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.1 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 = L2) 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 1896.2


2 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.  

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. 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), 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.

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.


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

In the preface to his translation Guinther writes: 'Caeterum non mediocris in hoc opere vertendo fuit labor, primum quod exemplar fuerit depravatum, 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. 22v). 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. 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. 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: δαι – δηλωσει 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 ὁσαρ (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: δια τὸ πολλοὶς ἡδη γεγονέναι προγνωστικοὶ τῶν ἐσομένων ιατροίς (propter ea quod multi medici sunt pronosticatores futurarum Nic.) ... πολλα ... προγνωστικὴν ... ἱατρικήν Ald.: quia medicina futurarum divinarix facta est Guin.9

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. 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. Probably it was considered completely superseded after the publication of the Basle edition in 1538, which provided a better Greek text.13

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 ‘priore molto castigatius’. Probably such an exemplar was an Aldine edition sent from

8 On Josephus Struthius’ accusation that Guinther did not undertake the task of finding Greek manuscripts, see Durling, ‘A Chronological Census’, 237 n. 37.
9 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.
10 On Chartier’s Greek based on Latin translations, see Fortuna, op. cit. (n. 2), 75–6.
13 Basle edition, vol. ii, a 2r; 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.14

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.15 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. Trincavelli16 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:


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

295.13: κρισίμων καὶ κρίσεων L Nic.: κρίσεων Bas.: de criticis diebus... et de crisi Nic.: de iudicis, decretorissique diebus Trinc.: κρίσεων καὶ κρισίμων ἰμερῶν perperam Kühn ex Char. sec. Trinc.;

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.;
293.6: καὶ πολλάκις γε σὺν τῇ νίκη L Ald. Nic.: πολλάκις γε καὶ πρὸ τῆς νίκης Bas.: et saepe ante partam victorianum Trinc.

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

289.8: πάλυν L Ald.: πᾶν Bas. sec. Nic. ommem: vero Trinc.;
292.5–7: καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τήν πρόγνωσιν ἐπαγγέλλοντας, τοῦ πάντ' ὀρθῶς ἣ οὐκ ὀρθῶς γενήσεσθαι περὶ τοῦτο νοοῦντας L Ald.: seel. Bas. sec. Nic.: immo et idipsum se praesagire pollicentur, nimium futurumne sit ut omnia recte an perperam circa aegrotantes peragantur

---

15 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.
16 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.
In some corrections he also used Niccolò's translation, but very rarely and not correctly, as in 277.15: ἐφεβήζει (L Ald.: ante ἐφεβήζει add. ἕκρει· τὸ δ' ἐλάχιστον in mg. L²): quod autem est paucissimum provocat Nic.: at minimum id... incitabit Trinc.: τοιτί δ' ἐλάχιστον ἐφεβήζει 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. 3⁰), Agostino Gadaldino includes him among his collaborators: "Bartholomeus Silvanius Salonensis excellens et doctus medicus".¹⁷ 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. 8⁰): 'Bartholomeo Silvanio da Salo medico'.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ From the dedication it appears that Silvani once

¹⁷ 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.


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: καὶ ἡλκομένον ἦ τι om. Bas. Silv.;

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

296.3: πειρατέον εἰς δοσον ἐστι om. Bas.: tentandum est quantum possible est Nic.: tentandum quod liceat Silv.;
295.13: κρίζιμων καὶ κρίζων: κρίζων Bas.: de criticis diebus... et de crisi Nic.: de diebus judicialibus, de judicialibus Silv.;
296.11–13: ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ κυβινεῖσαι τὰ ἔσχατα. δυσδιάγραμτα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν αἰτίων ὡς ἄν μηδέπω λυθοῦστα τῶν ἀνθρωπον om. Bas.: aliquando autem et pericliciti summe. Difficile autem cognoscibiles sunt huiusmodi causa in quorum non contratibus hominem Nic.: quandoque vero in summum discriminis adduci. Nec facile propter causae cognosci huiusmodi possunt, ut quae hominem non insint Silv.;
also 296.16: ἐνεκεν 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: οὖν add. Bas. sec. Nic. non;
284.10–11: αἰ ἐς ἐμφανίσεις τε καὶ σφηνώσεις τούτων εἰς γένους add. Bas. sec. Nic. obstructiones autem et inculcationes ad hoc genus pertinent;
293.6: καὶ πολλάκις γε σὺν τῆς νίκης: πολλάκις γε καὶ πρὸ τῆς νίκης Bas.: saepe et cum victoria Silv.;
also 289.8: πάλιν: πάν Bas. sec. Nic. omitt: contra Silv.;
292.5–7: καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸν τοῦτο θη τὴν πρόγνωσιν ἐπαγγέλλονται, τοῦ πάντ’ ὁρθῶς ἦ οὖν ὁρθῶς γεννήσασθαι τερὶ τοὺς νοσοῦντας secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: huius etenim ipsius precognitionem, nempne quod omnia prospera vel infeliciter cessura sint circa aegrotos profitteretur Silv.;
300.7–8: ἀλλην ὃς ἐὰν αὐτὸν ἤ τε σύμμετρος τρίγων ἐργαζέσθαι δύναται: ἀλλην ὃς ἐὰν τῆς συμμετρίας ἡ τε... Ald.: secl. Bas. sec. Nic.: modice... validatem medicam efficere possunt, frictio medicus Silv.

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


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: ὁργανικῶν μορίων L Ald.: ante ὁργανικῶν add. κατεχόντων Bas. sec. Nic. continentium particularum: continentium instrumentialium partium Silv.

Silvani’s translation provides interesting readings in some passages, as in 238.6: συμφύσεις: ἐνεργείας in ras. L²: 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. 150r-184r, 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.* This Latin text is incomplete and lacks the last sixteen pages of Kühn's edition, from 288.6: *αἴμα.* 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 τῶν Ἐπίκουρων* om. Ald. Bas. Acak.;
255.9–11: *ϑερμότεραν καὶ ψυχρότεραν καὶ υγρότεραν καὶ ξηρότεραν...υγρότεραν...* ψυχρότεραν, θερμότεραν...υγρότεραν: ψυχρότερα καὶ υγρότερα καὶ ξηρότερα...υγρότερα...ψυχρότερα, θερμότερα...υγρότερα: *calidiores, frigidiores, humidiores et sicciiores...humidiores...frigidiores, calidiores...humidiores 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. 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. The author of this version was Giorgio Valla, who was a translator and above all a collector of manuscripts. 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: *περὶ τῶν* om. B Valla;
292.4: *ἐναταῖον: ἐντέων B: sinendum Valla;*
294.14: *ἐμφερομένων: ἐμφανομένων B: apparent Valla;*
299.7: *γυμνασίας: γυμνάσεως: exerciseatione Valla.*

23 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’.
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. 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. 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; and two others are also missing, of which one is very easy (266.8: ὀ: τωι: 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, 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. 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.
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: διασπέπλασται L Nic.: διασπέπλεκται Ald. Bas.: πλαγ’ (διασπέπλαγεται sic) Ad. It should be an easy mistake of confusing letters (σ – γ), which Caius or his source made by copying the right reading (πλαγ’). 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, 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 ἀ’ τῆς φύσεως ρώμην: ἱσχύν μὲν τῆς φύσεως Bas.: τὴν μὲν ὀν 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: κρίσιμων καὶ κρίσεων: κρίσεων Bas.: post κρίσεων add. καὶ κρίσιμων ήμερων Cle., and then ‘fortasse imperfectum est’), and the last one is 296.16: ἐρεκές 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). 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 P4 (294.2 and 295.13), which corrected P for the preparation of the Aldine, mostly on the basis of Niccolò’s translation. Probably in this manuscript Caius found three other readings that are without references: 293.7: τοῦ 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: ὁστε οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ πλέον οὐδὲν ἐξ ὧν πάχει... ὁσπερ οὐδ’ ὁστό (L Nic.; ὁστε οὐδὲ: ὡς τοῦτο L, corr. L2; τοῦτῳ: τοῦτον L Nic.: in τοῦτο mut. L2; ἐξ ὧν om. Nic.; οὐδ’e eras. L): ὡστε οὐδὲ τοῦτῳ πλέον οὐδὲν ἐξ ὧν πάχει... ὁσπερ ὁστό Bas.: ὁστε οὐδὲ τοῦτῳ πλέον ἐξ ὧν πάχει... ὁσπερ οὐδ’ ὁστό Ven.: ὁστε οὐδὲ τοῦτῳ πλέον ἐξ ὧν πάχει...ERR: Κühn ex Char. sec. Guin. unde nec ullam magis eo dolorem ex is quibus efficiuntur percipiet; 253.6: ἐναντιόν: ὑπάντων Ven.

In three other treatises, De anatomicis administrationibus, Quomodo morbum simulantes sint reprehendi 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. 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.

something else.\footnote{36} 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.\footnote{37} 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: \(\varepsilon\alpha\nu\nu\tau\iota\omega\nu\); \(\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\) Ven.: 

\begin{align*}
\text{Bas.:} & \quad \delta\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \ \acute{o}v\delta \ \acute{o}\sigma\tau\omega \ : \ \acute{o}v\delta \ \acute{o}m. \\
\text{Ven.:} & \quad \text{quemadmodum} \ \text{Silv.}
\end{align*}

The first part is very interesting: 249.15–16:

\begin{align*}
\text{Bas.:} & \quad \acute{o}v\delta \ \tau\omicron\upsilon\acute{t} \ \pi\lambda\omicron\nu \ \acute{o}v\delta \ \acute{e} \ \acute{o} \ \pi\alpha\acute{a}\chi\epsilon \ : \ \ldots \ \ldots \\
\text{Ven.:} & \quad \frac{\text{quare neque plus huic quicquam accedit ex quibus patitur}}{	ext{Silv.}}
\end{align*}

The text of Caius’ *Venetus* has mistakes where the Basle edition is correct (the omission of \(\acute{o}v\delta\ \acute{e}\)), and the mistake \(\acute{e} \ \chi\omicron\nu\) instead of the right \(\acute{e} \ \acute{o}\ \acute{e}\)), but it is correct where the Basle edition is wrong (\(\tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\) instead of \(\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\)), and the reading \(\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omega\) 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: \(\acute{e} \ \chi\omicron\nu\) comes from \(\acute{e} \ \acute{o} \ \acute{e}\), 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).\footnote{38} 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.\footnote{39} 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.\footnote{40}

These notes are certainly humanistic conjectures rather than readings from manuscripts. In fact, one (\(\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\) instead of \(\varepsilon\nu\nu\tau\iota\omega\nu\)) is a banal substitution by misunderstanding of the context; another (\(\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omega\) instead of \(\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\)) is a good correction, just in a passage in which the manuscript tradition is corrupt (\(\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omega\) L

\footnote{36} 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*


\footnote{38} An example of Gadaldino as a corrector of Greek texts is in Vat. gr. 1908, f. 16\(^*\), 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.

\footnote{39} On Caius’ relation with Vesalius, see Nutton, *John Caius*, pp. 54, 66 n. 6.

\footnote{40} Nutton, *John Caius*, p. 6.
Nic.). The third case (οὐδεὶς’ 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. 2r): ‘In indice tamen, qui unicuique tomo preponetur, qui libri, quali castigatione emendati fuerint, clarier et exactius […] explicabitur’. In the index (vol. i, p. 9r), 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.: πάννα Bas.: corr. Cai.; and 225.13: ἐνθέως (divinitus Nic.): ἐνθέως 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: ἐπιθέκυνων: ἐπιθέκυνων L Ald. Bas.: corr. Cai. and 234.16: ἐπιστήμην (redeamus Nic.; non videtur L): ἐπιστήμην 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.41 Two of them are the readings that Caius attributes to the codex Venetus (249.15: τούτων; and 253.6: ἀπάντων), and the others, which were written by Caius after 1555 according to Nutton’s distinction, are the following: 249.11: οὐδεὶς’ ἐν: οὐδέν 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.42 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 τούτων of the Aldine and then of the Basle edition like Caius, but, unlike Caius, he does not fill in the omission of the negative οὐδε;; 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.43 Recently, Vivian Nutton has drawn attention to the

---

41 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 Galenicae (Jena, 1789), but not entirely accurately.

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

annotated Basle edition of Leo Allatius (1586–1669) in the Sudhoff Institut für die Geschichte der Medizin in Leipzig. 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. 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.

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. 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’. 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

---

45 I have read the copy in the British Library in London, 541. c. 22.
46 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 Henyka Heyllów (Gdańsk, 1963), with an English summary.
47 Only Prosper Calanus wrote paraphrases on Galen, in the volume Paraphrasis in librum Galeni de inaequali intemperi (Lyons, 1538), according to the unreliable catalogue by Ackermann, op. cit. (n. 1), p. lxxviii, where Calanus is wrongly written Alcuanus. John Symons, Curator of the early printed books in the Wellcome Library, has corrected Ackermann’s mistake.
48 Th. Zwinger, In Artem medicinalem Galeni tabulae et commentarii (Basileae, 1561), β 2v.
as part of the same project, one on the *Ars medica* and the other on the *De const. art. med.* With them Zwinger wanted to take part in the wide debate on the *tres doctrinae*, which started with Niccolò Leoniceno's untraditional interpretation of the initial passage of the *Ars medica* (i.305–6 Kühn), and continued throughout the sixteenth century.50

For the *De const. art. med.* Zwinger chose Trincavelli’s Latin translation. His reason for this seems to be more personal than scientific (p. a 4r): ‘Victoris Trincavelli Veneti, viri clarissimi, (quo praecipitator 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*.51 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.52 In this way, the analysed text is reduced to its essence and its coherence is pointed out: ‘Tabulae [...] artificium solum admittunt, aliena omnia et παρέφυγα respuant. Denique propter cohaerentiam rerum mirabilem κρύψις artificiosae dispositionis, sicut alias, hoc locum maxime habet’.53 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’,54 and ‘tabularum usus in γενέσει simul et in διαλύσει non modo opportunum et utilem, sed etiam necessarium esse’.55

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’.56 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,
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). 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’. It is difficult to speak about this issue, because the study of medical commentaries is still in an early stage. However, I think that Zwinger’s debt to Padua is bigger than has been assumed. Not Ramus, but rather Niccolò Leonceno, Giovanni Battista Da Monte and Bassiano Landi are quoted in the introduction to the commentary on the Ars medica (p. a 4r). 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. 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). 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 Vallériede (1504–92), who wrote a commentary on the De const. art. med. published in 1576, and republished twice in 1577. In the preface (p. **IV**), he referred to Theodor Zwinger as

---


59 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).

60 G. B. Montanus, Typus trium librorum artis parvae Galeni (Venice, 1546), with the information that the table on the corpus auctus was published for the first time in Venice, in 1543.

61 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.
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‘Germanicus quidam’, and curtly said that his tables ‘cum neque authoris mentem cumulate explicit, 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’. Vallérole’s aim is to explain Galen’s treatise clearly, and more precisely ‘ad explicandam Galeni mentem, vel locupletanda et amplificanda ea quae conciso ab eo in hoc libro et subscure 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.

Vallérole unfortunately used Guinther’s translation as the basis for his discussion, in the edition of 1531. 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 Vallérole 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 ai ἐμφράξεις τε καὶ σφηνώσεις τοῦτον 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 obstruzione 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, Vallérole writes (p. 332): ‘animadvertendum […]’

Although Vallérole 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 Vallérole recalls in the dedication of his commentary to the same duke.

In the preface (p. **IV**), Vallérole 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 Vallérole had some contacts. It is difficult to say

63 Guinther’s translation was printed three times before Vallérole’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: ei – ἐκκενοῦν. Vallérole’s text follows the edition of 1531 by Simon de Colines; see 259.17: κατάλοιπον δ’ έστι διελθείν: 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.

64 The quoted bibliography is not coherent on this point, and I am not able to verify it. Did Vallérole 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. 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.

A document concerning the teaching of the De const. art. med. at the University of Paris is preserved in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Pubbliche 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. The professor to whom these notes go back is Jean Riolan (1539-1605), who was a tenacious and obstinate defender of Greek medicine. 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 Lur. plut. 74.3, which, however, was

65 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.
67 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.
68 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 *ingenuum*, not on any new manuscripts.

*The Wellcome Institute, London*

**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).

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. 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, 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 *exclusi*. By *exclusi 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*. He has noticed the correspondence of this codex with Niccolo’s Latin translation, which was published for the first time in Diomede 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

---

71 Béguin, op. cit. (n. 69), 349.
is wrongly quoted by Goulston: 'facilius adducimur, ut illum Venetum codicum credamus interpretationis Latinae exemplar fuisse quam librum Graecum manu scriptum et temere Goulstonium inter codices enumeravisse libros editos'.

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 purgantiorem 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): Δρώσωνα: Δύσωνα Aldus cum asterisco Venet. in marg. *Alii Drysonem; and 104.19 Bar. (38.26 Goul. = 51.2 Kühn): εὐθειαν: cod. Venet. ant. et vetus interpres habent μίαν; quod et ἐλληνικόφωρον 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: *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.

ADDENDUM

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

73 Ibid. p. 35.
74 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.