprising for a treatise which did not have a wide circulation either in the Middle Ages or in the seventeenth century and later. In fact it is preserved in its entirety in only one Greek manuscript (Florence, Laur. plut. 74.3 = L of the twelfth or thirteenth century, with later corrections = L<sup>2</sup>) and in a Latin translation by Niccolò of Reggio, who worked mainly for King Robert I in Naples in the first half of the fourteenth century. Furthermore, in his edition of 1679 René Chartier made a mistake, which the humanistic editors of the Greek Galen had avoided. The last part of the *De const. art. med.* itself enjoyed a considerable *fortuna* as an independent tract on prognosis in the Greek and Latin manuscript tradition. The editors of the Aldine and the Basle editions knew such an *excerptum*, at least in the manuscript Par. gr. 2165 (= P) of the sixteenth century, and rightly decided not to print it. Chartier found it in the manuscript Par. gr. 2269 of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and published it in the wrong belief that it was a new treatise of Galen's (vol. ii.170–95 = viii.891–5). He was followed by Carl Gottlob Kühn in his edition of 1821, who printed the *De const. art. med.* in the first volume (289–304) and the *De praesagitura* in vol. xix.497–511. The error was not publicly detected until Kalbfleisch in 1896.<sup>2</sup>

\* I am very grateful to Vivian Nutton for his suggestions during my research and his comments on my paper. I wish to thank also Ernesto Berti, Antonio Carlini, Richard Durling, Amneris Roselli, Nancy Siraisi and John Symons.

<sup>1</sup> On the Renaissance Latin translations of Galen, see R. J. Durling, 'A Chronological Census of Renaissance Editions and Translations of Galen', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 24 (1961), 230–305. Only few of them have received a critical examination: Thomas Linacre's translations by R. J. Durling, 'Linacre and Medical Humanism', in F. Madisson, M. Pelling and C. Webster (eds.), *Linacre Studies, Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460–1524* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 76–106, and those of the treatise on prognosis by V. Nutton, *Galen, On Prognosis*, CMG v.8.1 (Berlin, 1979), pp. 41–2. A reliable catalogue of commentaries on Galen is not available; there is only that of J. Ch. G. Ackermann, 'Historia literaria Claudii Galeni', in C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, vol. i (Leipzig, 1821, repr. Hildesheim, 1964), pp. lxxvii–clxxxvi. Leonhart Fuchs' commentaries on Galen were philologically studied by R. J. Durling, 'Leonhart Fuchs and his Commentaries on Galen', *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 24 (1989), 42–7. On the history of Galen's text in the Renaissance and the philological activities of some medical humanists, see V. Nutton, *John Caius and the Manuscripts of Galen* (the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary volume no. 13, 1987). On Galen's influence on Renaissance medicine, see A. Wear, 'Galen in the Renaissance', in V. Nutton (ed.), *Galen: Problems and Prospects* (the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1981), pp. 226–62.

<sup>2</sup> K. Kalbfleisch, 'Zu Galenos', *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 16 (1896), 59–60. There are ten Greek manuscripts of the *excerptum* on prognosis, from the twelfth to the sixteenth century, and four or five of them (Rome, Vat. gr. 1063 = B, 12th or 13th cent.; Vat. gr. 283 = V, 13th cent.; Leiden, Voss. gr. Q 45 = Q, 15th cent.; and Venice, Marc. Ven. app. cl. v, 5 = M, 15th or 16th cent.; and in some passages, Paris, Par. gr. 2332 = N, 15th cent., which contains some short *excerpta* of the part on prognosis), are useful for reconstructing their common source (z), which is independent of L. On the tradition of the *De const. art. med.*, see S. Fortuna, 'La tradizione del *De constitutione artis medicae* di Galeno', *Bollettino dei classici*, s. 3, 11 (1990),

## 1. LATIN TRANSLATIONS

Niccolò's medieval translation of the *De const. art. med.* was printed in the first Latin edition of Galen's *Opera omnia*, prepared by Diomedes Bonardus of Brescia in 1490, and it was reprinted several times in the course of just a few years: in the edition by Hieronymus Surianus of Rimini in 1502, in that probably published by Bernardus Benalius in Venice in 1513, in that by Rusticus of Piacenza in 1515–16, in the first Giuntine in 1522, and finally in the second Giuntine in 1528.<sup>3</sup>

In 1525, the Aldine *editio princeps* was published under the direction of Giovanni Battista Opizzoni, and for the first time provided an accessible Greek text of Galen. A large number of new Latin translations followed soon afterwards.<sup>4</sup> The first one of the *De const. art. med.* was made by Guinther of Andernach (1505–74), for the Paris printer Simon de Colines in 1531. One or two years earlier Guinther had published with the same printer a Greek edition of this treatise (which is actually only a defective copy of the Aldine),<sup>5</sup> and in view of its introductory character, he dedicated it to Michael Brailon, a young would-be physician otherwise unknown. The *De const. art. med.* is one of the forty-two works of Galen, including the *De anatomicis administrationibus*, which Guinther translated between 1528 and 1536, contributing considerably to the rediscovery of Galenic medicine in his own day. He played the role of Galen's translator during his stay in Paris, initially as student of medicine and later as professor, but it seems that he did not continue translating when he left Paris around 1538 for Metz and then for Strasbourg, to escape from persecution as a Protestant.<sup>6</sup>

48–77. In that paper I do not consider manuscripts of Niccolò's Latin translation, but recently Vivian Nutton has pointed out to me that it is preserved in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque de l'Académie de Médecine, Par. Acad. 53, 15th cent. (see A. Boinet, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Académie de Médecine* (Paris, 1908), pp. 21–2), which is a twin of that of Dresden, Db 92, seriously damaged in the second world war; see V. Nutton, 'A Forgotten Manuscript of Galenus Latinus', in K. Treu (ed.), *Studia Codicologica* (Berlin, 1977), pp. 330–40.

<sup>3</sup> With regard to Niccolò's translation of the *De const. art. med.*, Surianus' edition and the Giuntine of 1522 are not mentioned by Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 284. On the existence of Bernardus Benalius' edition, see L. C. Mackinney, 'The Third Printing of Galen's Opera Omnia', *Isis* 41 (1950), 199–201, quoted by Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 279. On the other Latin editions of Galen, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 21–2.

<sup>4</sup> On the philological preparation of the Aldine and its importance in the history of Galen's text, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 38–42.

<sup>5</sup> The date is not given in the edition, and the precise year is uncertain; see Fortuna, op. cit. (n. 2), 73.

<sup>6</sup> On Guinther's life, see P. G. Bietenholz and Th. B. Deutscher, *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, vol. ii (Toronto–Buffalo–London, 1986), pp. 152–4; on his first period until 1527, see F. Broemer, 'Zur Biographie Johann Winters aus Andernach (1505–1574) bis zum Jahre 1527', *Landeskundliche Vierteljahres-Blätter* 31 (1985), 137–45; on Guinther's stay in Strasbourg and his treatise on the plague, see S. Wust, 'Le Docteur Jean Guinther d'Andernach, médecin strasbourgeois de la Renaissance et la peste', *Histoire des sciences médicales* 21 (1987), 43–4. On Guinther's anatomy and his relations with Vesalius, who was his student, see C. D. O'Malley, *Andreas Vesalius of Brussels (1514–1564)* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964), pp. 54–61; on his compromise with Paracelsus' new medicine, see A. G. Debus, 'Guintherius, Libarius, and Sennert: The Chemical Compromise in Early Modern Medicine', in A. G. Debus (ed.), *Science, Medicine and Society in the Renaissance, Essays to Honour Walter Pagel* (New York, 1972), pp. 151–4; *The French Paracelsism: The Chemical Challenge to Medical and Scientific Tradition in Early Modern France* (Cambridge–New York–Port Chester–Melbourne–Sydney, 1991), pp. 1–5, 19–21; and also K. H. Weimann, 'Der Renaissance-Arzt Johann Winther von Andernach. Seine Beziehungen zum oberrheinischen Paracelsismus und zum Paracelsus-Lexikon des Michael Toxites', *Würzburger medizinhistorische Mitteilungen* 7 (1989), 215–32.

In the preface to his translation Guinther writes: 'Caeterum non mediocris in hoc opere vertendo fuit labor, primum quod exemplar fuerit depravatam, deinde etiam quod multa hic desiderata, ex veteri translatione erant petenda. Quae quam sit corrupta, quis vel mediocriter eruditus non perspicit?' By *exemplar* Guinther refers to the Aldine, which he also mentions in a marginal annotation (p. 22<sup>v</sup>). Certainly his opinion of the Greek edition is well founded (the Aldine has an omission in 293.7–297.10), but the same cannot be said of Niccolò's version.<sup>7</sup> At any rate, Guinther did what he said: he filled in the long gap of the Aldine on the basis of Niccolò's translation, without consulting other manuscripts.<sup>8</sup> This is evident, although Guinther made modifications in terminology and above all in style, changing the word order, eliminating particles and, on the whole, summarizing Niccolò's text where he found it redundant or unclear. Obviously, the two versions have many mistakes in common, and to see this, it is sufficient to quote 294.16–295.1: ὅσα – δηλώσει om. Nic. Guin. Unfortunately, the various editions of Niccolò's translation are very similar in this section, and it is therefore impossible to identify which of them Guinther used. Probably it was one of the latest editions (1515–28), because both these and Guinther include ὥσπερ (*ita*) in 294.1. For all the rest of the text, Guinther followed the Aldine closely and quite obstinately. When it is clearly wrong and untranslatable, he proposed his own corrections, undervaluing and disregarding Niccolò's superior version; for example, 289.10–11: διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς ἤδη γεγονέναι προγνωστικούς τῶν ἐσομένων ἱατροῦς (*propterea quod multi medici sunt pronosticatores futurorum* Nic.): ...πολλὰ...προγνωστικὴν...ἱατρικὴν Ald.: *quia medicina futurorum divinatricis facta est* Guin.<sup>9</sup>

Guinther's translation was widely used by René Chartier in his edition of 1679, for both the Latin version and the Greek text. Chartier actually attempted to improve on the previous Greek editions by including readings mostly translated out of Guinther's Latin.<sup>10</sup> Chartier's text was reprinted by Kühn in his edition of 1821, and hence some of Guinther's less felicitous renderings have continued to haunt modern scholars. However, during the sixteenth century, unlike other translations by Guinther, that of the *De const. art. med.* was not often reprinted, and never appeared in any of the Latin editions of Galen's *Opera omnia*.<sup>11</sup> Probably it was considered completely superseded after the publication of the Basle edition in 1538, which provided a better Greek text.<sup>12</sup>

In fact, in this new Greek edition of Galen, the text of the *De const. art. med.* was much corrected on the basis of Niccolò's translation, and in particular the Aldine omission was filled in on the basis of a manuscript belonging to the English physician John Clement, Par. gr. 2165, which contains the *excerptum* on prognosis. There is no evidence that this manuscript was in Basle in 1538, but it is known that the Basle editors used 'exemplari illo quod ex Anglia transmissum erat', which was 'priori multo castigatius'.<sup>13</sup> Probably such an *exemplar* was an Aldine edition sent from

<sup>7</sup> On the relationship of the Renaissance translators with the medieval ones and on their unjust contempt for previous versions, see Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 231–45; 'Linacre', pp. 76–106.

<sup>8</sup> On Josephus Struthius' accusation that Guinther did not undertake the task of finding Greek manuscripts, see Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 237 n. 37.

<sup>9</sup> On the relation of Guinther's translations to Niccolò's and the Aldine, see Nutton, *On Prognosis*, pp. 41–2; and on their negligible philological value, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 43, 50–1.

<sup>10</sup> On Chartier's Greek based on Latin translations, see Fortuna, op. cit. (n. 2), 75–6.

<sup>11</sup> See Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 284.

<sup>12</sup> On the Basle edition and its philological importance, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 43–4.

<sup>13</sup> Basle edition, vol. ii, a 2<sup>r</sup>; see Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 44.

England, in which corrections from Clement's manuscript had been inscribed. Par. gr. 2165 is the manuscript copied by Nicolaos Pachus from that of Marcus Musurus (Marc. Ven. app. cl. v.5), probably for Francesco Asolano, who used it as printer's copy for a part of the Aldine, in whose preparation Clement also had a hand.<sup>14</sup>

Three years later, two new Latin translations were published, one by Bartolomeo Silvani in the first Giuntine of the new series edited by Agostino Gadaldino and Giovanni Battista Da Monte, and another by Vettore Trincavelli in the rival edition prepared by him and Agostino Ricci.<sup>15</sup> It is certain that Trincavelli and above all Ricci put much effort into searching for unknown Greek manuscripts for the new translations and the revision of old ones, but it can be established beyond doubt that no new manuscript was used for the *De const. art. med.* Trincavelli<sup>16</sup> based his translation on the Greek of the Basle edition in section 293.7–297.10 (where the Aldine has the long omission), for this translation has mistakes in common with the Basle edition; see:

295.4–5: *κᾶν ἡλκωμένον ἥ τι* L: om. Bas. Trinc.: *κᾶν μόριόν τι ἐλκωθέν ἥ* *perperam* Kühn ex Char. sec. Nic. Guin. *sive aliqua particula fuerit ulcerata*;  
296.3: *πειρατέον εἰς ὅσον ἔστι* L z Nic. (*εἰς – ἔστι* in ras. L<sup>2</sup>): om. Bas. Trinc.;  
296.16: *ἐνεκεν* L z Nic.: om. Bas. Trinc.

However, a few corrections were made by Trincavelli on the basis of Niccolò's translation; see:

295.13: *κρίσιμων καὶ κρίσεων* L Nic.: *κρίσεων* Bas.: *de criticis diebus...et de crisi* Nic.: *de iudiciis, decretoriisque diebus* Trinc.: *κρίσεων καὶ κρίσιμων ἡμερῶν* *perperam* Kühn ex Char. sec. Trinc.;  
296.11–13: *ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ κινδυνεύσαι τὰ ἔσχατα. δυσδιάγνωστα δ' ἔστι τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν αἰτίων ὡς ἂν μὴδέπω λυποῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον* L BV Nic.: om. Bas: *aliquando autem et periclitari summe. Difficile autem cognoscibiles sunt huiusmodi causae tamquam non contristantes hominem* Nic.: *quandoque vero ne extreme periclitetur. Verum saepe hae causae sunt cognitu difficiles, quum nullam fere homini molestiam praestet* Trinc.: *ποτέ δὲ καὶ ἐσχάτως κινδυνεύσαι. δυσδιάγνωστοι δὲ τοιαῦται αἰτίαι ἅτε οὐ λυπούσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον* *perperam* Kühn ex Char. sec. Nic. Guin.

As regards the remainder of the *De const. art. med.*, Trincavelli mostly followed the Basle edition, itself sometimes based on Niccolò's translation, and he accepted mistakes that are not in the Aldine; see:

244.5: *οὐκ* add. Bas. sec. Nic. *non: non omnino* Trinc.;  
284.10–11: *αἱ δὲ ἐμφράξεις τε καὶ σφηνώσεις τούτου εἰσὶ γένους* add. Bas. sec. Nic.: *obstructiones autem et inculcationes ad hoc genus pertinent* Nic. Trinc.;  
293.6: *καὶ πολλάκις γε σὺν τῇ νίκῃ* L Ald. Nic.: *πολλάκις γε καὶ πρὸ τῆς νίκης* Bas.: *et saepe ante partam victoriam* Trinc.

He did not disregard the Aldine completely, for he correctly followed it, for example, at:

289.8: *πάλιν* L Ald.: *πάν* Bas. sec. Nic. *omnem: vero* Trinc.;  
292.5–7: *καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦδε τὴν πρόγνωσιν ἐπαγγέλλονται, τοῦ πάντ' ὀρθῶς ἢ οὐκ ὀρθῶς γενήσασθαι περὶ τοὺς νοσοῦντας* L Ald.: secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: *immo et idipsum se praesagire pollicentur, nimirum futurumne sit ut omnia recte an perperam circa aegrotantes peragantur*

<sup>14</sup> See Fortuna, op. cit. (n. 2), 53–4, 59–60, 73–4.

<sup>15</sup> On the Giuntine of 1541–2, see Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 50; and O'Malley, op. cit. (n. 6), pp. 101–2; on the edition of Ricci and Trincavelli, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 50–1; and Durling, 'Linacre', p. 105.

<sup>16</sup> On Vettore Trincavelli's life, see Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 68 n. 28; and N. G. Siraisi, *Avicenna in the Renaissance Italy* (Princeton, 1987), p. 93 n. 55, with the bibliography quoted.

Trinc.: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἅπαντα τὰ τοῖς κάμνουσιν αἰσίως τε καὶ ἀπαισίως ἐπιγενησόμενα προμαντεύονται *perperam* Kühn ex Char. sec. Guin. *etenim tales omnia vel auspicato vel inauspicato cessura esse praedicunt*;

300.7-8: ὀλίγην δὲ θάλψιν ἢ τε σύμμετρος τρῖψις ἐργάζεσθαι δύναται (L z Ald.; ὀλίγην in ὀλίγον mut. L<sup>2</sup> z: ὀλίγον· ὀλίγην Ald; δὲ θάλψιν eras. L: om. z: δὲ θερμότητα Ald.; συμ- in ras. L<sup>2</sup>): secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: *parum...exiguum vero calorem et moderata frictio inducere valet* Trinc.: τὴν δὲ θάλψιν μετρίαν ποιεῖ ἡ εὐκρατος τρῖψις *perperam* Kühn ex Char. sec. Guin. *at calorem moderatum frictio temperata...possunt efficere*.

In some corrections he also used Niccolò's translation, but very rarely and not correctly, as in 277.15: ἐρεθίζει (L Ald.: ante ἐρεθίζει add. ἐκρεῖ· τὸ δ' ἐλάχιστον in mg. L<sup>2</sup>): *quod autem est paucissimum provocat* Nic.: *at minimum id...incitabit* Trinc.: *τοῦτι δ' ἐλάχιστον ἐρεθίζει* *perperam* Kühn ex Char. sec. Nic.

Trincavelli's translation underwent many reprints in the sixteenth century, and replaced that by Bartolomeo Silvani in the Giuntine editions from the fourth one of 1565. Philologically, it does not seem to be very penetrating, although Trincavelli accurately collated the textual sources, both the two Greek editions and Niccolò's Latin translation.

Bartolomeo Silvani, a physician from Salò on Lake Garda, is an obscure character. In the preface to the third Giuntine edition (vol. i, p. 3<sup>v</sup>), Agostino Gadaldino includes him among his collaborators: 'Bartholomeus Silvanius Salonensis excellens et doctus medicus'.<sup>17</sup> That *Salonenis* must be understood, in this case, as an adjective derived from 'Salò' and not from 'Salona', the ancient Roman town near Split in Dalmatia, is clear from another reference in the Giuntine, in the licence to print from Venice written in Italian (vol. i, p. 8<sup>v</sup>): 'Bartholomeo Silvania da Salo medico'.<sup>18</sup> Silvani had a significant role in the preparation of the new Giuntine, for which he translated six works by Galen and revised several translations of others. Moreover, in 1541 he published his Latin translation of Ammonius' commentary on Aristotle's *Categoriae*, and dedicated it to Ludovico Madruzzo (bishop of Trento from 1539 to 1542), who became cardinal one year later.<sup>19</sup> From the dedication it appears that Silvani once

<sup>17</sup> Gadaldino's preface was not reprinted in the subsequent Giuntines, and I have read it in the copy of the library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. On Gadaldino's preface, see O'Malley, op. cit. (n. 6), pp. 102-4, where there is an English translation of a part of it.

<sup>18</sup> See correctly G. Bruniati, *Dizionario degli uomini illustri della Riviera di Salò* (Milano, 1837), p. 136, and V. Peroni, *Biblioteca Bresciana*, vol. iii (Brescia, 1823), p. 224, both quoted by L. Ferrari, *Onomastikon. Repertorio biobibliografico degli scrittori italiani dal 1501 al 1850* (Milano, 1947), p. 629. Probably relying on the Giuntine, Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 298, writes: 'Bartholomeus Silvanius of Salo'. In M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800* (Boston, 1962), vol. iv, p. 3356, and vol. v (*Synopsis and Bibliography*), p. 442, which depends on C. W. Kestner, *Medicinisches Gelehrten-Lexicon* (Jena, 1740, repr. Hildesheim and New York, 1971), p. 825, Salona is indicated as Bartolomeo Silvani's town, on the basis of the most frequent meaning of the adjective *Salonenis*; see J. Perin, *Onomastikon totius latinitatis* (Patavii, 1920), ii.584.

<sup>19</sup> *Ammonii Hermiae in Praedicamenta Aristotelis Commentarii, per Bartholomeum Sylvanum Salonensem nuper latine conversi* (Venice, 1541, repr. Paris, 1542, with Gastonus Sala's revision). On Ludovico Madruzzo's life, see *Enciclopedia Italiana*, vol. xxi (Rome, 1951), pp. 854-5; and *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. ix (the Catholic University of America, Washington, 1981<sup>2</sup>), pp. 54-5, in which there is a misprint: Ludovico Madruzzo became bishop of Trento in 1539, not 1529; see G. van Gulik and C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi*, vol. iii (sumptibus et typis Librariae Regensbergianae, 1910), p. 339. On the cardinal's role in the council of Trento, see G. Alberigo, *I vescovi italiani al concilio di Trento (1545-1547)* (Florence, 1959). On his contacts with literary and scientific circles, see S. Corradini, *Le satire di Giovanni Agostino Cazza*, Tesi di laurea (Università di Trento, 1990-1). I have received this bibliographical reference from Marcello Bonagga of the Istituto Storico Italo-Germanico in Trento.

lived with Madruzzo, handed him his 'opera in litteris', and then went away, probably to Venice. In the preface of the Paris edition of 1542, someone named Gastonus Sala, who revised the translation, remembers that he himself had suggested that the printer should not publish it, which certainly does not encourage the reader, and he repeatedly speaks about Silvani's mistakes of interpretation and style: 'multa loca non recte intellecta esse deprehendi, formulas dicendi a Latinorum consuetudine alienas passim conspexi', etc. However, the same thing cannot be said about the translation of the *De const. art. med.*, particularly when it is compared with the others.

Where the Aldine has the lacuna, Silvani used the Basle edition like Trincavelli; see:

295.4-5: *κᾶν ἡλκωμένον ἥ τι om.* Bas. Silv.;

294.2: *τὴν μὲν <οὖν> τῆς φύσεως ῥώμην* (L.: *οὖν* add. P<sup>2</sup> sec. Nic.): *ἰσχὺν μὲν τῆς φύσεως* Bas. et *τὴν μὲν οὖν ῥώμην* in mg.: *robur quidem igitur virtutis* Nic.: *ergo robur naturae* Silv.

But he corrected it further on the basis of Niccolò's translation; see the following passages:

296.3: *πειρατέον εἰς ὅσον ἔστι om.* Bas.: *tentandum est quantum possibile est* Nic.: *tentandum quoad licet* Silv.;

295.13: *κρισίμων καὶ κρίσεων: κρίσεων* Bas.: *de criticis diebus...et de crisi* Nic.: *de diebus iudicialibus, de iudicationibus* Silv.;

296.11-13: *ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ κινδυνεύσαι τὰ ἔσχατα. δυσδιάγνωστα δ' ἔστι τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν αἰτίων ὡς ἂν μὴδέπω λυποῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον om.* Bas.: *aliquando autem et periclitari summe. Difficile autem cognoscibiles sunt huiusmodi causae tamquam non contristantes hominem* Nic.: *quandoque vero in summum discriminis adduci. Nec facile porro causae cognosci huiusmodi possunt, ut quae hominem non insistent* Silv.;

also 296.16: *ἔνεκεν om.* Bas.: *propter has causas* Nic.: *huiusmodi gratia causarum* Silv.

In contrast to Trincavelli, in the rest of the text, Silvani closely followed the Aldine. In this way he avoided the defective corrections of the Basle edition; see:

244.5: *οὐκ* add. Bas. sec. Nic. *non*;

284.10-11: *αἱ δὲ ἐμφράξεις τε καὶ σφηνώσεις τούτου εἰσὶ γένους* add. Bas. sec. Nic. *obstructiones autem et incalcationes ad hoc genus pertinent*;

293.6: *καὶ πολλάκις γε σὺν τῇ νίκῃ: πολλάκις γε καὶ πρὸ τῆς νίκης* Bas.: *saepe et cum victoria* Silv.;

also 289.8: *πάλιν: πᾶν* Bas. sec. Nic. *omnem: contra* Silv.;

292.5-7: *καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦδε τὴν πρόγνωσιν ἐπαγγέλλονται, τοῦ πάντ' ὁρθῶς ἢ οὐκ ὁρθῶς γενήσεσθαι περὶ τοὺς νοσοῦντας* secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: *huius etenim ipsius precognitionem, nempe quod omnia prospere vel infelicitur cessura sint circa aegrotos profitentur* Silv.;

300.7-8: *ὀλίγη δὲ θάλψιν ἢ τε σύμμετρος τρίψις ἐργάζεσθαι δύναται: ὀλίγον· ὀλίγη δὲ θερμότητα ἢ τε...* Ald.: secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: *modice...calidatem modicam efficere possunt, frictio mediocris* Silv.

But sometimes he repeated mistakes of the Aldine, even at places where the Basle edition has a better reading; see:

244.6: *ἐπτά* corr. Bas. sec. Nic. *septem: ἡ* Ald.: *an* Silv.;

also 243.5: *ἥπερ τοὺς ἱατρούς* L Ald.: secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: *medicis* Silv.

In fact, he accepted the text of the Basle edition rarely and only when it agrees with Niccolò's translation, as in 286.16-17: *ὀργανικῶν μορίων* L Ald.: ante *ὀργανικῶν* add. *κατεχόντων* Bas. sec. Nic. *continentium particularum: continentium instrumentalium partium* Silv.

Silvani's translation provides interesting readings in some passages, as in 238.6: *συμφύσεις: ἐνεργείας* in ras. L<sup>2</sup>: *correx* sec. Nic. *conglutinationes: functiones* Silv. et in mg. *malim legere uniones*. However, I think that he did not use manuscripts. But I shall speak about this later, in relation to Caius' textual annotations.

There is another humanistic translation of the *De const. art. med.*, which was not published or circulated. It is preserved in only one manuscript, Par. lat. 7120, fos. 150<sup>r</sup>–184<sup>r</sup>,<sup>20</sup> and its author was the French physician Martin Acakia (1497–1551), who translated two other works of Galen, the *Ars medica* and the *Ad Glauconem de methodo medendi libri II*.<sup>21</sup> This Latin text is incomplete and lacks the last sixteen pages of Kühn's edition, from 288.6: αἶμα. The writing is in italics, fairly uniform and very difficult to read.

To judge from a partial examination of Acakia's translation, it was probably written after 1538, because it seems that it is based on both the Aldine and the Basle edition, like those of Trincavelli and Silvani. In fact, it has mistakes in common with them, for example, in:

249.1: οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἐπίκουρον om. Ald. Bas. Acak.;

255.9–11: θερμότεραν καὶ ψυχρότεραν καὶ ὑγρότεραν καὶ ξηρότεραν...ὑγρότεραν...ψυχρότεραν, θερμότεραν...ὑγρότεραν: θερμότερας καὶ ψυχρότερας καὶ ὑγρότερας καὶ ξηρότερας...ὑγρότερας...ψυχρότερας, θερμότερας...ὑγρότερας: calidiores, frigidiores, humidiores et sicciiores...humidiores...frigidiores, calidiores...humidiores Acak.;

256.15: ἀνθρώπων om. Ald. Bas. Acak.

Sometimes it may follow the text of the Basle edition, as in 284.10–11: αἱ δὲ ἐμφράξεις τε καὶ σφηνώσεις τούτου εἰσὶ γένους add. Bas. sec. Nic. *obstructiones autem et inculcationes ad hoc genus pertinent: obstructiones autem et infarctus in hoc genere continentur* Acak. However, it definitely retains mistakes of the Aldine, as in 244.6; ἐπτά corr. Bas. sec. Nic. septum.: ἡ Ald.: an Acak.

A further Renaissance translation of the *excerptum* on prognosis was published for the first time in 1498 and reprinted in the editions of Galen's *Opera omnia* until the Giuntine of 1528.<sup>22</sup> Later on, the Latin editors of Galen also recognized that the *De praesagitura* was the last part of the *De const. art. med.*, and hence they omitted it in their editions.<sup>23</sup> The author of this version was Giorgio Valla, who was a translator and above all a collector of manuscripts.<sup>24</sup> The Greek originals of Valla's versions are preserved in his private library, now part of the Biblioteca Estense of Modena, but only for the *excerptum* on prognosis is no Greek manuscript reported in the printed catalogue. Is the printed catalogue in error and is the original of the *De praesagitura* to be found in the Biblioteca Estense, as Vivian Nutton suggests, or is it to be considered lost? A third possibility is not entirely to be ruled out, that Valla directly translated the oldest manuscript of this text, Vat. gr. 1063 (= B) of the twelfth or thirteenth century. It is certain that his version shares common mistakes present in B; see:

290.11; περιττόν om. B Valla;

292.4: ἐναταῖον: ἐατέον B: *sinendum* Valla;

294.14: ἐμφορομένων: ἐμφαινομένων B: *appareant* Valla;

299.7: γυμνασίων: γυμνάσεως: *exercitatione* Valla.

<sup>20</sup> See A. Melot, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, pars III, vol. iv (Paris, 1744), p. 315. In H. Diels, 'Die Handschriften der antiken Ärzte, Griechische Abteilung I', *Abhandlungen der königl. – preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil. – hist. Klasse* 3 (1905, repr. Leipzig, 1970), 60, there is a misprint: the manuscript is Par. lat. 7120, not 7023.

<sup>21</sup> See J. Balteau, M. Barroux and M. Prevost, *Dictionnaire de biographie française*, i (Paris, 1933), p. 1056.

<sup>22</sup> See Durling, 'A Chronological Census', 289; and Fortuna, op. cit. (n. 2), 67.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, the following note present in the index of Galen's Latin edition, published by Froben in Basle in 1542: 'libellus De praesagitura finis est libri De constitutione artis medicae'.

<sup>24</sup> On Giorgio Valla and his significance in the history of Galen's text, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 25, 33 nn. 41–4.

## 2. TEXTUAL ANNOTATIONS

The Greek text of the *De const. art. med.* was not much studied in the sixteenth century. In fact, besides the two editions of the *Opera omnia*, it had only one other, that of Guinther of Andernach, which philologically is unremarkable, as has been said above, because it is merely a bad copy of the Aldine. Moreover, the textual annotations of humanists are few in comparison with those in other works of Galen's. It is difficult to explain why, but I do not think that the reason is a lack of interest in the content of this treatise, for such an interest is evident from the many translations and commentaries. Rather, in the sixteenth century scholars and editors were unable to get new unknown sources to improve this Greek text. In fact, after the Aldine, the Greek manuscripts of the *De const. art. med.* were already lost (obviously except the Laur. plut. 74.3), since there is evidence that the translators did not use them and a manuscript of the *excerptum* served as printer's copy of the Basle edition to fill in the omission of the Aldine, as mentioned above.

In this context, it is very interesting to consider the annotations of the English physician John Caius, which contain references to manuscripts. In his copy of the Basle edition, presently at Eton College, Caius (1510–73) inscribed his notes and comments over a period of about twenty years, from 1539/40. A large part of his readings comes from the manuscripts which he saw and collated during his travels in Europe, especially in North Italy. These readings have been carefully studied by Vivian Nutton, who has distinguished the different stages in which they were written, and identified more than half of their sources.<sup>25</sup> Later on, Theodore Goulston (1574–1632), another English physician and editor of Galen, copied Caius' *marginalia* into his own copy of the Basle edition, which is presently preserved in the Marsh Library, Dublin.<sup>26</sup> As regards the *De const. art. med.*, the surviving readings of Goulston's Basle edition are exactly the same as those of Caius. In fact, the first four are missing, but only because some pages of the first volume were cut;<sup>27</sup> and two others are also missing, of which one is very easy (266.8: τὸ: τῷ: corr. Cai.), and the other is neither clear nor correct: Caius wrote 'οὐ fortasse', without reference in the text and near a passage in which the negation is incomprehensible (260.16–261.2).

Caius' textual notes to the *De const. art. med.* number about forty and most of them belong to the later 1550s. Caius used the Laur. plut. 74.3 for his translation of the *De diaeta Hippocratis in morbis acutis* and referred to it with regard to other treatises,<sup>28</sup> but not to the *De const. art. med.*, for which he quoted instead three different *codices*, the *codex Adelphi*, that of John Clement, and the *vetus Venetus*.<sup>29</sup> It is already known that by *codex* the reference is not necessarily to a manuscript; for example, the *codex Adelphi* must have been an annotated edition of an uncertain owner, who, as Vivian Nutton has recently suggested, may be identified with John Freare or Friar (1499–1563), a friend and colleague of Caius. In any case, an edition with *marginalia* is not negligible, because it can contain good humanistic conjectures and readings from lost manuscripts too, as Nutton has demonstrated for the *codex Adelphi*.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Nutton, *John Caius*, especially pp. 5–11, 51–76.

<sup>26</sup> See V. Nutton, 'The Galenic Codices of Theodore Goulston', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 22 (1992), 259–68; also 'Harvey, Goulston and Galen', *Koroth* 8 (1985), 112–22; and *John Caius*, pp. 52–4, 61–3, 96–7.

<sup>27</sup> See Nutton, 'The Galenic Codices', 259; also *John Caius*, p. 75 n. 81.

<sup>28</sup> See Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 13, 55, 70 n. 35.

<sup>29</sup> See Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 106–9.

<sup>30</sup> Nutton, 'The Galenic Codices', 263–5. On *codex Adelphi* as a printed edition with *marginalia* and on *Adelphus*' identification, see A. Barigazzi, *Galeno, Sull'ottima maniera d'insegnare, Esortazione alla medicina*, CMG v, 1, 1 (Berlin, 1991), pp. 30–7, 73–85, where

As regards the *codex Adelphi*, Caius quoted it in the beginning of the *De const. art. med.*: ‘Castigat(us) hic liber ad codicem Adelphi’. Indeed, this promises more than can be found in the readings which follow. Only one belongs to the *codex Adelphi* and is wrong: 237.13: διαπέπλασται L Nic.: διαπέπλεκται Ald. Bas.: πλαγ’ (διαπέπλαγεται sic) Ad. It should be an easy mistake of confusing letters (σ – γ), which Caius or his source made by copying the right reading (πλασ’). This must not necessarily come from manuscripts and can be explained as a humanistic correction in an annotated edition. Certainly it is not enough to say what the *codex Adelphi* could be and what it could contain. Possibly other readings of Caius without references come from this *codex*, as Barigazzi suggests,<sup>31</sup> but at the moment it cannot be proved.

Caius referred to Clement’s *codex* four times. In two cases he correctly noticed its correspondence with the *marginalia* of the Basle edition (294.2: τὴν μὲν <οὖν> τῆς φύσεως ῥώμην: ἰσχὺν μὲν τῆς φύσεως Bas.: τὴν μὲν οὖν ῥώμην in mg. Bas. Cle.; 296.2: ἐν τούτῳ: τοῦτο Bas. Cle.: ἐν τούτῳ in mg. Bas.); in another he added a right comment to the reading (295.13: κρισίμων καὶ κρίσεων: κρίσεων Bas.: post κρίσεων add. καὶ κρισίμων ἡμερῶν Cle., and then ‘fortasse imperfectum est’), and the last one is 296.16: ἐνεκεν om. Bas.: add. Cle. Vivian Nutton has shown that Caius knew the manuscripts that his friend John Clement had received from the printer of the Aldine and had brought back to England with him, but he has not identified that of the *De const. art. med.*, because this treatise does not appear in the printed catalogues of Clement’s surviving manuscripts (Par. gr. 2164–8, 2172–3, and possibly Reg. gr. 173).<sup>32</sup> However, one of them, the Par. gr. 2165 quoted above, contains the *excerptum* on prognosis, and the readings inscribed by Caius all come from it. More precisely, two of them belong to P (296.2 and 296.13) and the others to P<sup>2</sup> (294.2 and 295.13), which corrected P for the preparation of the Aldine, mostly on the basis of Niccolò’s translation.<sup>33</sup> Probably in this manuscript Caius found three other readings that are without references: 293.7: τὸ τοιοῦτον: τοῦτο Bas.: corr. Cai.; 294.12: κατὰ: καὶ Bas.: corr. Cai.; and 297.11: πρὸς: παρ’ Q M P Cai.

The *codex Venetus*, with the adjective *vetus*, appears twice among Caius’ *marginalia*:

249.15–17: ὥστε οὐδὲ τούτῳ πλέον οὐδὲν ἐξ ὧν πάσχει... ὥσπερ οὐδ’ ὁσπῶ (L Nic.: ὥστε οὐδὲ: ὡς τοῦδε L, corr. L<sup>2</sup>; τούτῳ: τούτων L Nic.: in τοῦτο mut. L<sup>2</sup>; ἐξ ὧν om. Nic.: οὐδ’ eras. L): ὥστε οὐδὲ τοῦτο πλέον οὐδὲν ἐξ ὧν πάσχει... ὥσπερ ὁσπῶ Bas.: ὥστε οὐδὲ τούτῳ πλέον ἔχον πάσχει... ὥσπερ οὐδ’ ὁσπῶ Ven.: ὥστε οὐδὲ τούτῳ πλέον ὁδύνης ἔσται ἐξ ὧν πάσχει perperam Kühn ex Char. sec. Guin. unde nec ullum magis eo dolorem ex iis quibus efficitur percipiet; 253.6: ἐναντίων: ἀπάντων Ven.

In three other treatises, *De anatomicis administrationibus*, *Quomodo morbum simulantes sint deprehendendi* and *De optima secta ad Thrasybulum*, Caius referred to this *codex*, but Vivian Nutton suggests that it is not necessarily the same in all cases.<sup>34</sup> Certainly Theodore Goulston depends on Caius in his references to it, in his notes in his Basle edition, as well as in his edition of the *De optima secta ad Thrasybulum* of 1640.<sup>35</sup>

One can ask: what is the *codex Venetus*, a manuscript, an annotated edition, or *Adelphus* is identified with Johannes Muhling of Strasbourg (fl. 1500–23); see also D. Béguin, ‘L’Édition Goulston et les prétendus manuscrits perdus de Galien’, *Revue d’histoire des textes* 19 (1989), 341–9; a discussion is in Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 60–4.

<sup>31</sup> Barigazzi, op. cit. (n. 30), p. 83.

<sup>32</sup> Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 58–9.

<sup>33</sup> See Fortuna, op. cit. (n. 2), 53–4, 59–60.

<sup>34</sup> Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 52–4.

<sup>35</sup> See Nutton, ‘The Galenic Codices’, 259–61; *John Caius*, p. 54. On Theodore Goulston’s edition, *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Opuscula varia* (London, 1640), see *Appendix*.

something else?<sup>36</sup> It is difficult to give a precise answer, especially if, as here, only the *De const. art. med.* is considered; however, it is possible to pave the way towards one. Recently, Nutton has indicated an interesting line of research, by suggesting that the *codex Venetus* could be the annotations in a Giuntine.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately this hypothesis is problematic, because there are no *marginalia* in the Latin editions regarding these passages. The two readings quoted by Caius agree only with the Latin translation published in the Giuntines from 1541 to 1556, that of Bartolomeo Silvani. The case of the second reading is very clear: 253.6: ἐναντίων: ἀπάντων Ven.: *omnium* Silv. The first one is more complicated, but it can be shown that Caius copied the same text which Silvani translated. The second part of it is useless, because in Greek there is a negation, which cannot be translated into Latin: 249.17: ὥσπερ οὐδ' ὅσῳ: οὐδ' om. Bas.: add. Ven.: *quemadmodum* Silv. The first part is very interesting: 249.15–16: ὥστε οὐδὲ τούτῳ πλέον οὐδὲν ἐξ ὧν πάσχει: ... τοῦτο ... Bas.: ὥστε οὐδὲ τούτῳ πλέον ἔχον πάσχει Ven.: *quare neque plus huic quicquam accedit ex quibus patitur* Silv. The text of Caius' *Venetus* has mistakes where the Basle edition is correct (the omission of οὐδὲν and the mistake ἔχον instead of the right ἐξ ὧν), but it is correct where the Basle edition is wrong (τούτῳ instead of τοῦτο), and the reading τούτῳ corresponds to *huic* in Silvani's text, which is the only correct one in the Latin translations. How can one explain this? Certainly Caius could not have retranslated Silvani's Latin text into Greek, because his *Venetus* contains a mistake which is very easy to make while dealing with a Greek text: ἔχον comes from ἐξ ὧν, by confusing letters. Therefore, he had a Greek text, and he made mistakes by copying it. What was this Greek text, and who was its author? The answer is not clear, because there is more than one possibility. Caius could have read the annotations in the Greek edition that was used by Silvani for his translation, and Silvani could have written them. But Agostino Gadaldino could also have been the author; he worked very much in the revision of Galenic texts, as he says in the preface to the Giuntine of 1541–2 (vol. i, p. 2).<sup>38</sup> Besides, in *De libris propriis* (pp. 75–6), Caius speaks about a list of corrections that Gadaldino sent to Vesalius, who was revising the translations of Galen's anatomical works for the new edition, and which he saw and evaluated with Vesalius.<sup>39</sup> Did Gadaldino write a list like that for the *De const. art. med.* too, which Caius then copied? Anyway, Caius could have acquired the annotations, named *codex Venetus*, only in Italy, probably indeed in Venice, where the Giuntine was prepared. This is also confirmed by his handwriting in the Basle edition at Eton College: it belongs to the second stage in the early 1540s, when Caius travelled in Italy, according to Nutton's distinction.<sup>40</sup>

These notes are certainly humanistic conjectures rather than readings from manuscripts. In fact, one (ἀπάντων instead of ἐναντίων) is a banal substitution by misunderstanding of the context; another (τούτῳ instead of τοῦτο) is a good correction, just in a passage in which the manuscript tradition is corrupt (τούτων L

<sup>36</sup> The philologists of last century and later, as I. Marquardt, *Scripta minora*, vol. i (Lipsiae, 1884), pp. v–vi, and W. De Boer, *Praefatio in Galeni de atra bile libellum*, CMG v, 4, 1, 1 (Berlin, 1937), p. vii, thought that the *codex Venetus* was a manuscript; see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 52–4, 107, where it is taken to be a manuscript of a private library in Venice. But Béguin, op. cit. (n. 30), 349, suggests that it is an edition with *marginalia*.

<sup>37</sup> Nutton, 'The Galenic Codices', 261.

<sup>38</sup> An example of Gadaldino as a corrector of Greek texts is in Vat. gr. 1908, f. 16<sup>r</sup>, quoted by Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 66 n. 6; see also K. M. Dickson, 'Gadaldini's Hand (Ms. Hauniensis Bibl. Univ. e donat. var. fol. 29)', *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990), 441–5.

<sup>39</sup> On Caius' relation with Vesalius, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 54, 66 n. 6.

<sup>40</sup> Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 6.

Nic.). The third case (οὐδ' add.) is not an obvious correction *ope ingenii*, but it can probably be explained by Niccolò's translation, which was used by editors and translators of Galen, as has been shown. Moreover, it is certain that Silvani did not acquire new unknown manuscripts for his translation. In fact, in the preface to the Giuntine, Gadaldino speaks about the many manuscript sources and the enormous philological activity involved in the edition, and he concludes (vol. i, p. 2<sup>r</sup>): 'In indice tamen, qui unicuique tomo preponetur, qui libri, quali castigatione emendati fuerint, clarius et exactius [...] explicabitur'. In the index (vol. i, p. 9<sup>r</sup>), in contrast to others, the translation of the *De const. art. med.* appears only with the translator's name. There is no reason to doubt this information.

As regards Caius' other annotations, when they are not quotations of the Aldine (four), they can be explained *ope ingenii*, except for two of them, for which Niccolò's translation was probably used: 228.12: πάντας L Nic.: πάνυ Bas.: corr. Cai.; and 225.13: ἐνθέως (divinitus Nic.): εὐθέως Bas.: corr. Cai. In this second passage Trincavelli's translation, which depends on that of Niccolò, is also right (divinitus). Very often these corrections are present elsewhere in the manuscript tradition, but for two of them Caius' Basle edition is the first authority: 227.3: ἐπιδεικνύων: ἐπιδεικνύων L Ald. Bas.: corr. Cai.; and 234.16: ἐπανίωμεν (redeamus Nic.; non videtur L): ἐπανόμεν Ald. Bas.: corr. Cai.

Four textual notes on the *De const. art. med.* in Caius' Basle edition are present also among the *marginalia* that Janus Cornarius of Zwickau (c. 1500–58) inscribed in his private copy of the Aldine, presently at the Universitätsbibliothek of Jena.<sup>41</sup> Two of them are the readings that Caius attributes to the *codex Venetus* (249.15: τούτω; and 253.6: ἀπάντων), and the others, which were written by Caius after 1555 according to Nutton's distinction, are the following: 249.11: οὐδ' ἐν: οὐδὲν L Ald. Bas.: corr. Corn. Cai.; and 259.1: ἐπιστήμης: ἐπιστήμην Ald. Bas.: corr. Corn. Cai. These correspondences do not seem to be fortuitous, but it does not follow that there were links between Caius and Cornarius.<sup>42</sup> However, it is not difficult to explain the quoted readings, above all 253.6 (ἀπάντων), as Cornarius' retranslation in Greek of Silvani's Latin text, for this version was chosen by Cornarius for his Latin edition of Galen, which was published in Basle in 1549. That Cornarius did not know the same *codex Venetus* as Caius, is suggested by his intervention in 249.15–17: Cornarius corrects τούτο of the Aldine and then of the Basle edition like Caius, but, unlike Caius, he does not fill in the omission of the negative οὐδ', which is not present in Silvani's translation.

Cornarius' other annotations on the *De const. art. med.*, approximately twenty, are not particularly interesting, because they are either present in the manuscript tradition or, more rarely, they are unacceptable. There is one exception: 235.7: οὐκ secl. Corn. This is likely to be his own conjecture, for it is certain that he did not have manuscripts to correct this treatise. In fact, although he was aware of the long lacuna in the Aldine, he filled it in by retranslating Niccolò's Latin text, in a very erudite way.

The philological annotations by Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) in his Aldine, preserved in the Herzog August Bibliothek of Wolfenbüttel (Gud. lat. 7–8), do not concern the *De const. art. med.*<sup>43</sup> Recently, Vivian Nutton has drawn attention to the

<sup>41</sup> On Janus Cornarius' life and activity, see the bibliography quoted by Nutton, *On Prognosis*, p. 45 n. 1. His notes on Galen were published by G. Gruner, *Coniecturae et emendationes Galenicæ* (Jena, 1789), but not entirely accurately.

<sup>42</sup> See Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 87; and, differently, Barigazzi, *op. cit.* (n. 30), pp. 32–3, 35.

<sup>43</sup> See G. Milchsack, *Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel. IV. Die Gudischen Handschriften, Die lateinischen Handschriften* (Wolfenbüttel, 1913), p. 81.

annotated Basle edition of Leo Allatius (1586–1669) in the Sudhoff Institut für die Geschichte der Medizin in Leipzig.<sup>44</sup> These and others can almost certainly help the modern editor, but we can usually exclude the possibility that they represent collations of variants from manuscripts.

### 3. COMMENTARIES

The first commentary on the *De const. art. med.* was published in Mainz in 1534.<sup>45</sup> Its author was Christopher Heyll Soter (1499–1585), who wrote on literature and medicine, and translated three other works of the Galenic corpus, *De curandi ratione per venae sectionem*, *De plenitudine* and *De renum affectus dignotione*. The translation of the last treatise, published for the first time in Mainz in 1530, was reprinted several times, because it was the only one available for this text. Heyll was a physician and also professor of ancient Greek in Elbląg's secondary school for ten years. Although he moved many times during his life, his family settled down in Danzig, and his private library, mainly containing classical texts on medicine, with later purchases by his son Henry, is currently a part of the library of Danzig's Municipal Council.<sup>46</sup>

Christopher Heyll's work is a paraphrase of the *De const. art. med.*, inspired by his admiration for Galen and ancient medicine, which has, in his humanistic view, the task of raising modern medical science from its decline.<sup>47</sup> Although Heyll knew the Greek language, he used only Niccolò's translation. His paraphrase has errors in common with the Latin version, and there is no evidence that it corrects some of them on the basis of the Aldine. This paraphrase is very close to Galen's text. The digressions are quite few and the reader can easily recognize them, because there is an indication, as in this example (p. 39): 'Digressionem hanc tametsi ab instituto videri possit alienior, rei dignitas mihi extorsit'. One of these digressions regards Galen's life and his relation with his father, which is dealt with in a fiction-like way (pp. 31–3). The others are rarely medical, as the one on poison is (pp. 74–5). Generally, and especially in the beginning, they are rhetorical, about the importance of medicine, about its decline in his own day, and the modern physicians who are the new Methodists, charlatans, ignorant and attracted only by money. Among them, Heyll mentions the Jews twice (pp. ii and 3).

It is difficult to speak about the circulation of Heyll's paraphrase, but certainly the later commentaries on the *De const. art. med.* do not refer to it. Maybe it was not known or not considered significant.

A very different approach to the *De const. art. med.* is that of the physician and philosopher of Basle, Theodor Zwinger (1533–88), who wrote: 'medicina [...] philosophica est et philosophia quaedam sensata'.<sup>48</sup> Zwinger studied medicine, Galen and Aristotle with Bassiano Landi in Padua, where he obtained his doctorate in 1559. He then returned to Basle, where he published in 1561 two commentaries on Galen

<sup>44</sup> V. Nutton, 'Ancient Medicine in East German Libraries', *Newsletter, Society for Ancient Medicine and Pharmacy* 19 (1991), 16.

<sup>45</sup> I have read the copy in the British Library in London, 541. c. 22.

<sup>46</sup> On Christopher Heyll's life and works, see the introduction to the catalogue of his library, S. Sokół and M. Pelczarowa, *Księgozbiór Gdańskich Lekarzy Krzysztofa i Henryka Heyllów* (Gdańsk, 1963), with an English summary.

<sup>47</sup> Only Prosper Calanus wrote paraphrases on Galen, in the volume *Paraphrasis in librum Galeni de inaequali intemperie* (Lyons, 1538), according to the unreliable catalogue by Ackermann, op. cit. (n. 1), p. lxxviii, where Calanus is wrongly written Alcucanus. John Symons, Curator of the early printed books in the Wellcome Library, has corrected Ackermann's mistake.

<sup>48</sup> Th. Zwinger, *In Artem medicinalem Galeni tabulae et commentarii* (Basileae, 1561), β 2<sup>r</sup>.

as part of the same project, one on the *Ars medica* and the other on the *De const. art. med.*<sup>49</sup> With them Zwinger wanted to take part in the wide debate on the *tres doctrinae*, which started with Niccolò Leonicensio's untraditional interpretation of the initial passage of the *Ars medica* (i.305–6 Kühn), and continued throughout the sixteenth century.<sup>50</sup>

For the *De const. art. med.* Zwinger chose Trincavelli's Latin translation. His reason for this seems to be more personal than scientific (p. α 4<sup>r</sup>): 'Victoris Trincavelli Veneti, viri clarissimi, (quo praeceptore Patavii usus sum) interpretationem retinere placuit'. In his commentary he did not discuss the text of the translation philologically, but rather provided a new subdivision into chapters, that could be compatible with his method of tables. This method was frequently applied by Zwinger in his commentaries on Galen, then on Hippocrates and Aristotle and, simply to introduce the subjects, in his most significant work, the *Theatrum vitae humanae*.<sup>51</sup> He spoke many times about the tables. In his opinion they provided a method of division, which analyses a work in its genesis, and in order to clarify them, he also used Porphyry's metaphor of the tree.<sup>52</sup> In this way, the analysed text is reduced to its essence and its coherence is pointed out: 'Tabulae [...] artificium solum admittunt, aliena omnia et πάρεργα respuunt. Denique propter cohaerentiam rerum mirabilem κρύψις artificiosae dispositionis, sicut alias, his locum maxime habet'.<sup>53</sup> Zwinger distinguished the logical method of tables, which is named *synopsis*, from the rhetorical one, which is named *diexodus*. He recognized that the latter is more clear than the former; nevertheless, he concluded that 'synopsis [...] compendiosior et fortassis etiam utilior',<sup>54</sup> and 'tabularum usus in γενέσει simul et in διαλύσει non modo opportunum et utilem, sed etiam necessarium esse'.<sup>55</sup>

In practice, the content of the *De const. art. med.* is reorganized on the basis of what Zwinger named the 'communes termini', that is, 'Essentiale et Accidentale, Commune et Proprium, Internum et Externum, Materiale et Formale'.<sup>56</sup> In other words, it is rewritten on the basis of concepts which could be extraneous to Galen's text, or which anyway do violence to it. Besides, in this commentary further information is added,

<sup>49</sup> The most complete monography on Theodor Zwinger is that of C. Gilly, 'Zwischen Erfahrung und Spekulation. I Teil: Theodor Zwinger und die Krise seiner Zeit'; 'II Teil: Zwingers Philosophie', *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 77 (1977), 57–137; 79 (1979), 123–223, which renews the studies of A. Rotondò, *Pietro Perna e la vita culturale e religiosa di Basilea fra il 1570 e il 1580*, in *Studi e ricerche di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Scienze politiche dell'Università di Torino, 31, Turin, 1974), pp. 273–391. For a brief and useful survey, see M. L. Portmann, 'Theodor Zwinger (1533–1588) ein Basler Humanistenarzt', *Praxis* 77 (1988), 1110–13.

<sup>50</sup> A debatable analysis of Zwinger's introductions to the commentaries is in Gilly, 'Zwischen Erfahrung und Spekulation, II', 138–42. On Niccolò Leonicensio's position, see D. Mugnai Carrara, 'Una polemica umanistico-scolastica circa l'interpretazione delle tre dottrine ordinate di Galeno', *Annali dell'Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza di Firenze* 8 (1983), 31–57, with a discussion of the interpretation of W. F. Edwards, 'Niccolò Leonicensio and the Origins of Humanist Discussion of Method', in E. P. Mahoney (ed.), *Philosophy and Humanism, Renaissance Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Leiden, 1976), pp. 283–305. On the subsequent debate, see Wear, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 238–45.

<sup>51</sup> Th. Zwinger, *Viginti duo commentarii tabulis illustrati* (Basileae, 1579); *Aristotelis De moribus ad Nicomachum libri decem* (Basileae, 1566); *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomachiorum libri decem* (Basileae, 1582); *Aristotelis Politicorum libri octo* (Basileae, 1582); *Theatrum vitae humanae* (Basileae, 1565).

<sup>52</sup> Zwinger, *In Artem medicinalem*, p. α 6<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> Th. Zwinger, *In Galeni librum De constitutione artis medicae tabulae et commentarii* (Basileae, 1561), α 4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> Zwinger, *In Artem medicinalem*, p. α 6<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>55</sup> Zwinger, *In Galeni librum De constitutione*, α 4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> Zwinger, *In Artem medicinalem*, p. β 2<sup>r</sup>.

for example, an explication of the content and the nature of the treatise, references to other passages of it or of the Galenic corpus, and, particularly, to Hippocrates, Avicenna, Aristotle and Plato.

The method of tables was used in many medical texts in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth century, and the propagator, if not the inventor, is considered to be Pierre de la Ramée (Petrus Ramus, 1515–72).<sup>57</sup> Gilly believes that Zwinger learnt this method from Ramus, when he was his student in Paris in 1551–2, and that 'da Ramus die Methodenlehre des Galen [...] verworfen hatte, ließ ihn Zwinger in dieser Einleitung [of the commentary on the *Ars medica*] vorläufig unerwähnt'.<sup>58</sup> It is difficult to speak about this issue, because the study of medical commentaries is still in an early stage.<sup>59</sup> However, I think that Zwinger's debt to Padua is bigger than has been assumed. Not Ramus, but rather Niccolò Leonicensio, Giovanni Battista Da Monte and Bassiano Landi are quoted in the introduction to the commentary on the *Ars medica* (p. a 4<sup>r</sup>). It seems unlikely that Zwinger did not know the tables on the *Ars medica* that Giovanni Battista Da Monte had published in Venice in 1546.<sup>60</sup> In fact, they are very similar to those of Zwinger, though more synthetic. Certainly, they were compiled by Da Monte for his practical teaching, when he was professor of *theoria* in Padua (1543–51).<sup>61</sup> Later on, his chair was held by his student Bassiano Landi, who was the teacher of Zwinger, as noted above. Probably Zwinger read Da Monte's tables during his studies in Padua.

Zwinger's tables were not highly appreciated by François Vallériole (1504–92), who wrote a commentary on the *De const. art. med.* published in 1576, and republished twice in 1577.<sup>62</sup> In the preface (p. \*\*IV<sup>v</sup>), he referred to Theodor Zwinger as

<sup>57</sup> See K. J. Höltgen, 'Synoptische Tabellen in der medizinischen Literatur und die Logik Agricolae und Ramus', *Sudhoff Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften* 49 (1965), 371–90. For previous medieval examples, see Siraisi, op. cit. (n. 16), p. 165 n. 108, and the already quoted bibliography therein.

<sup>58</sup> Gilly, 'Zwischen Erfahrung und Spekulation, II', 141. For the interpretation of Zwinger's methodological debt to Ramus, Gilly depends on the research of Höltgen, op. cit. (n. 57), 383–4. See also Portmann, op. cit. (n. 49), 1110; and A. Ségal, J. Masson and A. Pecker, 'Propos sur le commentaire d'Hippocrate par Theodor Zwinger, médecin humaniste bâlois', in 'Hippocrate et sa héritage', Colloque franco-hellénique de Lyon (1985, unpublished).

<sup>59</sup> There are no reliable catalogues of medical commentaries, and there is no real research on them in A. Buck and O. Herdin, *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance* (Boppard, 1975); see only Buck's introduction, pp. 14–15. The best study on medical commentaries is that of Siraisi, op. cit. (n. 16), part III, chap. 6, who deals with the commentaries on the *Canon* of Avicenna and gives a very useful general introduction (pp. 175–87).

<sup>60</sup> G. B. Montanus, *Typus trium librorum artis parvae Galeni* (Venice, 1546), with the information that the table on the *corporum affectus* was published for the first time in Venice, in 1543.

<sup>61</sup> Many references to Giovanni Battista Da Monte and his medical teaching are in Siraisi, op. cit. (n. 16), in particular pp. 98–103, 194. In the sixteenth century, in Padua University, the curriculum of theoretical medicine was organized in the following way: Avicenna's *Canon* in the first year, Hippocrates' *Aphorisms* in the second year, and Galen's *Articella* in the third year; see B. Bertolaso, 'Ricerche d'archivio su alcuni aspetti dell'insegnamento medico presso l'Università di Padova nel Cinque- e Seicento', *Acta Medicae Historiae Patavina* 6 (1959–60), 22–3.

<sup>62</sup> On François Vallériole's life, see E. Cuvelier, 'A Treatise of the Plague de Thomas Lodge (1603), traduction d'un ouvrage médical français', *Études Anglaises* 21 (1968), 395–6, which is imprecise; and L. Dulieu, *La Médecine à Montpellier, II. La Renaissance* (Avignon, 1979), p. 427. On his commentary, *Commentarii in librum Galeni De constitutione artis medicae*, heirs of N. Bevilacqua (Turin, 1576), repr. A. Rivery (Geneva, 1577), Ch. Pesnot (Lyons, 1577), see R. J. Durling, *A Catalogue of Sixteenth Century Printed Books in the National Library of Medicine*, (US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland, 1967), p. 582; the catalogue of Ackermann, op. cit. (n. 1), p. lxxiv, is wrong.

'Germanicus quidam', and curtly said that his tables 'cum neque authoris mentem cumulate explicant, nec commentarii vice esse possint, haud ita magni momenti eas esse censendum est'. Hence, he did not hesitate to designate his commentary the first one on the *De const. art. med.*, and to feel like 'primus ego (quod sciam) vastum mare sulcavi'. Vallériole's aim is to explain Galen's treatise clearly, and more precisely 'ad explicandam Galeni mentem, vel locupletanda et amplificanda ea quae concise ab eo in hoc libro et suboscure scripta essent'. The result is evident: his commentary is 566 pages long, interrupted only by short quotations of keywords. The text of the *De const. art. med.* is explicated through references of all types, to ancient and modern medical works, to Greek and Latin authors and to Christian literature. Obviously, in an exposition like this, useful and interesting information is mixed with a variety of material chosen mainly for scholarly and rhetorical reasons.

Vallériole unfortunately used Guinther's translation as the basis for his discussion, in the edition of 1531.<sup>63</sup> He compared the Latin version with the Greek Basle edition, but seemingly he was not aware that Guinther did not use this text, but the Aldine. An example is his comment on the passage 284.10–11, in which Vallériole desperately defends the Basle edition, which has an interpolation, whereas the Aldine is correct (p. 340): 'plus in Graeco codice quam in eius versione continetur. Haec enim desunt αἱ ἐμφράξεις τε καὶ σφηνώσεις τούτου εἰσὶ γένους, hoc est, obstructiones et densitates huius sunt generis, nempe indicantia commodum remediorum mediorum usum, prout et partis substantia atque figura et situs. Quod et sequenti serie (in qua de obstructione edisseret Galenus) palam ipse faciet'. Therefore, this attack against Guinther is doubly wrong. His few other textual notes deal, for the most part, with the translation of Greek words into Latin, and unfortunately it is necessary for us to defend the bad version of Guinther. For example, concerning 282.7, Vallériole writes (p. 332): 'animadvertendum [...] Andernacum in vertendo lapsum fuisse. Sic enim ipse vertit, si per urinas, vescicae, vel naturalium meatus; cum si Graecum codicem consulisset, pro naturalium, genitalium posuisset. Sic enim Graece habetur [...] τοῦ κατὰ τὸ αἰδοῖον πόρον [...] Vox enim αἰδοῖον testiculum, penem et genitale Graecis significat; rectius itaque fuerat pro voce naturalium, genitalium vertisse'. But this remark is just a misunderstanding of the meaning of both the Latin and Greek terms. In fact, *naturalia* is a good version of αἰδοῖον, and αἰδοῖον refers to both men and women.

Although Vallériole probably tried to reach a wide learned public, his commentary is certainly linked, in some way, with his medical teaching in the University of Turin, to which he had been invited by Duke Filiberto Testa di Ferro in 1572, after the death of the famous Giovanni Argenterio, as Vallériole recalls in the dedication of his commentary to the same duke.

In the preface (p. \*\*IV<sup>v</sup>), Vallériole quotes an unpublished commentary on the *De const. art. med.* by the physician Jean Schyron (?–1556), who was professor in the University of Montpellier, where Vallériole had some contacts.<sup>64</sup> It is difficult to say

<sup>63</sup> Guinther's translation was printed three times before Vallériole's commentary: the first two editions in 1531, by Simon de Colines in Paris and by Andreas Cratander in Basle, and the third one in 1534 by Simon de Colines. This last edition has some errors in comparison with that of 1531 published by the same printer, for example an omission in 299.4–14: εἰ – ἐκκενοῦν. Vallériole's text follows the edition of 1531 by Simon de Colines; see 259.17: κατάλοιπον δ' ἔστι διελεῖν: *restat vero percensere* Guin. 1531 Vall.: *reliquum vero est ut percenseamus* Guin. 1534. But I have not seen the edition published by Andreas Cratander in Basle in 1531.

<sup>64</sup> The quoted bibliography is not coherent on this point, and I am not able to verify it. Did Vallériole study in Montpellier in 1522, as Cuvelier suggests, or did he have a degree *honoris causa* after 1572, as Dulieu writes?

whether Schyron actually wrote a commentary, but it is sure that he held a course, in Greek, on this treatise in 1536.<sup>65</sup> It was only the beginning, for the *De const. art. med.* appears eleven times in the required readings for courses in Montpellier University, between 1536 and 1594.<sup>66</sup>

A document concerning the teaching of the *De const. art. med.* at the University of Paris is preserved in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Publique in Angers, Andec. 461 (446). It contains lecture notes which an anonymous student of medicine wrote between 1575 and 1577, some of them on the *De const. art. med.*<sup>67</sup> The professor to whom these notes go back is Jean Riolan (1539–1605), who was a tenacious and obstinate defender of Greek medicine.<sup>68</sup> Although Riolan knew Greek, he explained Galen in Latin, and used Trincavelli's translation of the *De const. art. med.* in an edition posterior to 1562. In fact, after a general introduction to the contents of the treatise, the notes provide a summary of all the chapters (twenty-one), with the quotation of their *incipits*. This subdivision appears, for the first time, in the edition of 1562–3 by Giambattista Rasario, and it was accepted in the Giuntines starting from the 1565 edition, which printed, for the first time, Trincavelli's version instead of that of Bartolomeo Silvani. The lecture notes are dated, at both the beginning and the end, as follows: 23 April–3 May 1577, Galen's *De const. art. med.* in classroom.

Throughout the sixteenth century, the *De const. art. med.*, which was almost completely ignored in the Middle Ages, was used as a general introduction to medicine in university teaching, at least in Paris, in Montpellier and in Turin, for it provided a good summary of all the parts of medicine. Therefore, in some university courses it replaced the *Ars medica*, which, however, was not superseded by the *De const. art. med.* and continued to be the most widely read treatise of Galen. Furthermore, in the same period the *De const. art. med.* enjoyed a considerable interest from philosophers for its method of exposition. But also in this respect the *De const. art. med.* seems to be linked and subordinated to the *Ars med.*, which received a large number of commentaries, for Galen actually speaks about the question of the *tres doctrinae* just in the beginning of this work.

Although it is said that the *De const. art. med.* was taught in Greek by Jean Schyron in Montpellier University, its main circulation was in Latin. The most frequently printed translation was that by Vettore Trincavelli, which replaced Bartolomeo Silvani's version in the Giuntine editions from 1565. These two translations and also the unpublished one by Martin Acakia were based on both Greek editions (the Aldine and the Basle edition) as well as the medieval translation by Niccolò da Reggio. Niccolò's version had been widely used in particular by Guinther of Andernach in the first Renaissance translation of the *De const. art. med.*, to supplement and correct the Greek of the Aldine. The Renaissance translators of the *De const. art. med.* did not use manuscripts, probably because these were already lost after the Aldine publication, with the obvious exception of Laur. plut. 74.3, which, however, was

<sup>65</sup> See Dulieu, op. cit. (n. 62), p. 139. In this book there are many references to Jean Schyron; on his life, see in particular pp. 349–51, and also, briefly, Kestner, op. cit. (n. 18), pp. 771–2.

<sup>66</sup> See Dulieu, op. cit. (n. 62), p. 143.

<sup>67</sup> See A. Molinier, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, vol. xxxi (Paris, 1898), pp. 346–7, where it is indicated that the hand is the same as in another manuscript, Andec. 460 (445), which contains notes of lectures of 1577 on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*.

<sup>68</sup> On Jean Riolan's life and works, see R. Tabuteau, *Deux anatomistes français les Riolan* (Paris, 1929); and more synthetically *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne* (Michaud), vol. xxxv, pp. 45–6.

ignored. An analysis of the annotations of John Caius and Janus Cornarius confirms that they, too, depended on translations and their own *ingenium*, not on any new manuscripts.

*The Wellcome Institute, London*

STEFANIA FORTUNA

#### APPENDIX: IN DEFENCE OF GOULSTON AS GALEN'S EDITOR

In the Appendix to his edition of *Claudii Pergameni Opuscula varia*, published in 1640, eight years after his death, Theodore Goulston says that he has used four Greek *codices*, *Adelphi*, *Regius*, *Londinensis* and *Venetus*, and quotes the readings that they provide for each treatise. By now, it is known that at least two of them are printed editions with *marginalia* containing both humanistic conjectures and variants from manuscripts: the *Londinensis* is Caius' Basle edition at Eton College, and the *codex Adelphi* is another annotated edition of an uncertain owner, who may probably be identified with John Freare (1499–1563).<sup>69</sup>

However, from the last century onwards philologists have praised Goulston's philology and thought that his *codices* were Greek manuscripts, although there were no traces of them in the present libraries.<sup>70</sup> The reason for this is not entirely Goulston's confusion in using the word *codex* with the double meaning of manuscript and printed edition, as Béguin has suggested,<sup>71</sup> but rather an over-optimistic interpretation of his words. In fact, in the introduction to the annotations, Goulston tries to arrange his sources precisely, and distinguishes between *codices manuscripti* and *excusi*. By *excusi codices* he means the Greek and Latin editions, of which he indicates the date and place of publication: the Aldine and the Basle edition in Greek, the edition by Rusticus Placentinus and the Giuntine of 1597 in Latin. As regards the others, he writes: 'manuscripti codices graeci veteres (qui vel ipsi, vel eorum transcripta ad manus nostras pervenerunt)', and then he quotes the *codex Adelphi*, *Regius*, *Londinensis* and *Venetus*.

Therefore, Goulston informs us that these *codices* could be annotations and collations from manuscripts, and at least two or three of them actually are. In sum, why should they necessarily be manuscripts, as was once believed?

What is the Greek *codex Venetus* referred to by Goulston in his edition of 1640? This old question has been recently discussed by Barigazzi in his edition of Galen's treatise *De optimo docendi genere*.<sup>72</sup> He has noticed the correspondence of this *codex* with Niccolò's Latin translation, which was published for the first time in Diomedè Bonardo's Galenic edition in 1490, and republished in the subsequent Latin editions until the Giuntine of 1528, including the one by Rusticus Placentinus in 1515. Therefore, Barigazzi suggests that the *Venetus* should be the Latin translation, which

<sup>69</sup> See D. Béguin, 'L'Édition Goulston et les prétendus manuscrits perdus de Galien', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 19 (1989), 341–9; and V. Nutton, 'The Galenic Codices of Theodore Goulston', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 22 (1992), 261–8.

<sup>70</sup> See G. Kaibel, *Claudii Galeni Protreptici quae supersunt* (Berlin, 1894, repr. Berlin, 1963), p. v; I. Marquardt, *Scripta minora*, vol. i (Lipsiae, 1884), pp. v–vi; and also W. De Boer, *Praefatio in Galeni de atra bile libellum*, CMG v, 4, 1, 1 (Berlin, 1937), p. vii. On Goulston as editor and translator, not much is in J. W. Binns, 'Latin Translations from Greek in the English Renaissance', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 28 (1978), 154–5.

<sup>71</sup> Béguin, op. cit. (n. 69), 349.

<sup>72</sup> A. Barigazzi, *Galenò, Sull'ottima maniera d'insegnare, Esortazione alla medicina*, CMG v, 1, 1 (Berlin, 1991), pp. 30–7.

is wrongly quoted by Goulston: 'facilius adducimur, ut illum Venetum codicem credamus interpretationis Latinae exemplar fuisse quam librum Graecum manu scriptum et temere Goulstonium inter codices enumeravisse libros editos'.<sup>73</sup>

But in his edition Goulston does not use this *codex* for the *De optimo docendi genere*. In fact, in the introduction to the annotations of this last treatise, it does not appear among the utilized sources: 'Ex manuscriptis Adelphi, Londinensi, vetere interprete, et impressis invicem collatis, graecum textum aliquanto purgantiorum exhibemus'. Where should the references to the *codex Venetus* be? There are two passages to be considered: 94.7 Bar. (32.46 Goul. = 42.3 Kühn): Δρύσωνα: Δύσωνα Aldus cum asterisco Venet. in marg. \*Alii Drysonem; and 104.19 Bar. (38.26 Goul. = 51.2 Kühn): εἰθεῖαν: cod. Venet. ant. et vetus interpres habent μίαν; quod et ἑλληνικώτερον est, sensui verborum accommodatius. In both, by Venet. and cod. Venet., Goulston refers to the Giuntine of 1597, which contains Erasmus' translation of the *De optimo docendi genere*. In fact, the readings quoted by Goulston are among the *marginalia* of this edition and the other Giuntines starting from that prepared by Agostino Gadaldino of 1565:<sup>74</sup> \*Alii Drysonem and μίαν with the reference to Niccolò, the *vetus* or *antiquus interpres*. Certainly Goulston's writing is not very clear, because the initials used here for the Giuntine of 1597 (Venet. and cod. Venet.) are not the same as those mentioned in the list of abbreviations, in the beginning of the Appendix (Ven. Lat.). But an explanation can be provided: in the first case, Goulston was quoting a Latin reading (Alii Drysonem), and probably it was obvious for him that the reader would attribute the reference to a Latin edition; in the second case the situation is more ambiguous. It is not clear that the reader would immediately think that Goulston was listing the Latin editions generally used, namely the edition by Rusticus Placentinus (ant.) and the Giuntine of 1597.

In his edition Goulston does not refer to the Greek *codex Venetus* for the *De optimo docendi genere*, but rather only for one other treatise, *De optima secta ad Thrasybulum*. For these readings, as well as for those inscribed by him in his Basle edition presently in the Marsh Library, Dublin, Goulston relies on John Caius' Basle edition at Eton College, in which the *codex Venetus* is quoted for four works, *De optima secta ad Thrasybulum*, *De anatomicis administrationibus*, *Quomodo morbum simulantes sint deprehendendi* and *De constitutione artis medicae*. Therefore, Nutton's conclusions are confirmed: Goulston has no more information on this *codex* than Caius, and in order to identify it, we must start from Caius.<sup>75</sup>

## ADDENDUM

Richard Durling has informed me that a commentary on the *De const. art. med.* is contained in a Latin manuscript: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vind. lat. 11224; see *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, vol. VI (Vienna, 1873), p. 290.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid. p. 35.

<sup>74</sup> These two readings are not in the Giuntine of 1556, and hence it is unlikely that they are in the previous editions of 1541 and 1550, which I have not seen.

<sup>75</sup> V. Nutton, *John Caius and the Manuscripts of Galen* (the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary volume no. 13, 1987), pp. 52–4, 61–3, 96–7; 'The Galenic Codices', 259–61; also 'Harvey, Goulston and Galen', *Koroth* 8 (1985), 113–15.