

XXIII. Notes on the Text of Caelius Aurelianus

I. E. DRABKIN

NEW YORK CITY

Proposed emendations of passages in the treatises on Acute and Chronic Diseases, preceded by a brief general discussion of the text.

Among the lost Greek works on medicine of which we possess Latin versions are the treatises on Acute and Chronic Diseases by the great Methodist physician Soranus of Ephesus. Fairly close translations of these works were made, probably in the fifth century, by Caelius Aurelianus, a Methodist physician of Sicca Veneria in Numidia.

For one seeking to constitute the text of Caelius' versions the basis must be the first printed editions. Caelius' treatise on Chronic Diseases was first edited by Joannes Sichart in 1529 at the press of Heinrich Petri in Basle; the treatise on Acute Diseases was first edited by Winter von Andernach in 1533 at the press of Simon de Colines in Paris.

In each case a single manuscript was used for the edition, and in each case the manuscript disappeared after the publication of the work. Some twenty-five years ago three leaves of the manuscript used by Sichart were discovered in a library at Zwickau.¹ It appears to be a ninth-century manuscript and may have been the very one referred to in the ninth-century library catalogues of the monastery at Lorsch.²

Comparison of these manuscript leaves with Sichart's text indicates that his edition is generally faithful and dependable. His deviations from the manuscript are confined almost exclusively to correcting obvious errors of the scribe and, what from our viewpoint is regrettable, substituting the standard orthography of the sixteenth century for that found in the manuscript. But the text

¹ A page of this manuscript is reproduced by J. Ilberg, *SPAW* 1921, 820.

² See P. Schmid, *Contributions à la critique du texte de Caelius Aurelianus* (Neuchâtel, 1942) 15 f. Apart from a dubious reference in Cassiodorus (*Inst.* 1.31.2), a few references in the library catalogues constitute the only direct mention of Caelius before the appearance of the printed editions of his works. See Max Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen* (Leipzig, 1935), 251-2.

as such is very little altered by the editor, and this fact is in accord with what we know of Sichart as an editor of other works.³

As for Winter's edition of the Acute Diseases, while no comparison with a manuscript is possible, there is evidence, both in the text itself and from what we know of Winter as an editor, to support the conclusion that here too, as in the case of the Chronic Diseases, we have a firm foundation for further study of the text.

There have been many subsequent editions of these works: an edition of the Chronic Diseases, practically a reprint of Sichart's text, in the Aldine collection *Medici Antiqui Omnes* (Venice, 1547), an anonymous edition of both treatises at the press of G. Rouille in Lyons (1566?, reprinted 1567, 1569), an edition of both treatises by Johannes Conrad Amman (Amsterdam, 1709, reprinted with minor changes in 1722 and 1755, and at Venice in 1757), an edition of both treatises by Albrecht von Haller (Lausanne, 1774, reprinted 1787), and an edition of the Acute Diseases by C. Delattre (Paris, 1826).

In only one of these editions, the Lyons edition, is a claim made that manuscripts were consulted; this claim is demonstrably false.⁴ That is to say, all deviations from the text of the first edition that may be found in any of the subsequent editions are to be considered as conjectural emendations. This is not to deny the value of some of these alterations, which are especially numerous in the Lyons edition and in that of Amman, but we must recognize them for what they are, conjectures.

Apart from the two treatises themselves (and they are of considerable size — some six hundred pages of text), the student of Caelius' usage is aided primarily by the fragments of Caelius' *Medicinales Responsiones* (see Rose, *Anecdota Graeca et Graecolatina* 2.163–240), and by the Greek of Soranus' extant works.⁵ Again,

³ On Sichart, see P. Lehmann, *Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften* (Quellen u. Unters. z. lat. Philol. d. Mittelalters 4.1), Munich 1911.

⁴ This was first pointed out by Amman in the introduction to his edition; see also P. Schmid, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 27–35.

⁵ Edited by J. Ilberg (Leipzig, 1927) in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* with indices by E. Kind. Cf. also the dissertation of K. Vietmeier, *Beobachtungen über Caelius Aurelianus als Übersetzer medizinischer Fachausdrücke verlorener griechischer Schriften des methodischen Arztes Soranos von Ephesos* (Gütersloh, 1937). Some insight into Caelius' method of translation is afforded by a fragment of Caelius' version of Soranus' *Gynaecia* (p. 142 of Rose's edition of Soranus). Again, there are in Caelius' treatises on Acute and Chronic Diseases long passages quoting works extant in the

the usage of other Latin translators of Greek medical works, notably Cassius Felix and Theodore Priscian, is in many respects extremely close to Caelius'.⁶ In fact Caelius is generally assigned to the fifth century on the basis of a comparison of his Latinity with that of Cassius Felix, whose work is known to have been written in the middle of that century.

Occasional textual difficulties in Caelius may be resolved by reference to Isidore of Seville who (*Orig.* 4.6-8), without mentioning his source, quotes directly from Caelius when giving the etymology of names of diseases. Even more important for our purpose are the medical writings that go under the name of Aurelius, Escolapius, and Gariopontus (Passionarius Galeni). Though recent study has minimized the extent of the direct dependence of these writings on Caelius,⁷ they are none the less valuable both for the text and interpretation of particular passages in Caelius. For considerable portions of these texts go back directly or indirectly to early translations of the works of Soranus. To this extent even where they do not draw directly from Caelius their source is ultimately the same as Caelius'; on occasion, therefore, each of these texts can throw light on the others.

Despite the importance of Caelius' work for the historian of medicine and philosophy and for the student of post-classical Latin, little has been done to establish and elucidate the text. In the seventeenth century Thomas Reinesius in his *Variae Lectiones* and Caspar Barth in his *Adversaria* dealt with numerous passages of Caelius, but their work was largely vitiated by their exclusive use of the Lyons edition and their failure to consult the first editions. Theodor Janssen van Almeloveen in his notes in Amman's edition quoted some of the comments of Reinesius and Barth, and added a number of his own conjectures. A considerable body of com-

original, notably the Hippocratic *Regimen in Acute Diseases*. Comparison of these passages with the original furnishes additional evidence about Caelius as a translator.

⁶ Here one should mention the Latin versions and abridgments of Soranus' *Gynaecia*, of which considerable portions are extant, though the tradition poses some difficult problems, as does the tradition of the Greek text itself.

⁷ C. Daremberg, who edited a Brussels manuscript of the text of Aurelius in the old *Janus* 2 (1847) 468-99 and 690-731, was of the opinion that he was dealing with an abridgment of Caelius Aurelianus. But see P. Schmid, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 42-72. It may well be, to judge from the multiplication of manuscripts containing texts of Aurelius, Escolapius, and Gariopontus, that the availability of these relatively short practical treatises contributed to the neglect of Caelius' works in the middle ages. The historical and doxographical material, which bulks so large in Caelius' work and reflects Soranus' interests, is not present in the practical handbooks.

mentary left in manuscript by D. G. Triller was published by Carl Gottlob Kühn⁸ along with his own discussions.

The critical editions of Greek and Latin medical works beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century — one thinks in particular of the series of works edited by V. Rose — and culminating in the volumes of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* and *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum*, furnish an indispensable aid for the study of Caelius.⁹ Recent research, pursued chiefly by Scandinavian scholars, on the Latinity of post-classical technical writers, may also be mentioned in this connection.

Philological dissertations and articles devoted to Caelius include the following: Victor H. Friedel,¹⁰ *De scriptis Caelii Aureliani* (Bischofsweiler, 1892); two articles of G. Helmreich on textual problems in Caelius, in the *Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie* 12 (1902) 173–86 and 309–331; two articles by Ilberg dealing with the manuscript leaves discovered at Zwickau, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1921), 819–29 and 1922, 282–4, and an article by the same author, “Vorläufiges zu Caelius Aurelianus,” on problems of editing Caelius, with a specimen edition of the portion of the text (Chr. 5.77–91 and 122–8) for which the manuscript is available, in the *Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse* 77 (Leipzig, 1925) 3–18; the lexicographical study of Vietmeier cited in note 5, above; and finally Schmid’s dissertation cited in note 2, above. The work of Schmid is especially important for his study of the relation between Caelius’ treatises and the texts of Aurelius, Escolapius, and Gariopontus and for his excellent emendations of certain passages in Book I of Caelius’ work *On Acute Diseases*.

There are other works on Caelius which concern themselves chiefly with problems of medical history rather than with the philo-

⁸ *Opuscula academica medica et philologica* (Leipzig, 1828) 2.1–190.

⁹ Since Caelius preserves a considerable number of fragments from the no longer extant works of Greek physicians, discussions of the text of many Caelian passages are to be found in such books as Wellmann’s edition of the fragments of Diocles, Deichgräber’s edition of the fragments of the Empirical School, and F. Steckerl’s forthcoming edition of the fragments of Praxagoras.

¹⁰ Friedel undertook to prepare a critical edition of Caelius Aurelianus as an appendix to the Soranus of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* but the plan was not carried out. Incidentally, Friedel speaks (13, n. 6) of preparing a new edition of the fragments of the *Medicinales Responsiones*, and refers to the section entitled “*Salutaria Praecepta*” as in press, but so far as I know there was no actual publication. Among others, Daremberg too planned an edition of Caelius Aurelianus but did not carry out his intention.

logical problems raised by the text. The most important of these works is that of T. Meyer-Steineg, *Das medizinische System der Methodiker, eine Vorstudie zu Caelius Aurelianus* (Jenaer med. hist. Beiträge 7-8, Jena, 1916).¹¹

I have selected for discussion in the following pages certain passages of Caelius which in my opinion have not been satisfactorily dealt with by editors or commentators. The passages have been chosen with a view to illustrating textual corruption of various types arising from mistakes both of transcription and interpretation.

Following Ilberg (in his article "Vorläufiges zu Caelius Aurelianus," noted above) I use the following abbreviations:

S — Sichart's edition of the Chronic Diseases.

G — Winter von Andernach's (Gunterius Andernacus) edition of the Acute Diseases.

R — the anonymous edition of both works at the press of G. Rouille in Lyons.

A — Amman's edition of both works. (In the case of *R* and *A* the various printings need not be differentiated here, for no significant variants are involved in the passages I shall discuss.)

edd. — The consensus of *SRA* in the case of the Chronic Diseases, and of *GRA* in the case of the Acute Diseases.

Sm, Rm, Am — the marginal notes in the editions of Sichart, Rouille, and Amman, respectively.

Citations are made from the treatises on Acute (Ac.) and Chronic (Chr.) Diseases by the book and paragraph numbers of Amman's edition. In quoting the editions I have sometimes altered the punctuation where such alteration does not affect the matters under discussion.

Acute Diseases, Book I

15*med.* sensu aliarum viarum *G*] Read *sensualium viarum* ('the sensory channels'). Cf. *sensualibus viis*, 14. *R*'s <non con>*sensu aliarum viarum* is quite improbable.

29*med.* quid enim est repugnans? *edd.*] The question makes no sense in the context. Since the sentence introduces a refutation, read

¹¹ I have not been able to examine the dissertation of Klaus Althoff, *Caelius Aurelianus: "Ueber die akuten Krankheiten," 3. Buch* (Greifswald, 1940) cited by Schmid, *op. cit.* (see note 2) x.

quod enim est repugnans ('but such a view is illogical'). *Enim* = *autem* (δέ) occurs not infrequently in Caelius.

- 29*fin.* quomodo igitur signum vocari potest cuius non solum praesens non est quod ostenderit, verum etiam in quibusdam neque erit *edd.*] For *cuius* read *cum* ('how then can something be called a sign when the thing signified is not only not present now, but in certain cases will never be present?')
- 31 *mentis sollicitudo ac pravitas sine ratione, frequens tergorum est versio iacendi edd.*] For *pravitas* read *gravitas*. Another case of the confusion of *p* and *g* in our text is indicated in the note on Chr. 5.4. *Est* is out of place in the listing of the symptoms of imminent phrenitis; for *est versio* read *conversio*. This reading is confirmed by *conversione iacendi*, Chr. 5.106; Rm's conjectures *inversio iacendo* and *inversio iacentis* are unsound. For another example of the confusion of *est* and *con* (through abbreviation) see Ac. 1.91 *fin. est tergendā G*, where *contegenda* (Rm) must be read.
- 35 *alienatio intra diatria vel post diatria tempus G*] For *diatria* in each case read *diatriiti* ('mental derangement arising before or after the end of the three-day period'). *Diatrietaum* (Rm) does not occur in Caelius.
- 77 *ita detractis cucurbitis si partes erubuisse viderimus, leniter scarificamus, si minus mitigamus vaporantes spongiis sine nimis calidis relaxamus: vapore etenim nimio tanquam frixantes densamus G*] R's reading of *non* for *sine* is in the right direction; I should read *sed non*. But instead of adding *ac* after *calidis* (R), it seems preferable to read *mitiganter* for *mitigamus*, with comma after *minus* ('Then on removing the cups, if we find that the parts have become red, we scarify them moderately; but otherwise, we relax them by gentle applications of warmth, using sponges that are not too hot, for excessive heat will have the effect of roasting and condensing the parts'). The scribe seems to have had difficulty with *mitiganter* also at Ac. 3.184.
- 133/134 *haec est secundum Asclepiadem metu periculosa (perniciosa R) atque cauta differentia curationis. huic extemplo respondemus quia nulla est metu periculosa differentia curationis arte formata, sed est potius tuta; neque etiam vehemens, quam secundam posuit periculosam ac metuendam edd.*] Previously (131) we are told that Asclepiades had two methods of treating phrenitis, a cautious or 'timid' treatment and a heroic treatment: *unam meticulosam . . . aliam vehementem atque periculosam, quam philoparabolon appellavit* (where R completely spoils the sense by reading <*non*> *meticulosam*). Cf. also 144, *periculosam sive temerariam, quam philoparabolon appellavit*.
- Clearly then, in 133/134 for *metu periculosa* we must in each case read *meticulosa*. A misunderstanding of the opposition between *meticulosa* and *periculosa* seems to have occasioned the corruption.

136^{fin.} curantes cataplasmatibus et aceto G] For *et* read *ex* ('plasters containing vinegar,' a common type of plaster).

144^{fin.} etenim inquit quae primo imbecilla atque tarda de sorbilibus et mulsa dederunt aegro commoda, omnia ex vino celerius atque coacervatim implentur *edd.*]

145^{med.} haec est vehementior quam dicit curatio, pro mulsa habens vinum *edd.*]

In the cautious treatment Asclepiades prescribes *mulsum* ('honey-drink,' 'mead'): see 132, 140, 145^{fin.} In the heroic treatment he prescribes *vinum*. For *mulsa* in the two passages quoted we must therefore read *mulso*. The reading *mulsa* seems to be due to a corrector who considered *mulsum* the equivalent of Greek *oinomeli* and for whom *mulsum* was consequently a form of *vinum*. This corrector presumably substituted *mulsa* (= *hydromeli*), not aware that *mulsum* (= *melikraton*) had nothing to do with *vinum*, in the sense of product of the grape, and that *mulsum* and *vinum* could therefore be properly set in opposition one to the other.

147^{in.} mulsum atque meracum *edd.*]

147^{fin.} non mulsum neque meracum *edd.*]

149^{med.} mulso atque meraco *edd.*]

In each case we are dealing with a criticism of Asclepiades' prescription of wine (Asclepiades had said: plurimum et extentum, hoc est meracum, et salsum dabimus vinum, 144). Caelius (Soranus) criticizes the prescription as excessive in amount and strength, among other things. *Mulsum* has nothing to do with the argument; we must therefore read *multum* in the first two cases, and *multo* in the third: cf. 148, quomodo igitur credi potest eosdem multo vino accepto atque meraco relevari . . . ?

159^{fin.} post unctionem aqua frigida faciem fomentat (*sc.* Asclepiades) constringens rursum tumentia, phreniticis strictura caput afficit. omni (omnis *G: corr. R*) etenim phrenitico strictura caput affici nemo negat *edd.*] *Phreniticis strictura caput afficit* in the first sentence should be bracketed. The words as they stand lack grammatical connection; they were probably a marginal note on the important generalization of the next sentence ('for every case of phrenitis involves a state of stricture in the head'), which fits in well after *constringens rursum tumentia*.

Acute Diseases, Book II

3 quod autem in inflatione erectus (*sc.* pulsus) videtur G] For *inflatione* read *inflationem*. Cf. in magnitudinem erigitur (*sc.* pulsus) later in this paragraph; also Ac. 1.38. R's omission of *in* is unsound.

6 alienatio subita acrescens (acrescens *A*) cum febris acutis G] Read *alienatio subita ac recens* etc.; *recens* is frequently used to characterize acute as opposed to chronic conditions.

- 14^{in.} sine his enim neque esse intelligi lethargus potest *edd.*] Supply *neque* before *intelligi* ('without these indications a case of lethargy cannot exist or be recognized as such'). Cf. Ac. 2.25 *falsum etiam solutione lethargum fieri, quantum intelligitur atque est lethargus*.
- 24^{fin.} sed omnes illius summae atque generalis passionis differentias tradiderunt, et non specialem lethargi G] To preserve the contrast between disease in general and lethargy in particular, read *illi* for *illius* ('but all those physicians [viz. Mnaseas, certain followers of Asclepiades, and many Methodists] have indicated differences that apply to disease as a whole and in general, not to lethargy in particular'). Rm's reading, *summas atque generales*, does not help.
- 47 non enim ratione quadam tacita veluti animal sentiens poterit medicamen animalia relinquere, et ab his quae contra naturam sunt detrahenda separare G] *Animalia* seems to be an error due to the presence of the word *animal* in the vicinity. R reads *utilia*; I should prefer *naturalia* ('for the drug will not be able, by some secret power of reason as if it were a sentient being, to leave untouched what is normal, and to separate therefrom that which is abnormal and should be removed'; the passage, incidentally, reminds one of Clerk Maxwell's sorting demon).
- 57^{in.} quo constat errasse Philippum libro quo de ipsa passione (*sc. cataleptica*) scripsit G] For *Philippum* we must surely read *Chrysippum*. It was Chrysippus who wrote on the subject of catalepsy: cf. Ac. 2.64, 82; Chr. 2.86.
- 63^{fin.} apprehenso aegro nullam resurrectionem dabunt (*sc. hae febres*), sed in sudores et respirationem celerem, in pulsum febricitantem occidunt G] For *in pulsum* read *impulsum*, deleting the comma after *celerem*. The passage has nothing to do with the pulse. R's correction <*desinunt ac*> *occidunt* is consequently without value.
- 65^{fin.} se vidisse plurimos memorat (*sc. Soranus*) ex intemporalis cibo vel plurimo persicorum ista (*sc. cataleptica*) oppressos passione *edd.*] *Persicorum* can hardly be right; I should read *puerorum* which is surely appropriate in the discussion of catalepsy.
- 69^{fin.} circa stomachi sessionem *edd.*] For *sessionem* read *sessionem*. *Sessio* is regularly used by Caelius to translate Greek *basis* or *hedra*.
- 80^{fin.} relevatis partibus mediis caput tondemus, atque apposita cucurbita, ex quibus nihil in catalepticis invenitur, praeterea scarificamus occipitium et tempora G] The words *ex quibus nihil in catalepticis invenitur* are out of place here. They either belong in the discussion of the differential diagnosis of catalepsy (75–78), possibly after *torpore* (78) where in the present state of the text there seems to be a lacuna, or else they were originally a marginal note at some point in that discussion. *Praeterea* should also be bracketed; it was probably added as a connective after the clause *ex . . . invenitur*

was erroneously inserted. The words, *scarificamus occipitium* etc., fit well after *apposita cucurbita*.

86*med.* iusta imitatione recentium vulnerum *edd.*] Read *iuxta imitationem* etc. ('in imitation [of the procedure in cases] of recent wounds'). For a similar correction see Chr. 1.96.

91*fin.* (in an account of the symptoms of pleurisy) sequitur etiam aegros supra id (*sc.* patiens) latus iacendi difficultas, atque cum se supra contrarium latus verterint, dolor *edd.*] For *difficultas* read *facultas* (possibly also *at* for *atque*). Cf. 96, where reference is made to the fact that in pleurisy the patient generally can lie with comfort on the affected side, but feels pain when he turns on the other side. The mistake in our passage was undoubtedly due to a zealous but uninformed corrector.

104 at si venter influxerit, poterit somnus ante dimissionem, permitte hoc est declinante accessione, prohibitis accersiri, scilicet laxativis cataplasmatibus G] For *prohibitis accersiri* read *accersiri, prohibitis* ('if the stomach is loose, let the patient sleep even before the remission, provided the attack permits, that is declines; but of course do not use relaxing poultices'). This transposition makes unnecessary such corrections as *adhibitis* (R) or *prohibitis* (A). For another case of transposition see the note on Ac. 2.173.

108*fin.* deinde denique pulticula G] For *deinde* read *danda*. This change is preferable to R's *deinde dabitur pulticula*.

130 at si plus defecerint, nutriendos etiam post accessionem quintae diei permittimus *edd.*] For *plus defecerint* read *pulsus defecerit* ('if the pulse fails, etc.'). This reading is confirmed by *pulsus* . . . *defectio* 133, referring to our passage.

143*in.* (in an account of the symptoms of pneumonia) sensus laborantium quadam difficultate laterum atque medium papularum *edd.*] For *medium papularum* read *medii scapularum*. This is a regular expression for the interscapular region, and the reading is confirmed by *medio scapularum*, 149. There is just the possibility that Caelius wrote *medii palarum*. But Rm's *mammaram et papillarum*, whether intended as a reading or an explanation, is out of the question.

153 aliqui etiam adhibuerunt illud (*sc.* malagma) quod Nileus appellatur, item Antisophantis, quae non sunt ita vehementia G] Greek and Roman medical authors often refer to Nileus' plaster (our text should have the genitive, *Nileos*); but the other name is obviously incorrect. Rm suggested *Apolllophanis*. A more probable correction from the point of view of the *ductus literarum* is *Cephisophantis* (or *Cefi* —). Cf. Chr. 2.34; 3.55; Soranus *Gyn.* p. 118.3 (Ilberg); Sor. Lat. p. 66.24 (Rose).

166*in.* somnus parvus et facilis in suscitatione *edd.*] For *suscitatione* read *suscitationem* in accordance with the regular construction much used by Caelius.

- 173 (on the question whether there is fever in the morbus cardiacus) item Themison et Thessalus Demetrius Aponieus quosdam (*sc. cardiacos*) febricitare aiunt, quosdam negaverunt. Demetrius vero Aponieus incipiente inquit passione atque crescente omnes febricitare; post vero cum vehementescere coeperit febris, passio recedere fertur *edd.*] *Aponieus* should unquestionably be corrected to *Apameus*, as suggested by Van Almelooven (p. 711 of Amman's edition). Cf. Chr. 2.64; 5.89; Soranus *Gyn.* p. 94.22, 106.10. But it seems to me that *Demetrius Aponieus* in the first sentence should be bracketed as inadvertently copied from the second, or in some other way improperly inserted. For the view of Demetrius is meant to be contrasted with that of Themison and Thessalus. Moreover the absence of a connective after Thessalus may be taken as a warning of textual derangement.

Again, in the second sentence for *febris*, *passio* I should read *passio, febris* ('all have fever at the beginning of the disease and in its increasing phase, but later when the disease enters its most active stage, the fever recedes').

- 174 secundum Asclepiadem febricula est fervor plurimus in omnibus sive plurimis corporis partibus, commutatiove pulsus in vehementem ob obrusionem facta G] A improves the text by reading *commutatione*; I should prefer *cum mutatione* ('with a change to a stronger pulse, caused by a blocking [of the corpuscles]').

- 218/219 sympasmatibus utentes, quae nos aspergines dixerimus, item et calce cum pipere, cibis acribus utentes atque edacibus, alii salsa-mento et lasere *edd.*] M. Wellmann (*A. Cornelius Celsus* 85, n. 2) is certainly right in reading *ex calce* for *et calce* (see 223) and may be right in adding *ex faecibus* after *dixerimus*.

But one other correction should be made. For *alii* read *al(l)io* ('garlic'). When Caelius comes to refute the prescription he says (224): est etiam iners allium dare atque laser et salsamentum.

Acute Diseases, Book III

- 7 (on the symptoms of synanche) surgente vero ac crescente passione sic ut manifesto tumore fuerit rubens facta, videbitur tumor faucium atque uvae G] For *sic ut* read *si cum*. The author has previously (2) referred to two types of synanche: synanches igitur alia est sine manifesto indicio, alia cum visibili atque manifesto. In 7-8 he gives the symptoms of one type; in 9 he gives the symptoms of the other type beginning thus: at si sine manifesto tumore fuerit passio, sequitur collorum tenuitas etc. This passage supports the proposed correction. R supplies *pars* before *facta*; the addition is probably unnecessary.
- 16 item utendum decoctione cantabri atque glycyrizae vel lini seminis ac foenugraeci, sed nusquam ad crassitudinem succi decoctione ob viscosam tenacitatem humorum fluori connexa difficultatem faciant

spirationis G] For *succi decoctione* read *succo decocto*, *ne* ('but in no case should the preparation be allowed to boil down to the point where it becomes thick, for in that case because of its stickiness the decoction would gum the flow of liquid matter and cause difficulty in breathing'). This seems an easier correction than R's *succi <facta> decoctione*, *<ne>*.

- 35^{fin}. omne etenim quod acre fuerit atque tenuans incendet (-it R) humorem *edd.*] For *humorem* read *tumorem* ('for everything sharp and attenuating aggravates inflammation'). For other instances of the confusion of *humor* and *tumor* in our text see Ac. 3.215; Chr. 3.103, 105, 112; 4.36, 111; 5.98.
- 55 discernitur etiam paralysi apoplexia, quanquam idem multis videatur veteribus ut Hippocrati et Diocli et Praxagorae et Asclepiadi Titiensi et Demetrio G] Wellmann correctly altered *Titiensi* to *Cittensi* (Diocles, frag. 56); I should suggest the possibility of reading *Apollonio* for *Asclepiadi*. No Asclepiades of Citium is known apart from this passage, whereas the famous Apollonius of Citium is referred to by Caelius in Chr. 1.140 and 3.56, and in the latter passage is named among the *veteres*.
- 141ⁱⁿ. (in a list of symptoms of intestinal obstruction) exitus per podicem venti nihil relevantis *edd.*] For *relevantis* read *relevans* ('passage of wind through the anus without bringing relief'). The correction is confirmed by Ac. 3.194: per podicem venti fluor nihil relevans (among the symptoms of morbus cholericus). Cf. also *Diaet. Pass.* 44, p. 230 Rose (again on intestinal obstruction): venti per podicem frequentia (*abl.*) nihil relevante.
- 153 (discussing the treatment of intestinal obstruction as given in the Hippocratic *De Morbis* 3.14 [vii.134 Littré]) tunc sacculum aqua calida plenum deponendo iubet aegrotantes G] Amman is certainly right in adding *in* before *sacculum*, and probably right in changing *sacculum* to *vasculum* (the Greek has ἐν σκάφη): cf. Ac. 3.133 in vasculum plenum frigida miserunt (*sc.* hydrophobicos). But he is probably wrong in reading *deponere* for *deponendo*. The proper correction is *deponendos*, which yields a construction quite common in Caelius.
- 167 inhibitio vaporationum ex aqua calida tanquam facile frigentium *edd.*] For *frigentium* read *frigerantium* ('the rejection of applications of heat with hot water, on the ground that such applications can readily chill the patient').
- 184ⁱⁿ. decoctionibus mitigantur laxativis G] For *mitigantur* read *mitiganter*. R's *mitigantibus <et>* is far less probable.
- 215 febribus quoque irruentibus, et quantum credendum est humore interposito, inconueniens est lenticula et infusiones sive decoctiones constringentium materiarum *edd.*] For *humore* read *tumore* ('inflammation'). The presence of inflammation makes the use of

astringent substances inadvisable, according to the Methodists. See note on Ac. 3.35.

Chronic Diseases, Book I

- 7in. (in a discussion of the *locus patiens* in chronic headache, some having proposed the membrane of the brain, others the skin of the head, others the muscles of the temples and jaws) nos vero aliquando istorum aliqua, secundum quod se sensus doloris extendit, aliquando omnia, secundum quod fomenta vel accessiones passionum ordinate se ingerunt *edd.*] A lacuna must be assumed after *omnia*; what follows no longer belongs to the discussion of the part affected but to a discussion of other ways in which the cases differ, first in regard to the regularity of the attacks. For *fomenta* we must probably read *augmenta*.
- 26fin. sed ne quid odiosum e quantitate multorum dierum fiat aegrotanti, hoc est pulmentorum similis oblatio, erit in communi qualitate specierum diversitas varianda *edd.*] For *quantitate* read *qualitate*, as the sequel requires ('to avoid causing the patient distaste on the score of the quality of his food over a period of many days — I mean the repeated serving of the same type of food — we must, without altering the general type, vary the particular items [within that type]').
- 29 tunc infuso mulso et aceto confecto simplici vel scillino *edd.*] For *et* read *ex* ('then pouring [over the radishes] oxymel, either plain or flavored with squill'). *mulsum ex aceto* (*confectum*) is the regular term for oxymel.
- 36 cucurbitae infigendae . . . dorso atque cervici vel caeteris nervis, quos tenontas appellant *edd.*] For *caeteris* read *cervicis*. Cf. e.g. nervis maioribus cervicis, quos tenontas appellant, Ac. 3.23.
- 45med. caput impletum . . . totius passionis duplicat modum *edd.*] For *modum* read *motum* ('the congestion of the head aggravates the vehemence of the whole disease'). *Motus* commonly occurs in Caelius in the sense of agitation produced by a disease or a remedy (cf., e.g., Chr. 1.43, 46, 59, 117; 2.163; Ac. 1.72).
- 47 (discussing the treatment of chronic headache by the non-Methodists) dant quoque mastichen masticandam, ex quo in passione constituta densatus constrictivae virtutis cassatur *S* (with an asterisk to indicate textual corruption)] For *densatus* etc. I should suggest *densantur constrictivae virtutis causae* ('they also have the patient chew mastic, but the affected parts are thereby condensed by reason of the astringent property [of the mastic]').
- 52 (on vertigo) asperatur praeterea passio (*sc.* scotomatica) si ex alto aspexerint aegrotantes vel meatum fluminis, aut rotae vertiginem sive ignis *S*] For *sive ignis* read *figuli* ('the disease is aggravated if the patient watches . . . the turning of a potter's wheel'). That

the passage has nothing to do with fire is indicated, e.g., by Chr. 1.66 (of epilepsy): cum . . . aegrotantes . . . rotam figuli . . . conspexerint; and *Diaet. Pass.* 51, p. 231 Rose (of vertigo): cum . . . rotae figulinae vertiginem conspiciunt.

- 56 (on the symptoms of nightmare) cum somno surrexerint, faciem atque transforationis partes uvidas et humectas sentiunt *edd.*] Read *transvorationis partes* ('the parts used in swallowing'), as, e.g., in Chr. 1.109. Our lexicons still cite *transforatio* on the basis of Rm's fanciful interpretation of our passage as referring to external bodily orifices.
- 59*fin.* ac corporum usus acriorum *edd.*] Read *acoporum usus acriorum* ('the use of sharp restorative ointments'). Cf. Chr. 1.39, where for *usura corporum* of the editions, D. G. Triller's conjecture *usus acoporum* is certainly right (see C. G. Kühn, *De Incubone*, p. 9). Cf. Chr. 1.99 *acopa acriora*.
- 96 cum recorporativa curatione . . . iusta cyclorum regula *edd.*] For *iusta cyclorum regula* read *iuxta cyclorum regulam* ('in accordance with the standard system of treatments'). Cf., e.g., Chr. 2.211; 3.67, 92. For a similar correction see Ac. 2.86.
- 100 (on the timing of the hellebore treatment and other metasyncritic remedies in intervals between epileptic attacks) in iis vero qui ordinate admonentur eo tempore adhibenda curatio quo conicere possumus medium praeteritae atque futurae accessionis *edd.*] Caelius has just indicated his conclusions with respect to cases where the attacks are known to come at regular intervals (iis qui ordine servato admonentur). The present sentence is meant to form a contrast. We must therefore read *inordinate* for *ordinate* ('but in cases where the attacks come irregularly the treatment must be administered at some time which we may guess will be midway between the last attack and the next attack'). That the solution does not lie in altering the preceding clause (iis qui ordine servato admonentur) is confirmed by a comparison of the language of 138 and 100.

Chronic Diseases, Book II

- 9 (after discussing cases of paralysis of the esophagus) sed discernuntur ab iis qui facilem paralyisin ex difficultate transvorandi patiuntur, siquidem etc. *edd.*] For *facilem* read *faucium* ('but such cases [paralysis of the esophagus] are distinguished from cases in which the difficulty of swallowing is due to paralysis of the fauces'). The factors in determining the diagnosis are then stated, one of which, *immobilitas faucium*, confirms the proposed correction.
- 25 (referring to the necessity of separating the jaws when the teeth are clenched in cases of paralysis) immittimus ceram vel tabellam alearem aut feruleam *edd.*] For *alearem*, which makes no sense, read *tiliarem* ('we insert wax or a thin slab of linden or fennel').

The correction is confirmed by Chr. 2.42 *dandum . . . cera indulgentior mordenda, tunc ferulae particula, vel per profectum tiliæ tabella*; cf. Chr. 5.20 *tabulae tiliari*.

- 32*in*. *singularum viarum motus invadens (sc. spiritus) edd.*] For *motus* read *meatus*, referring to the channels of the various pores.
- 56 *non advertens quia . . . exigunt laxationem atque indulgentiam tensionis et non . . . conscriptionem* S] For *conscriptionem* read *constrictionem*, the term regularly used by Caelius in opposition to *laxatio*; Rm's *circumscriptionem* is less satisfactory from this viewpoint.
- 70 *item eundem immissione medicaminum edd.*] For *eundem*, which makes no sense, read *utendum* (not *tentandum* Rm).
- 110*in*. *sed hoc facit in tardante passione edd.*] Write *intardante* as one word ('when the disease becomes chronic'). The same correction is to be made at Chr. 5.38. Cf. Ac. 1.43 *magis intardans atque perseverans perspicitur*.
- 115 *monendi etiam aegrotantes ne ultra modum competentem retinendo spiritum alterent potius tussiculam quam mitigent edd.*] For *alterent* read *asperent* (i.e. 'aggravate the cough rather than soothe it'). If Rm's suggestion of *irritent* is intended as a reading and not merely as a gloss, it is quite improbable.
- 121 *Themison libro Tardarum Passionum edd.*] Read <*secundo*> *libro*. Cf. Chr. 2.184 *Themison secundo libro Tardarum Passionum*, where the discussion is on the treatment of hemorrhage. Since our passage also deals with hemorrhage, presumably the same number must be supplied.
- 133 *item iis (ii RA) qui ex capite sanguinem fluunt acceptum primo vel exceptum internis visceribus atque ita redditum, si in arteriam deflexerit, excludunt, deinde cum tussicula vehementi etiam quam de pulmone feratur similitudinem dabit; sin vero in stomachum deflexerit vel ventrem, commota nausea vomitur etiam quam ex iisdem locis ferri videatur similitudinem dabit edd.*] For *etiam quam* in each case read *et tamquam* ('In cases of [internal] bleeding from the head, the blood is first taken by inner organs and then given up again. If the blood flows [from the head] into the windpipe, it is discharged from there, and there is violent coughing, the case resembling one in which the bleeding is from the lung; but if the blood flows [from the head] into the esophagus or stomach, there is nausea and vomiting, and the case resembles one in which the bleeding is from those parts [the esophagus and the stomach]'). The author goes on to distinguish true cases of bleeding from lungs, esophagus, and stomach from cases where the blood that is coughed or vomited up came originally from the head. Rm's suggestion of *qua veluti si* for the first *quam*, and <*et*> *etiam* <*tan*> *quam* for *etiam quam* in the second case are not acceptable.

- 150 aër qui in pausabiliorem inspirationem adductus S] For *in pausabiliorem inspirationem* read *impausabiliorē inspiratione* ('the air inhaled in continual breathing'). Cf. *impausabiliter* Chr. 3.20. R omits *in* and reads *pausabiliōri inspiratione*, which hardly gives the sense required.
- 182*in.* (in a list of directions for treatment) *imitanda consuetudo frigida lavacri* S] The correction to *frigidi* (Am) is almost certainly right. For *imitanda* I should read *initianda*; Rm's *ineunda* gives the required sense but is less probable.
- 183 siquidem Erasistratus phlebotomari praeceperit patientes; alii vero eius sectatores . . . damnaverunt adiutorii genus (*sc.* phlebotomiam) S] After a statement that physicians of old disagreed on four aspects of the treatment of hemorrhage, *viz.* the position of the patient, the use of venesection, the use of bandages, and the application of certain astringent remedies, each of the four points of disagreement is taken up. The first is introduced with the words, *de schemate, inquam, iacendi* (183*in.*); there follows a statement of the conflicting views on whether the patient should or should not lie on the affected part. The words quoted in our lemma follow immediately and obviously belong to the discussion of the second point of disagreement, the use of venesection. They should be preceded by some phrase like <item de phlebotomia inquam> or <item de phlebotomia pugnauerunt> (cf. 186: *item de ligationibus pugnauerunt*). It may be that the lacuna is still larger, i.e., that the discussion of the *schema iacendi* is incomplete; but of that one cannot be sure.
- 186*in.* alii (*sc.* phlebotomiam probant) ob evacuandas venas quo exeant late celerius concedant atque coeant divisurae S] For *exeant late*, which is quite unintelligible, read *exantillatae*, a word much used by Caelius ('to empty the veins so that drained of blood they may close and heal more quickly').

Chronic Diseases, Book III

- 16*in.* (in a list of symptoms of *passio stomachica*) *dentium confictio sive concubitus inseparabilis* *edd.* (with punctuation after *concubitus*; but *inseparabilis* is better taken with *concubitus* than with the words that follow, *capitis gravedo*)] For *confictio* read *confixio*. *Confixio* is the regular translation of *συνέπειρος*. Cf. Ac. 2.18 *dentium confixio*; 70 *dentium concubitus, hoc est confixio vehemens*; 3.67 *dentium . . . concubitus, hoc est incumbens confixio*; Cass. Fel. p. 187.13 (Rose) *dentium confixio* (*so g p: confixio c*). The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* reads *conflictio* in all these cases (except Ac. 2.18 which it does not cite). But the basis is *figo* (cf. Ac. 3.69 *mentum pectori configitur*) not *fligo*. While *confictio* is a hypothetical possibility (note the occurrence of *confictus* = *confixus*), there is nothing in the textual tradition to commend it in Caelius. The same is true of

contritio (Rm). It is interesting to note that in Chr. 5.133 the editions have *hoplomachia*, hoc est armorum ficta confrixio, where *conflictio* probably should be read.

- 21in. discernentes . . . contrariarum adiutoria passionum stricturae ac solutionis, quae suis speciebus signis approbantur S] For *speciebus* read *specialibus* ('distinguishing the remedies to be applied in the contrary conditions of stricture and looseness, conditions which are indicated by their special signs'). Cf. Ac. 2.187 speciali concursu ac significatione; Chr. 5.102 specialis significatio. In our passage R's reading, *speciebus* <et> *signis*, is not helpful.

- 22 pectori quoque saccelli calidi ex cantabro confecti sive polline, nam Graeci omphacomeli vocant *edd.*]

- 63 adhibenda quoque <putat RA> cataplasmata ex phoenicobalanis cum vino atque lini semine et sesamo et pollinibus, quos omphacomeli appellant *edd.*]

Omphacomeli, a mixture of sour grapes and honey, is obviously not in place here. I should read *omelysin* in both cases. Though *omelysis* is the regular term for the raw meal used in poultices and often appears in similar contexts in Caelius and in most Greek and Roman medical authors, it seems to have troubled the scribe in the two passages cited. For this I can offer no explanation. Rm's reading in the second passage, <et eo> quod omphacomeli (adopted by Wellmann, Diocles frag. 69), is quite improbable.

- 36 plurimi vero medici stomachicos putant eos qui duritia laboraverunt et singultu castoreum ex aqua mulsa solutum quantitate pleni cochlearis tribus cyathis aquae miscentes S] For *putant* read *potant* and for *quantitate* read *quantitatem*; we should probably also change *castoreum* . . . *solutum* to *castoreo* . . . *soluto* ('but many doctors in cases of disease of the esophagus characterized by hardness and hiccoughs give the patient castor dissolved in hydromel to drink, mixing a spoonful [of castor] with three *cyathi* of water'). The readings *potant* and *quantitatem* are confirmed by the sentence immediately following in the text: eos autem qui fluore stomachi . . . laboraverint aqua (aquam S: corr. R) *potant*, miscentes aloës cochlearis pleni *quantitatem* (37). In view of this, such expedients as supplying *iisque dant* after *singultu* (R) are clearly unnecessary. The formula *potare aliquem aliquo* (not *aliquid*) is frequent in Caelius. Should *laboraverint* be read instead of *laboraverunt* as in the passage just cited from 37? Note 40: in quo fluore . . . laboraverunt.

- 58 cucurbitis rapidis forti raptura motis *edd.*] For *raptura motis* read *raptu remotis*. Cf., e.g., Chr. 1.36 quae quidem (*sc.* cucurbitae) capiti erunt magno raptu detrahendae. Van Almeloveen is probably right in supplying *hoc est* after *rapidis*.

- 61in. item ammoniaci guttae drachmam unam (*sc.* dant) cum mulso ex aceto confecto cyathis tribus vel tamarisci ligno. item cibum vel potum sumere iubent aegrotantes in vasculis <ex RA> tamarisci

ligno confectis *edd.*] The words *vel tamarisci ligno* are out of place in the first sentence and should be deleted; they may have been copied by mistake from the second sentence.

70*in.* *convenit igitur . . . eam adhibere curationem quam de tumoribus in corporibus in torpore constitutis saepe memoravimus* S] R obtains the correct sense by deleting *in torpore* ('it is proper then to administer the treatment we have often indicated for inflammations in the body'); but I prefer to delete *in corporibus* and read *corpore* for *torpore*, thus: *de tumoribus in corpore constitutis*. That is to say, the scribe, seeing that he had written *in corporibus* by mistake, proceeded to write the correct *in corpore* but failed to erase *in corporibus*; later *torpore* arose as an attempt to correct *corpore*.

92 *atque iuxta cycli regulam eorum (sc. pulmentorum etc.) augmenta ac detractones variare, non repetitis nec perfectis ilico cyclis, sed unius tantummodo qualitatis, ut de cataleptico scribentes docuimus. denique cum ex volantibus solis adhibemus, initium ex parvulis ordinamus: tum autem ex agrestibus, ex teneribus, cum porcina ex membrorum summitatibus* S] The discussion referred to in *docuimus*, on changes in the quality and quantity of food in the standard metasyncritic treatment of the Methodists, is in all probability Chr. 1.26-28 (on chronic headache); possibly also Chr. 2.30 (on paralysis). But there is no such discussion in the chapter on catalepsy. For *cataleptico* we must therefore probably read *cephalaea*. A spelling *cafalea* could have occasioned the confusion.

In the following sentence for *tum* read *cum*. And it is quite probable, though not certain, that *ex* should be added before *porcina* ('then when we prescribe an exclusive diet of fowl, we begin with small birds; when we prescribe game, we begin with the tender varieties; and when we prescribe pork, we begin with the animal's extremities'). The later editions require even more correction than the first edition to restore the meaning.

103*in.* (in an account of the symptoms of dropsy) *inflatio vel extantia tumoris* *edd.*]

105*in.* (on the same subject) *iacentibus praeterea aegrotantibus diffusa atque elatior (latior A, correctly) tumoris extantia fiet, surgentium vero vel stantium maior atque extenta* S]

In each case for *tumoris* read *humoris*. The reference is to 'the swelling caused by the accumulation of fluid' in dropsy. A page or two later in Chr. 3.112 not only are *humore* and *tumore* confused, but *habentibus* and *tabentibus*. See also the note on Ac. 3.35.

104*fin.* *quod aegrotantis color albidioris imaginem ferat* S] For *albidioris* read *albidū humoris*. The discussion is on the etymology of *leucophlegmatia*, and though *albidioris* might conceivably stand, it is best to make the correction, which involves only a slight addition (*ū*). R's *albidioris* <*pituilae*> is quite unnecessary.

- 140^{fin.} dehinc si phlebotomare oportuerit, non solum aestivo tempore ac media aestate, sed etiam omni tempori atque aetati convenire probamus S] For *media aestate* read *media aetate*, as the sequel requires. The necessity for a similar correction at the beginning of 140, where *aetas media* should be read for *aestas media*, was indicated, though not very clearly, by Rm. R's addition of *phlebotomiam* before *probamus* is unnecessary, as are most of the corrections proposed in that edition.
- 141 Diocles . . . inquit . . . urinam provocandam diagridio et apii semine resoluto succo herbae salviae. item cardamomum quantum ventrem valeat semel deducere *edd.*] For *diagridio* substitute *cardamomo*, and for *cardamomum* substitute *diagridium*. This transposition is suggested by the fact that *diagridium* (scammony juice) is preeminently purgative, while *cardamum* is preeminently diuretic. The change may also obviate the necessity of adding *et ventrem* as Rm does after *provocandam* and Wellmann (Diocles, frag. 48) after *urinam* (with a change to *provocandum*). Furthermore, it seems unnecessary in the second sentence to alter the accusative *cardamum* (or in my reading *diagridium*) to the ablative, as Wellmann does; and it is better to supply *dandum* in thought than to add it to the text, as Rm does.
- 144^{fin.} (on Praxagoras' treatment of dropsy) item potum repugnante mordicativo; dat enim acetum vel puscum, vel his rursum contraria, ut mulsam *edd.*] For *repugnante mordicativo*, which is unintelligible, we may perhaps read *repugnantem ordinat* ('he [*sc.* Praxagoras] prescribes drinks of conflicting properties, on the one hand vinegar or vinegar water, and on the other hand their contraries, e.g. hydromel').
- 148^{in.} (on the treatment of dropsy) utitur (*sc.* Erasistratus) etiam malagmatibus <et R> cataplasmatibus cum somno cubaverint aegrotantes, non tamen designans eos qui coacervatam ac vehementem humoris detractionem reprobant S] There is obviously a lacuna after *designans*; I should read *designans <ea. et est inter>* eos ('Erasistratus prescribes emollient plasters and poultices [in dropsy] but he does not specify the precise drugs; and he is one of those who oppose the drastic removal of the fluid all at once [e.g. by tapping]'). Failure to specify drugs is a criticism frequently voiced by Caelius (Soranus); Erasistratus' opposition to tapping is noted in Chr. 3.122.

Chronic Diseases, Book IV

- 8^{in.} (after a statement that Asclepiades bars anointing in his treatment of elephantiasis) sed adhibet graecum non coniiciens hoc quoque esse laxativae virtutis *edd.*] For the unintelligible *graecum*, I suggest *lavacrum*. Rm's <*picem*> *graecam* does not at all fit the context.

- 16in. (on the treatment of phthiriasis) *superpositione resumptio adhibenda atque recorporatio* S] In 15, the procedure during the attack (*superpositio*) had been indicated beginning with the words, *superpositionis tempore iacere oportet aegrotos loco mediocriter frigido*. What we now require is the procedure during the interval of remission (*lenimentum*). The lemma quoted tells us that this procedure is the restorative treatment (*resumptio*) and metasyncrisis (*recorporatio*). But of course for *superpositione* we must substitute some expression denoting the interval of remission. <post> *superpositionem* or *superpositione* <resoluta> come to mind. But a regular expression in Caelius in similar contexts is *in lenimento vero* and this may be what Caelius wrote here, *superpositione* having been miscopied from 15. In any case R's <in> *superpositione* cannot be correct.
- 22fin. *lanis mollibus venter contegendus leviter oleo hispano praetactus edd.*] For *praetactus* read *praetinctis* ('wool dipped in Spanish olive oil'). Rm's *praeunctus* is unsatisfactory.
- 24in. (in testing a clyster apparatus) *tunc leviter oppresso liquore, quo folliculi reflatio fiat, erit tentandum ne clysteris caverna fuerit clausa edd.*] Here again a transposition will make sense of the passage. For *oppresso liquore quo folliculi* read *oppresso folliculo quo liquoris* ('by gentle pressure on the clyster bulb, which should cause the liquid to emerge, test to be sure that the opening of the pipe is not obstructed').
- 25 (referring to cases in which only the lower part of the intestines is ulcerated) *erit denique parvae longitudinis atque altioris cavernae fistula procuranda edd.*] For *altioris* read *lterioris*. In the cases in question a short pipe with a broad opening is necessary.
- 38fin. *diatheon emplastri edd.*] Read *diaiteon emplastri* ('the plaster of willows'). So also at Chr. 1.9; 4.71. The preparation has nothing to do with sulphur (*theion*) as the editors suppose. The spelling *diatheon* occurs not infrequently in medical manuscripts: see, e.g., Cass. Fel., Index I s.v. *διὰ τῆων* (Rose).
- 68fin. *mala cydonia . . . fricatione siccata atque crassificata edd.*] Rm's *frixione* yields the required sense ('quinces dried and thickened by roasting'). *Frixatione* is somewhat more probable; cf. *frixantes densamus* Ac. 1.77.
- 71fin. *illud quod Graeci appellant inter corticem quercus inhaerens pertetā nervorum fila teneriora* S (with asterisk to indicate textual corruption)] I should add *hymenodes* after *Graeci* and read *per tanta* (possibly *per tot*) for *pertetā*. For *hymenōdes* (or *hymenoeides*) cf. Diosc. *Mat. Med.* 1.106.1; Galen xi.865 (Kühn). There is the possibility that the words *per tanta nervorum fila teneriora* should be bracketed as originating in a gloss on *hymenodes*. In any case it seems clear that the reference is to the fibrous membrane inside the bark of the oak tree.

- 73*in.* (in connection with the diet of convalescents from morbus coeliacus) tardis vel parvis volantum animalibus *edd.*] For *tardis* read *turdis* ('thrushes'), frequently referred to in similar contexts. Rm's *teneris et parvis* is unsound.
- 106 item alii ad acriores clysteres confugerunt ex initio adhibendos, velut Asclepiades: et aliquibus etiam fluor ventris efficitur *edd.*] The editions begin the chapter (VIII) on worms with the words just quoted, Rm noting that the beginning of the chapter is lost. But *item* . . . *Asclepiades* belongs to the preceding chapter, continuing as it does the refutation of the non-Methodist treatment of diseases of the colon. A lacuna should be indicated after *Asclepiades*, not only the beginning of chapter VIII but also the end of chapter VII being lost.
- 111*in.* a stomachicis discernuntur (*sc.* lumbricosi) cum nullus fuerit humor in stomachi partibus inventus *edd.*] For *humor* read *tumor* (cf. the note on Ac. 3.35). The reading is confirmed by Escolapius 29 (see Rose, *Anec. Graeca* II, p. 238.4).
- 121 si vero vehementius oportuerit animalia alia sauciare *edd.*] I should bracket *alia* as a case of dittography rather than read *alia* (Rm). There is of course no reference to 'other animals'; the meaning is merely 'if more drastic measures are necessary to overcome the animals (i.e. the worms).'
- 126*fin.* (on the treatment of worms) hinc denique etiam pinnae aridae veluti atque tritae potui sufficientem modum miscuerunt *edd.*] For *veluti* read *vel ustae*. Cf. Theo. Prisc. 2.98-99 for the use of a powder of burnt feathers (*pinnae combustae*) in cases of worms.

Chronic Diseases, Book v

- 4 (on the symptoms of morbus ischiadicus) et in itineris pressu, quibus forte permittitur, ut initia motus impediuntur, fervore partium attestante *edd.*] For *pressu* read *gressu* (cf. the confusion of *pravitas* and *gravitas*, Ac. 1.31). I should follow Rm to the extent of deleting *ut* and reading *impediuntur* ('and even in the case of those who are able to walk, the first steps are difficult and there is a burning sensation in the parts').
- 6 (on the symptoms of what may be lumbago) ut se renitente dolore nec inclinare valeant *edd.*] For *renitente* read *retinente*.
- 7*in.* quae de ipsis (*sc.* nephriticis) scribentes memoravimus *edd.*] Here we should write *memorabimus* to avoid confusion. The reference is to Chr. 5.54-58.
- 28 nam quidam medici arthriticam passionem genus vocant, podagricam vero speciem: etenim quod Graecis hamartritis recte nuncupatur, siquidem sit in articulis dolor, quamquam in pedibus constitutus S] For *quod Graecis hamartritis* read *podagra etiam art(h)ritis* ('certain physicians call arthritis the general class and

podagra a species of the class. And indeed podagra is properly called a form of arthritis, for it is an affection of the joints, but confined to the feet'). Both Liddell-Scott-Jones and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* still deal with *hamarthritis* as if there were such a disease. Rm was on the right path in reading *podagra Graecis arthritis*, but did not see that *Graecis* arose from the *-gra* of *podagra* and the *eti-* (becoming *eci-*) of *etiam*, while the *-am* of *etiam* contributed to form (*h*)*amart(h)ritis*.

- 45ⁱⁿ. ex papaveris coliculis *edd.*] Read *ex papaveris caliculis* (i.e. *caly-*), 'poppy-heads.' Cf. Ps.-Theo. Prisc. *Addit.* p. 307.16 Rose.
- 56 (on the symptoms of nephritis) *tum oleosum veluti adipis qualitatem simulans* (*sc. urina*), *cum renum fluor pinguis acceperit* S] For *oleosum* read *oleosam* and for *fluor* read *fluorem* ('the urine then taking on an oily and fatty appearance, since it receives a flow of fat from the kidneys'). It seems easier to make these corrections than to read *oleosa* (R) and either *acciderit* (Rm) or *accesserit* (Van Almelo-veen).
- 59^{fin}. illis vero qui vesicae (*sc. vitiis laborant*), pectini vel pubetenus, quod Graeci peritoneon vocant (*sc. localia adiutoria adhibeantur*) S] R, obviously because of the impossibility of identifying the pubic regions with the peritoneum, corrected *peritoneon* to *perineon*. But more extensive correction is required, for the pubic region is not the perineum either. Read: *pectini vel pubetenus quod Graeci <etron vocant, vel circa veretri initium, quod Graeci> perineon* vocant. Such a restoration of the words lost through haplography is confirmed by 68, where incidentally S again has *peritoneon* for *perineon*, as also in 65, 66, and 79.
- 62 (on bladder stone) *ut lapis angusta deserens loca atque vesicae aditum repetens mictus tribuat facultatem* *edd.*] For *aditum* read *ambitum*, the broad curved part of the bladder away from the narrow entrance or neck (cf. 65). The stone must be dislodged from this entrance if urination is to be facilitated.
- 65 *non solo ex ambitu vesicae fluor iste* (*sc. sanguinis*) *fiet* (*fit RA*), *sed etiam ex collo vel mictualibus visco acervatus sanguis excluditur* *edd.*] For *visco acervatus* read *viis coacervatus* ('not only does the flow of blood originate in the broad part of the bladder, but a mass of blood coming from the neck of the bladder or the urinary passages may also be discharged'). *Coacervatus* occurs very frequently in Caelius. Rm saw that *viis* was involved, but went no further.
- 104ⁱⁿ. *item ad intestina vel ventrem, vel podicem ferri; ad renes vero vel vesicam, per mictuales vias* *edd.*] For *vel podicem* read *per podicem*, as is indicated by the following clause and the remainder of the sentence ('in cases where the purulent matter flows into the intestines and is discharged through the anus, or flows into the kidneys or bladder and is discharged through the urinary canal, etc.').

- 105ⁱⁿ. per quas limpida vel purulenta quadam exudatione ferantur *edd.*] For *limpida* read *liquida*. Cf. *liquida* et *purulenta*, 103ⁱⁿ.
- 107ⁱⁿ. (on the symptoms after the breaking up of an internal abscess) sed si inanis fuerit ruptio thoracis facta, superiorum partium a discrimine, quod Graeci diaphragma vocant, cum difficultate spirationis ac tussiculæ querela sequetur S] For *inanis* read <ad> *inania*: cf. 106 ad *inania* thoracis; 112 ad *inanitatem* thoracis; and for *tussiculæ* read *tussicula* ('but if the pus is discharged into the chest cavity, there is pain in the parts above the dividing membrane (Greek *diaphragma*), with coughing and difficulty in breathing'). R's omission of *ac* is unsound.
- 109ⁱⁿ. erit approbanda significatio non in fundo factae ruptionis, cum inter aliquos dies repleta vomica sive eruptio tensionem rursum atque gravedinem cum febre moverit aegrotanti *edd.*] For *sive eruptio*, which makes no sense, read *sine eruptione* ('the indication that an internal abscess has failed to discharge completely is that within a few days it fills up again and by not discharging brings renewed tension, heaviness, and fever to the patient'). An alternative reading *sive collectio* is less probable.
- 114ⁱⁿ. pessima autem aut difficulter aut ut saepe contingit interfectiva ferri iudicamus eis quibus post eruptionem febres annexae perseveraverint *edd.*] I should read *pessimas* (sc. *vomicas*, 'internal abscesses') for *pessima*; *difficillimas* for *difficulter* (*difficillima* Rm), though *difficulter* <*curabiles*> or <*sanabiles*> remains a possibility; *interfectivas esse* for *interfectiva ferri* (which gives the clue to the source of the textual corruption); and *eas* for *eis* ('we hold that the worst and most difficult cases of empyema, cases in which the outcome is sometimes fatal, are those where the accompanying fever persists after the breaking up of the abscess').
- 120 tum eruptione facta speculandum utrum per partes atque deposito liquida excludantur, an vero coacervata, aut omnino difficulter et paulatim *edd.*] For *deposito* read *disposito* ('in an orderly manner'). Cf. *indisposito*, Ac. 1.51. The contrast is between a part by part and orderly discharge on the one hand, and either a too sudden or a too gradual discharge on the other.
- 139ⁱⁿ. item vomitum post vespertinum vinum (sc. aliqui medici probant) *edd.*] For *vinum* we should probably read *cibum*. Cf. 140 vomitus post cibum; 141 si forte vinorum fuerit excessa moderatio, tunc erit vomitus adhibendus, where Rm's correction of *vinorum* to *ciborum* is almost certainly right.
- 141^{fin}. omnium tardarum passionum curationes explicavimus, intentione neglecta S] Some correction like *intentione* <*non*> *neglecta* or *intentione perfecta* ('fulfilling our purpose'), is necessary. R's *intentione* <*aliarum sectarum*> *neglecta* is not only improbable; it does not even accord with the facts.