CHAPTER 4. RELATING THE MANUSCRIPTS:
A JUSTIFICATION OF AND COMMENTARY
ON THE STEMMA

This chapter summarizes my findings and hypotheses to date regarding the genetic relations existing within the ‘mainstream’ tradition (i.e. between those manuscripts which contain complete copies of the text), and between the latter and the most important of the ‘excerpting’ manuscripts, namely Vendôme 109 (v1) (the Uppsala (u) and Poitiers (po) excerpts are also assessed in some degree). At the end of the chapter is a provisional Latin text (together with the Greek original) of those chapters collated and referred to in 4.1–4.9, apart from Book 2, chs 1–11, which are set out more fully, by way of a sample of the intended edition, in Chapter 5.

My attempts first to produce and then to explain and justify the stemma printed as Plate XII have yielded a long and complex chapter. The first five sections (4.1–4.5) set out what I hope are fairly clear errors characterizing lost copies of the text, moving down the tree, as it were, from the archetype, \( \alpha \) (4.1), to the latest recension, that of \( \phi \), the more-or-less immediate source of the text used in the early printing of 1504, ed. (4.5). The next three sections (4.6–4.8) are much more tentative, dealing with questions that I do not pretend to have answered conclusively, but which are too important not to raise, namely the sources of \( \phi \) (4.6), the principal cases of apparent contamination (4.7), and at least eight further remaining problems concerning the relations between the manuscripts (4.8). The chapter ends with impressionistic notes on the form of the text in each manuscript and brief illustration of individual secondary readings (4.9), and finally the provisional text, referred to above, of those chapters constantly referred to in Chapter 4 on the collation of which the reconstruction of the stemma is based (4.10).

4.1. \( \alpha \): The Question of a Single, Reconstructable Archetype

There is no reason to doubt that all the Latin manuscripts currently known derive ultimately from a single Latin translation of the Greek text. The further postulation, however, that they derive from a single archetype is made harder by the fact that supposed ‘errors’ common to all the Latin manuscripts may in principle originate not in unconjecturable errors in an early lost manuscript-copy, but in errors in the original translation itself (these in turn reflecting either corruption in the translator’s Greek manuscript, or the translator’s incompetence, or both). Thus, at e.g. 1.87.2 (see below) the translator’s Greek model may have omitted (by a saut du même au même) the words μέν τοῖς ἀδήκτοις καὶ προώτταις ἔξωθεν, and at 2.236.5 the negative οὐ. Again, at 2.11.3 it is arguable that the translator thought he was writing good sense and translating the Greek in front of him; in this instance, this is made less likely by his frequent and correct translation of Greek ἀπαλλαγιάνται (with liberare, sanare, releuare, etc.), but it is always open to the sceptic to point out that the wording of the translator’s Greek manuscript may have made the crucial difference. The same applies to additions to the Greek text, such as the lines from Theodorus Priscianus at the very start of 1.1: unless we have evidence of a version without the addition — and in this case, the Theodorean material is there in the secondary tradition (the Liber passionalis and the Tereoperica,
3.2.2 and 3.2.3 above) — we have no grounds for claiming that its incorporation was not part of the original creation of the Latin Alexander.

The collation of only a small part of the Latin text has not yielded sufficient 'errors' common to all the Latin manuscripts to justify the confident postulation of a single archetype. However, that some of these shared errors are more easily explicable in terms of corruption within a Latin than a Greek tradition justifies, I hope, the reference that I make in the stemma and this chapter to an archetype (α) distinct from the original translation. In one chapter in particular (2.241), collation of the secondary tradition has revealed a small handful of errors common to all the mainstream manuscripts but avoided by the excerpting manuscripts. This is the most important example so far uncovered, offering a clear characterization of α, and nicely illustrating the importance of secondary traditions in the reconstruction of the history of texts. Collation of further parts of the text will no doubt reveal more shared errors, the quality and quantity of which will strengthen or weaken the postulation of α. For now, I list those so far discovered, separating those involving simply omission of Greek material from those requiring the assumption of more complex corruption.

4.1.1. OMISSIONS COMMON TO ALL THE LATIN MANUSCRIPTS

1.87.2 The obviously accidental omission of (a translation of) the words underlined in the following passage from the Greek text, II, 7, 2–4 καὶ βοηθήμασι χρόνου, ἐνδοθεν μὲν τοῖς ἀδήκτοις καὶ πρακτάτοις ἐξοδευθὲν δὲ τοῖς συμπέτειν δυναμένοις τὰς φλεγμόνας.\(^1\)

2.236.5 The omission of the negative before mediocris commotionis for Gk II, 503, 1 οὗ μετρίους ἐργάζεται τοὺς παροξυσμοὺς; see 4.10.6 below and note ad loc.

4.1.2. OTHER FORMS OF APPARENT CORRUPTION COMMON TO ALL THE LATIN MANUSCRIPTS

2.4.2 The addition of si accesserit tussis in an effort to make sense of a Latin text rendered unintelligible by the transposition of the section-heading 2.5.1. De tusse si ex humoribus fiat (itself not in the Greek text either).

2.5.2 The substitution of solus (solum M) for locus in qualis suscipit locus (Gk II, 149, 19 ποῖα <μάλλον δέχεται μόρια M>: see 5.4 below and note ad loc.

2.11.3 The nonsensical extussire in non poterat fortiter extussire (om. G1 L2 Ge') for Gk II, 153, 23–4 οὐκ ἴδινήθη τὸ βήσειν ἰχυρῶς ἀπαλλαγήναι: see 5.4 below and note ad loc.

2.241.4 Pisces uero aspratiles, et maxime eos qui duras habent carnes et nihil in se habent pingue; albas v1 Pod. | pingue α Pod. (vat2 vat3 vat4) Pass. pinguedinis (-em v1) v1 Pod. (po l2) (Gk II, 509, 18–19 Καὶ τῶν ἰχθυῶν τῶν ζωτικῶν μάλιστα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, οἷς ἡ οὐσία λευκή καὶ ψαφαρά κατὰ φύσιν καὶ οὕδεν ἔχουσα πιμελώδες)

\(^1\) Nearly all the Latin manuscripts also ignore ἐξοδευθὲν δὲ, having just intrinsecus qui digerere possint flegmoneis; three, however, have 'inside or outside' (intrinsecus uel extrinsecus G1 Ma interius uel exterius Ge); and one, P3, has extrinsecus alone.
This passage came to light during my cursory study of the secondary tradition. It is important here because it shows all of the mainstream manuscripts erring together in comparison not only with the Greek text, but also with v1 and with the consensus of the manuscripts of the De podagra (3.2.5 above), a well-attested branch of the excerpting tradition. Whatever the truth behind the second case of variation here (pingue ~ pinguedinis: I incline to prefer the latter),\(^2\) albas in v1 and the De podagra must be right (Greek λευκά) and duras in the mainstream tradition wrong (and duras is surely not for the second Greek adjective ψαθοφόρος ‘friable’ either). All of the surviving mainstream manuscripts (α) err where at least two lost mainstream manuscripts (the sources of v1 and the De podagra, respectively\(^3\)) preserved a correct reading. (For further hints in the secondary tradition of a lost copy higher than α in the stemma, see 4.8.1 below)

Whatever the status of α, the surviving Latin manuscripts reflect two hyparchetypes, β and δ in the stemma. β is represented directly by only two complete copies, P1 and M, but additionally by the most extensive surviving set of excerpts of the Latin Alexander, that contained in v1 (and by a small excerpt in u). However, β is also represented indirectly in the other “half” of the tradition, in that accessory use of a copy deriving from β (γ′ in the stemma) is certainly reflected in all the copies deriving from θ (especially P3 and Ox and probably O as well, which seems to have used θ as an accessory model). In what follows, I deal first with the descendants of β and then with those of δ. I note instances of contamination as they arise, but postpone a more systematic discussion of contamination to the end of the chapter, before concluding with a list of outstanding problems (and illustration of innovations exclusive to single manuscripts).

4.2. β, γ and δ: Readings Setting P1 M (and u v1) Apart from the Rest

We are in the fortunate position of being able to collate P1, M, u, and v1 — all four for 2.36 De cardiaca passione, and P1, M, and v1 for 2.235–6, the first two chapters of the section on gout. Many of the readings unique to these four (or three) copies are either of uncertain value or probably preferable to the alternatives offered. Still, there are sufficient shared errors to establish their descent from a common hyparchetype, β.

The passages below illustrate, first, errors in β (or γ, in passages where we do not have u or v1), secondly errors in δ, and thirdly instances where β and δ diverge but it remains as yet uncertain which is in error.

4.2.1. β Errs

2.37.1 et propter sincopos patiuntur P1 u v1 (pro hoc M): propterea cett. (om. Ma P3) (Gk Π, 281, 6 και διὰ τοῦτο συγκοπῆ grading κινδυνεύουσαν)

Most probably, the original had propterea or propter hoc and P1, u, and v1 reflect an error in β (partly corrected in M?). δ then has either the correct reading or an improvement of propter hoc.\(^4\) We cannot rule out the possibility that the original had

---

\(^2\) This variation is curiously reminiscent of 2.3.1 salsum (as O) salsidinem P1 (᾿αλμυρόν).

\(^3\) As the sample collations in Tables 3.7 and 3.8 show, v1 shares with α some errors avoided by Pod.

\(^4\) In Book 1, A has 8x propterea, 3x propter hoc, and this proportion is maintained in Book 2.
adverbial *propter*, although this seems less likely in view of the reasonably elevated level of the translation at this point.\(^5\)

2.235.1 *ex multis et ex duierserum causarum* (causarum *om. P1*): diuersis causis Ox P3

\(\text{Gk II, 501, 8–9} \varepsilon\kappa\alpha\pi\lambda\lambda\omega \varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota\varsigma \theta\omicron\upsilon \varsigma \alpha\iota\tau\omicron \upsilon\nu\tau\omicron \varsigma\) 

The mixture of ablative and genitive after *ex* in β is bewildering and hard to parallel.\(^6\)

Presumably, *causis* was in the original and lost in δ: Ox and P3 may have found it in θ (which took it from γ') and made it available to φ.

2.236.3 *ardorem simul et intensionem locis qui dolent inferet magnos dolores: inferit P1 v1 inferet M L2\(^7\) (Gk II, 501, 22–3 καὶ τὸ φλέγειν ἄμω καὶ διατείνειν ἐπιφέρειν οἴδε μεγάλας ὀδύνας)

Here, β *errs*, as, although the structure of the Latin differs from that of the Greek, the *et* is required. Even if we reckon with an original version something like *ardore simul et intensione loci infer magnos dolores*, \(^8\) β *errs* in the form of the main verb.

### 4.2.2. γ *Errs*

Other significant errors uniting M and P1 against the rest of the tradition, in passages for which u and v1 are not available, include the following:

1.85.2 *ut legentes hunc librum non quaeant ex alio codice quae ad oculorum curationes sunt utilia: om. P1 M (Gk II, 3, 8–9 ὅστε τὸν ἐντυγχάνοντα τόδε τὸ βιβλίῳ θεραπευτικῷ ὄντι(?) μὴ ζητεῖν εὗ ἔτερων ἀναλέγεσθαι περὶ(?) τῶν ἐν ὀδοθαλμίοις χρησίμων)*

γ omits the words underlined.

2.7.2 *flegmonem necesse est de his omnibus signis suspicari nos in pulmone esse factum: pleumone P1, pulmone M, flegmonem cett. recte (Gk II, 151, 5–6 φλεγμονήν ἐκ ἀνάγκης ἐκ πάντων τούτων ὑποπτεύειν ἡμᾶς περὶ τῶν πνεύμωνα γεγενήσθαι προσῆκει)*

The original error here conceivably lies in γ using a phonetic spelling *fleumone(m)* for *flegmonem*, \(^9\) *fleumone* being then corrected to a form of the word for ‘lung’, Greek in P1, Latin in M, in the latter perhaps in anticipation of the following in *pulmone*. Cf. 5.4 below and note ad loc.

2.7.3 *si autem et... calor sentiatur multus in thorace, ita ut frigidum desiderent aerem: ita ut P3 m2 (in marg. ad et P3') intus et M intus P1 id est ut AMu C G1 P2 L2 B ut O Ge φ et Ma P3' D Ox (Gk II, 151, 8–9 εἰ δὲ καὶ ... θέρμης αἰσθησις αὐτῷ γίνοιτο πολλὴ περὶ τῶν θάρακα, ὅστε ψυχρὸν ἐπιθυμεῖν ἀέρα ἀναπνεῖν)*

M and P1 alone have *intus* for *ita ut*. It looks as if δ had *id est ut* (retained by η and θ'), and θ lost *id est*.

---

\(^5\) See Hofmann and Szantyr, 246 (including a reference to *pro quod=propter ea quod* in Diosc. (Svennung, *Palladius, 396f.*) — cf. the reading of M here: does *pro hoc* recur in M? in other manuscripts?).


\(^7\) Given the numerous close links between G1 and L2, I would explain the *inferet* of L2 as reflecting *infer(unt)* *et*, the reading of G1 and B (presumably from θ').

\(^8\) I owe this suggestion to Cloudy Fischer.

\(^9\) The cluster *gm* goes regularly to *um* in Late Latin (cf. e.g. *sagma > sauma > French somme ‘saddle’*).
2.9.2 Et spuunt nihil, neque soni aliquid aut cernon patiuntur: sonum aliquem O Ma fortasse recte, sonum aliquid P1 sonum aliquod M aliquid P3' (Gk II, 153, 2–4 καὶ οὐτὲ αναστύσουσιν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ψόφουν τινά οὐδὲ κέρχουν ὑπομένουσιν) γ substututes sonum for the probably original partitive genitive soni, which is preserved by δ. I presume that O and Ma ‘correct’ independently to sonum aliquem (though O might have found sonum in γ: see 4.8.3 below).

4.2.3. δ Errs

1.19.2 Est autem quod defluit aut colericum aut flegmaticum interdum etiam et melancolicum: interdum etiam et γ C P3 φ aut δ (Gk I, 463, 4–5 ἐστι δὲ τὸ παραφρέων ὦτε μὲν χολόδες ἢ φλεγματώδες, ὦτε δὲ καὶ μελαγχολικῶν)

δ substitutes a third aut for interdum etiam et (cf. ὦτε δὲ καὶ). Additional interest here lies in the distribution of the correct reading, in particular in the presence of C among the seven manuscripts which retain it. (On agreements of C with P3 and/or φ, see 4.7.5 below.)

1.87.1 magis capitalis incidenda est uena δ: incidenda est uena magis (magis om. M Ox P3') capitalis γ Ox i. est m. c. u. D i. est m. c. P3 L2 m. i. est u. c. (capitis ed.)

φ (Gk II, 5, 27 τέμενιν χρή τὴν φλέβα τὴν ὅμισσαν)

In view of the Greek, I here prefer the word-order of γ (and γ', reflected in θ (D Ox P3 L2) and indirectly in φ). δ innovates by fronting capitalis in order to emphasize it, and Ma and Ge here follow θ'.

2.1.3 et quaequam (quaedam?) quidem earum ipsa loca patiuntur, alia etiam compatituntur: quamquam AM uC P2 L2 B (for further detail, see 5.4 and the app. crit. ad loc.) (Gk II, 147, 11–12 καὶ ὃτι αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν κατὰ πρωτύπαθειαν, αἱ δὲ κατὰ συμπάθειαν συνίστανται)

This is extremely messy (and there seems to be something missing in the Latin version), but η and θ' appear to share the same erroneous deletion of et and the substitution of quamquam for quaequam (quaequam?) ‘some of them’. This then would have already occurred in δ. The correct reading is preserved by γ, O and θ (O and θ presumably following γ'), although θ', κ, κ' and φ have each gone slightly their own way; see 5.4 below with app. crit. and note ad loc.

2.36.4–37.1 etiam lumbricorum signa sunt requirenda. +– – (37.1) Nam qui habent in stomacho mordicationem: Nam qui Ox u v110 in hanc qui Π1 M hiis qui φ qui cett. (Gk II, 281, 3–5 καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐλμίθον σημεῖα ζητεῖν +–οὔτω γὰρ καὶ τὰ θηρία ταῦτα θανάτους αἰφνιδίους ἐργάζονται καὶ συγκοπᾶς οὐδὲν ήπτον τῶν ὀλεθρίων χυμῶν.+ (37.1) τοῖς οὖν ἔχουσι μοχθηροὺς καὶ δακνώδεις ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοῦς)

δ omiss Nam. There is an obvious phonetic connection between nam and in hanc, the latter surely a corruption of the former in γ. Nam is quite appropriate here either as the first word of the lost sentence (for Greek γάρ, marked above) or as marking a move to a new subject (Greek τοῖς οὖν). Furthermore, the translator at this point begins every sentence with a particle. The presence of Nam in Ox may again reflect knowledge of γ'.11

10 This is barely legible on the film of v1 but is confirmed by autopsy.
11 hiis in φ is presumably an anticipation of 2.37.1 eis, unless it arose through a misreading of an abbreviation of enim as h (an idea I owe to Cloudy Fischer).
2.37.6 Nihil enim est aliud maius iuuanem P1 M P3 u v1: nullum cett. (Gk II, 281, 21–2)

It is probable that β (and hence γ' reflected in P3?) preserves the original reading (cf. Greek οὔδεν), δ showing a reinterpretation of est and presumably an attempt to improve the Latin.

2.37.10 malaxat et confortat P1 M P3' u v1: malaxat autem et confortat cett. (Gk II, 283, 1 μαλακτεί καί τονοι)

δ adds autem. β (including γ', whence P3') preserves the absence of particle in the Greek.

2.37.11 hoc enim medicamen ad haec optimum est: enim om. β P3' (Gk II, 283, 1 τούτο το βοηθημα κάλλιστόν έστιν)

δ adds enim. β (including γ', whence P3') preserves the absence of particle in the Greek.

2.37.14 quae proueniunt in stomacho simptomata P1 M u v1 (also G1 Ma P3'0)

δ errs (with cum simptomata for simptomate) through dittography of -co, the last syllable of stomacho. θ' (Ma P3'), followed here by G1 and L2) appears to have corrected the text; in the interests of parsimony (see 4.3.3, 4.7.2 below), I am reluctant to allow θ' access to γ'. There is also the problem of where the corrector of P3 found the incorrect cum, if not in θ' or γ'.

2.37.14 ex aegritudinibus diuersis augmentantibus humoribus: augmentantibus (aumentantis P1) P1 M u augmentatis cett. etiam v1 (cf. diuersorum augmentatione humorum θ'')

δ errs in corrupting augmentantibus to augmentatis (an easy corruption committed also by v1, although the converse — augmentatis > augmentantibus is also thinkable, given confusion over the participle in Late Latin).12

2.158.1 Non scio si est alia peior passio ... non ob hoc solum quia ipsa per se ...

δ reflects an attempt to make sense of a nonsensical text preserved in β, where non enim hoc solum matches exactly Greek οὐ γάρ αὐτό καθ' αὐτό ... ἀναιρεῖν πέψυκεν, ἀλλά ...)

2.235.2 quia eius (i.e. podagrae) ignorantur natiuitates: ignoratur natiuitas M P3' v1

There is nothing corresponding in the Greek at this point (II, 501, 12), but I incline to prefer the singular which β must have had (and γ' reflected in P3'). The genitives in P1,

12 The presence of aegritudinibus may suggest that the translator read not ποσίτητα but (the non-existent) νοσίτητα, which would imply either that he was not concentrating or that Greek was not his first language: else he would have restored the opposition between quality and quantity (which he elsewhere correctly understands and translates). Diuersus usually (and frequently) stands for Greek διάφορος (e.g. 1.6 = I, 447, 12; 1.6 fin. = Gk ms. Mf f. 4v; 1.21 = I, 465, 17; 1.53 = I, 509, 18). Here it matches nothing in the Greek: presumably the translator added it for clarity and naturalness. An alternative possibility (suggested to me by Michael Reeve) is that diuersis renders ποσίτητα (although I am unable to find parallels for this).
although resembling a corruption of the plural, are easy slips given -\textit{ti}- and \textit{eius} just before.\(^\text{13}\) (Note the transposition and the additional words in po.)

2.271.10 \textit{donec soluantur omnes carnes eius: omnes om. } \textit{P1 M (Gk II, 575, 23–4 ἐὼς ἰσὺς χαλωθῶσιν αἴ 
δαρκες σπητῆς)}

\(\delta\) adds \textit{omnes} absent from \textit{P1, M, and the Greek text.}

2.271.12 \textit{coques autem oleum sicut dictum est} \textit{(Gk II, 575, 27–8 ἔψε δὲ τὸ ἥλαιον, ὡς προγάραπται)}

\(\delta\) omits \textit{sicut dictum est} present in \textit{P1, M, and the Greek text.}

4.2.4. \(\beta, \gamma\) and \textit{u v1}

On the evidence at present available, it is not possible to establish beyond doubt the relations among the descendants of \(\beta\). On the face of it, in 2.235–6 \textit{M and v1 agree very closely, often against P1, but P1 is nearly always in error and M and v1 probably merely transmit what was in \(\beta\). In provisionally setting \textit{P1 and M against v1 and u, I have regard especially to the following shared errors.}}

2.36.3 \textit{ita ut interdum etiam aliqui mox derepente moriantur: iterum aut dementia \linebreak[4]aliquid M, iterum autem tumentia aliqui P1 (Gk II, 279, 22 ὥστε τυνᾶς παρανυτικά ἀπόλλουνται)}

The nonsensical sequences in \textit{P1 and M are strikingly similar. u and v1 have the words underlined in common with the rest of the tradition.}}

2.37.2 \textit{in eius stomacho: in eo P1 M si in P3 φ (nothing corresponding in the Gk II, 281, 12ff.)}

A small, phonetically-based error, but one shared only by \textit{P1 and M.}

2.37.4 \textit{Ceterum autem oportet eis addere paulatim cibos qui tarde digeruntur: et rarum \linebreak[eis adhibere paulatim M ceterarum autem oportit eis adhibere paulatim P1 (Gk II, 281, 15–16 λοιπὸν δὲ δεὶ προστιθέναι κατὰ μέρος αὐτοῖς ὡς \linebreak[4]δούλωτος ἐστὶ)}

Both the corruption of the conjunction \textit{ceterum} and the idiomatic but less appropriate choice of verb (\textit{adhibere}) unite \textit{P1 and M in error. u and v1 both have \textit{addere} with the rest of the tradition (although they follow \(\beta\) (including \(\gamma'\), and hence Ox and P3) in placing it, probably rightly, before \textit{paulatim}, as in the Greek); \textit{v1 has Ceterum, but u, like P1 and M, does not recognize the conjunction, and has Ceteris).}

4.3. Daughters of \(\delta\)

4.3.1. \(\eta\) \textit{Errs}

The left-hand branch of the family deriving from \(\delta\) — that is, those copies descending from what I am calling \(\eta\) — shows, at least in the chapters so far collated, apparently very few shared significant errors. Within \(\eta\), there are problems in that \(\mathrm{C}\) appears, at least in 1.85–7 and 2.1–11, to show contamination with a descendant of \(\theta'\), and in that in places \(\mathrm{O}\) seems to share significant errors with \(\beta\) (presumably via \(\theta\) or \(\gamma'\)).

\(^{13}\) I owe this observation to Michael Reeve.
I begin, however, with the few innovations of η (in addition to those set out below, note 2.37.7 and 2.235.5 in 4.8.2 below).

1.19.7 Gustus igitur si amarus fuerit, cholericus est humor; salsus autem si fuerit,
flegmaticus est; acetosus autem

This passage is surprisingly corrupt and messy (see my provisional text and notes ad loc.). What is clear is that salsedo, which A, O, Mu and C alone have, must have been an innovation in η for salsus. This passage may have been corrupt in δ (a possible trace of acetosus in the suffix of η’s salsedo?) and heroically corrected by e, all of whose descendants have acetosus.

2.1.2 aut alia aliqua qualitate assumpta (abl. abs.): sit (fit A') qualitas (qualitas existens
Mu') assumpta A O Mu C qualitas assumpta (adsum ta P1) P1 M P2' (ante qualitas habet rursuram (sit?) P2) (ab ... ) qualitate assumptas φ qualitates assumptas (assumptas Ma) cett. (Gk II, 147, 8–9 παντός τοῦ ἐπιρρέοντος χυμοῦ ἢ θερμήν ἢ ψυχράν ἢ ἄλλαν τίνα ποιότητα προσειληπτός)

The innovation of η here consists in the insertion of sit to make a finite passive verb out of a failed attempt to translate the Greek genitive absolute (are there parallels for this?). It is important to note the detail that P2 appears to have corrected the text of η at this point, erasing a short word (s/fit?) before qualitas, adding -s to each word in the phrase aliqua alia assumpta, and changing qualitas to qualitates. This raises the possibility that P2 found the addition in δ (this is allowed for in the stemma, as there are other reasons to suppose that P2 had knowledge of δ: see 4.7.1 below), in which case it is even thinkable that s/fit was original and lost in β.

2.236.2 dolores facere ← in pedibus → solent nimios: inimicos A O Mu' C (Gk II, 501, 20–1 ὀδύνην ἐργάζεσθαι πέφυκε σφοδράν)
inimicos is surely an error in η for nimios. Strikingly, it is corrected to nimios in Mu. I incline to think this a relatively easy correction, requiring in itself no assumption of an accessory model — for the possibility of contamination in Mu with reference to this very sentence see below under 'ε errs' (4.3.3).

4.3.2. η' Errs (O Mu)

Apart from two possible links between A and Mu (see 4.8.4 below), the only clear relations between copies derived from η are between O and Mu, and these point to a lost daughter of η, η'. Evidence for η' in the form of secondary readings exclusive to O and Mu is plentiful and scattered through all the chapters so far collated. Innovations of η' include the following:

1.18.2 melanteriacum aceto acro inungues: om. O Mu (Gk I, 461, 21 Μελαντηρίαν μετ’ ὄξους κατάχρησι)

η' omits acro, which, although it is not in the Greek, must have been in α.

1.19.3 subtilior apparat et subcolerico colore: et subcolerico apparat colore O Mu (Gk I, 463, 7–8 λεπτόν ἐστι τῇ συντάσσει καὶ ἅπαξ γραμμον [ὑπόχολον Μ] τῇ χρονόδ) η' moves the verb, with the result (if not the intention) of achieving a (for the Latin Alexander, characteristic) hyperbaton.
1.19.5 loca ex quibus fluit humor... ut nihil ex his defluat: humor fluit... defluat ex his O Mu (Gk I, 463, 10–11) οἱ τόποι ἐξ ὧν ἀπορρέετο τὸ υγρὸν... ὦς μηθὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπορρέειν)

η' twice moves the verb so as to make it follow its subject, in contrast with the rest of the tradition and with the Greek.

1.85.1 et (scil. modus) qualiter conficiantur ++ demonstratus est += demonstraturus O Mu' -atus/a/um cett. (not in the Gk II, 3, 6)
The future participle makes no sense here, and in Mu has been corrected to demonstratum. This is not the only case in which the exclusive agreement is between O and Mu' (Mu before correction): cf. 2.236.6 below.

1.85.7 sed adhuc etiam magis laeserunt (scil. multi medici): magis etiam O Mu magis M P2 B Ma φ (Gk II, 5, 20–21 ἐρυθρὰ γὰρ ἀκαντα καὶ αἰματώδη καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐρυθρὸν)

η' omits et, a small but important omission, exclusive to O and Mu.

1.86.2 rubra enim sunt omnia et sanguineo colore, et ipsa facies rubra: et om. O Mu (Gk II, 5, 20–21 ἐρυθρὰ γὰρ ἀκαντα καὶ αἰματώδη καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐρυθρὸν)

η' makes a not-unintelligental, but clearly secondary, substitution of 'because' for 'and'.

2.1.4 sine cognitione non possunt bene curari: om. O Mu (Gk II, 147, 15 ἀνευ διαγνώσεως οὐχ οἶον τε θεραπεύσαι καλῶς)

η' omits bene.

2.10.1 Quando autem desubito qui laborant sentiunt coangustata praecordia se habere: coangustata A γ τ'' coangusta O Mu per-/prae- cett. (Gk II, 153, 8 Ὑπεμηκία δὲ ἀθρόος ὅ κάμμα χρὴ άποστείλει στενοχωρίας)

η' writes by haplography the non-existent form coangusta. This was an easy mistake to make, but one confined among our eighteen witnesses to O and Mu. The translator uses coangustare and its participles quite frequently; co- is of course not an adjectival prefix.

2.37.5 Oportet autem his... suadere: om. O Mu (Gk II, 281, 20–21 δεὶ δὲ τούτους... συμβουλεύειν)

η' omits his.

2.37.6 Nihil enim est aliud maius iuuamen: iuuamen maius O Mu (nothing exactly corresponding in the Gk II, 281, 21–22 οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὕτω συμβάλλεται)

η' again reverses the order of a pair of words (cf. 1.85.7 above and 2.271.8 below).

2.236.6 Non enim solum oportet ut supercurrente materia reumatismi solent fieri sed et per simplicem solam qualitatem efficitur: om. O Mu' (add. Mu m2) (Gk II, 503, 2–3 οὐ μόνον δὲ διὰ ἐπιρροήν ὑλῆς οἱ ρεματισμοὶ τοῖς ἁρθροῖς εἰπίγνεθαι πεφύκασσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψυχῆς ποιότητα μόνον)

η' omits et per creating a nonsense. Mu' attempts to restore sense by writing efficit for efficitur: a second hand then inserts et per and corrects efficit to efficitur. As in 1.85.1 above, the agreement is between O and Mu'.

2.236.6 ex calido, frigido, sicco et humido et duplicata distemperantia, id est aut calido et sicco aut calido et humido aut frigido et humido aut certe frigido et sicco: alii alia: ex calido et humido. Et duplicata distemperantia O Mu (Gk II, 503, 3–4 καὶ θερμή καὶ ψυχράν ἐτι δὲ ἕρποτης τε καὶ ὑγρότης)
Because of the high risk of a *saut du même au même*, the transmission of this passage is extremely messy (I seek a parallel for the Latin etiology, particularly given the contrast with the Greek). Given, however, the agreement of O and Mu, it is clear that η' omitted the words *frigido sicco* in the list of the simple qualities.

2.236.7 Oportet ergo ... *contemplari quales sunt causarum singularum qualitates uel quantitates:* *om. O Mu* (not in the Gk II, 503, 5–6 δει οὖν ... ὑποπτεύειν ἡτίς ἁκριβῶς ἔστιν ἡ ποιητικὴ τοῦ πάθους αἰτία)

Although there is no corresponding word in the Greek, given the agreement of all the other Latin manuscripts, it is probable that *singularum* is original and lost already in η'.

2.236.7 *et sic singularum causarum expedienti eum apponere curationem:* purgationem O Mu (Gk II, 503, 6–7 καὶ τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν ἐπιθέρειν βοήθειαν) η' writes *purgationem* for *curationem*.

2.271.8 *Mittens in caccabo olei communis sext. ii.: communis olei O Mu* (Gk II, 575, 19 Βασιλίων εἰς κάκαβον ἔλαιον κοινοῦ ξε. β')

Whatever the original case of the phrase underlined (the tradition offers accusative, ablative, and genitive), once again η' reverses the order of two adjacent words (cf. 1.85.7 and 2.37.6 above).

4.3.3. ε Errs

The next important step in the history of this text was the recension reflected in ε, the common ancestor of eleven of the surviving copies as well as the early printing (*ed.*). Revisions affected minor changes in vocabulary and more significant changes in word-order. The fact that many of the descendants of ε are contaminated often makes it hard, sometimes impossible, to establish whether the corruption occurred already in ε or happened only later, in ε's daughter θ', and passed by way of λ to Ma, D and Ge, appearing then in all the descendants of ε except Ox and P3, both of which are heavily contaminated with γ-readings. My reason for preferring the latter course (which of course reduces the features of ε, and adds to those of θ') is that it allows γ-readings to enter the θ-family in a constrained fashion, through θ and P3 alone. Where θ agrees with γ, it is always possible to assume that θ has corrected the text inherited from ε with reference to γ', and that the error was indeed in ε. It is interesting that the distribution of errors straightforwardly attributable to ε is complementary to that concerning θ', and appears to increase sharply in the later chapters of Book 2 (there are hardly any compelling examples from Book 1 or the opening chapters of Book 2). If we assume a steady rate of error-commission by a given copyist, this could reflect a shift of source (or of main source, if two or more exemplars were available), such as, say, reduced use of γ' by the maker of θ in the latter part of Book 2. There are too many ifs and buts here, of course, but the spread of errors through the text is an aspect that may repay further consideration at a later date. Be that as it may, this initial set of ε-errors is fairly strict and should be taken closely with those ascribed below to θ' (4.4.1), some of which, as I say, may belong to ε. This initial list is reduced also in that it excludes those errors shared by (all or nearly all) the descendants of ε except P2: some of these, too, will have occurred in ε, but I present them among the principal cases of apparent contamination below (4.7.1) in order to illustrate the special position of P2.
1.18.t. Ad ulcera in capite spissa et rubra modica assimilantia titinulas, ex quibus tabes quaedam defluit: modica ulcera (modica sunt ulcera G1) G1 C L2 B Ma P3 D φ (Gk I, 461, 11–12 Πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐλκύθρια πυκνὰ καὶ ἐρυθρὰ παραπλήσια θηλαίς, ἀφ’ ὀν ἰγώρες ἀποτήκονται)

After the cautionary remarks in the last paragraph, this is a poor example to start with, as unfortunately, Ox, Ge and P2 omit *modica . . . defluit*. However, I tentatively ascribe to ε the insertion of a second *ulcera* (probably ending the title with *rubra* and beginning the chapter with *Modica*).

2.36.4 *opertet non omnino existimare: non oportet omnino ε praeter P3* (Gk II, 281, 1–2 χρη μὴ πάντοτε νομίζειν)

A small normalization of the Latin, which nicely characterizes ε apart from P3 (which may follow χ’).

2.37.2 *et panis in aqua frigida aut in calidaqua: in aqua frigida aut calida ε C (in aqua frigida infusus O in aqua frigida aut calida infusus D in aqua frigida infusus aut calida Ox in aqua calida aut frigida infusus P3)*

Although there is some variation here, what is common to all the descendants of ε (and C) is the elimination of the repetition of *aqua*, which, in view of its distribution (η and β), is probably original. The distribution of *infusus* (O D Ox P3) makes me wonder whether it was in θ, in which case Ma and Ge must have preferred λ at this point.

2.158.3 +– quibus agnitis –+ sic curatio competens est adhibenda et differri non oportet: curatio competens sic est ε praeter P3 (Gk II, 187, 6–7 καὶ οὖτω τὴν θεραπεύειν ἐπιθέρειν καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι)

Given Greek καὶ οὖτω, and the fact that *sic* here surely means ‘then, next’, its position before *curatio* is probably to be preferred. If this is right, ε has here made a slight adjustment to the word-order (corrected by D and P3, the latter of which may have followed χ’).

2.235.3 *Ego autem existimo ut quicumque eiusmod bene potuerit natiuitates cognoscere uel diuersitates aut ipsas species quae cumque fiunt et qualiter contingunt bene et cito posse curare et facilius a medicis ab ipsis in istoriam liberari: fuerint G1 P2 L2 B D P3 om. Ox Ge (no direct correspondence in Gk II, 501, 12–14 ἐγώ δὲ φημι, οὐ, εἶτε Διαγνωσθείσην καλώς αὕτη τε διαφοραί καὶ τὰ εἴδη αὐτῆς, ὡσα τε καὶ οἷα τυχόντα, εὔθεραπεύοντος ἀν ῥαδίως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱστρῶν γενήσεται)*

ε has *fuerint* for *fiunt*. χ’ omits the word. Ma and φ somehow have *fiunt*, probably independently, as these two forms are easily confused.

2.236.2 *Etenim sanguis calidus supercurrens in articulorum cauitates, extenduntur et nerui quos sindismos uocant dolores facere +– in pedibus –+ solent nimios: concauitates extenditur θ’ (not C) θ’ κ φ et Mu! (Gk II, 501, 19–21 καὶ γὰρ σῖμα συρρεύσαν εν τῇ τῶν ἄρθρων κοιλότητι θερμῶν καὶ διατείνον αὐτὰ τε καὶ τοὺς συννεσίους ὀδύνην ἐργάζεσθαι πέφυκε σφοδράν)*

Whatever the truth behind the Latin (where the construction seems to change after *cauitates*), ε apparently altered *cauitates* to *concauitates* and *extenduntur* to *extenditur*. It is striking that Mu here corrects *cauitates* to *concauitates* and *extenduntur* to *extenditur*. Is this independent, or is Mu contaminated? I have not allowed for the latter in the stemma, as this is the only potentially serious instance so far identified (but see 2.236.2 in 4.3.1 above).
2.236.6 Non enim solum oportet ut supercurrente materia reumatismi solent fieri sed et per simplicem solam qualitatem efficitur: oportet solum existimare Ma B oportet oportet P2 oportet oportere G1 D P3 φ | ut | a G1 P2 B Ma P3 φ | reumatismum solum fieri P2 solum reumatismum fieri G1 B Ma P3 φ (Gk II, 503, 2–3 οὐ μόνον δὲ διὰ ἐπίρροιαν ὕλης οἱ ρέματισμοί τοῖς ἁρθροῖς ἐπιγίνεσθαι περίκεςιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψυλὴν ποιότητα μόνην) θ′ (but not C), θ′, D and φ, and therefore ε already, introduce existimare, and all but D also replace ut with the preposition a (governing supercurrente materia); only Ma and B retain solum early in the sentence. Before fieri, probably solent is original (Greek περίκεςιν) but looked odd after oportet ut, and was changed to solum and put before its noun (reumatismum) in ε (although P2 has the older word-order, perhaps by reference to δ).

κ has more or less the correct text, which poses a problem. Either θ corrects the text with reference to γ′, and makes it available to κ: this (unlike in 2.5.2 above, where P3 omits the relevant words) obliges me to suppose that P3 has the ε-error here from a third source (other than θγ and γ′; cf. 2.37.14 above). Alternatively, κ had independent access to γ′: this is of course an easy solution, but one which, on grounds of parsimony, should be used only as a last resort. D and Ge (independently?) have soleant for solent after oportet ut, but D alone of the descendants of κ has the secondary existimare: did D here follow λ (as in 2.5.2 under 4.4.1 below)? or did κ′ (Ox Ge) omit existimare accidentally?\textsuperscript{15}

All in all, this is a nice example of an unsuccessful attempt in the High Middle Ages to improve an obviously unacceptable text.

2.236.6 Ex quibus distemperationibus fiunt saepius reumatismi: distemperantiiis O P2 B Ma D Ox Ge (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 503, 4–5 αἰτία γίνονται πολλάκις ρέματισμών)

The distribution of distemperantiiis is odd. Unless it is due just to sporadic and independent normalizations of distemperatio (distemperantia being the normal word), it was in ε, θ′/λ, θ (whence O) and κ, but corrected by θ′ (whence G1, P3 and φ).

2.271.6 Item aliud cerotum simile quod in statu passionis adhibeat: Aliud quod ε Aliud. Aliud (sic) D Quod O Mu Ma Aliud cerotum quod C (Gk II, 575, 9 έτερα καιροτή όμοιος ἐν τῇ ἁκμῇ ἐπιτίθεσθαι δυνομένη)

γ and A are obviously right with Item aliud cerotum simile quod. ε has abbreviated this heading considerably, and is the source of the readings of D and Ma. The heading is abbreviated also (independently) in η′ (by mistake?) and in C (deliberately?).

2.271.7 Item aliud cerotum et ipsum mitigatum est: ipse γ, hoc ipsum ε (Gk II, 575, 12 Ἀλλή καιροτή καὶ ύστη παρηγορική)

The sequence et hoc ipsum + another word (…etiam P2 …enim Ma …autem B φ …antidotum P3) seems to be an innovation of ε. (Note that η (A O Mu; and incidentally L2) had et ipsum enim, so that probably the particle was introduced in δ. Save in Ma, hoc and enim are in complementary distribution, and hoc may have arisen from a misreading of the abbreviation of enim that resembles a small capital H.)
2.271.13 Sic enim facta coctio multum ualere potest: iuuare (Ch) G1 P2 L2 B Ma P3 φ om. Ox Ge (Gk II, 575, 30 οὕτω γάρ ποιῶν ἐπιτεύξῃ)
Again (as in 2.158.6 under ‘φ Errs’ below), κ (though here we have only D!) disagrees with ε. It is at least thinkable that facta coctio (not in the Greek) was added as an explanatory gloss, and that the alternation ualere/iuuare arose in the same way, which obviously reduces its value for present purposes. (In any case, what is (Ch) doing agreeing with ε?)

2.271.13 Sufficiat haec de anodinis et paragoricis cataplasmatis dixisse: podagricis ε (but not C) (Gk II, 575, 29–30 τοσσοῦτα περὶ τῶν ἀνωδύνων καὶ παρηγορικῶν ἐπιπλασμάτων μοι λέεικται)
Although paragoricus was fairly common and might have been left alone, this is a perfectly intelligent substitution at the end of the chapters on gout, which nicely characterizes all copies descending from ε, and shows that ε did not refer to the Greek text.

3.59 [post uerba nullo modo in aere tardandus est infirmus, hoc est post finem cap. 59 ed.:] In usciberibus autem oleo infundendum est magis et exuente de balneo depones in frigidam piscinam non tantum aquam frigidam habentem sed lactaneam. Inuolutus ergo sanabatis non satis remoretur in eos. Volens autem . . . Quod si sitem habet infirmus et in sanabatis adhuc positus accipiat tunc magis traditur nutrimentum per totum corpus: haec uerba habent soli γ (P1 M) Mu ba16 (Gk I, 363, 16–26)
As this omission is in P2 and in all the manuscripts deriving from θ, including φ, it must have been in ε. Of the copies deriving from η, Mu has the missing lines, C omits them, and — alas! — we do not have this chapter in A, O, or (Ch). As there are other reasons for believing C to be contaminated, it is simpler to assume for the moment that C followed his θ'-source at this point (B stops before this chapter, but G1 and L2 have it and omit the lines), rather than that the omission was already in δ and that Mu recovered the material from an accessory model: while I think that O must have known θ (and conceivably γ'), it seems that where O agrees with θ (or γ') it disagrees with Mu, so that I am reluctant to ascribe knowledge of θ or γ' to η'.

4.4. Descendants of ε

4.4.1. θ' Errs

θ' is one of two lost daughters of ε, and heads a family which is hard to characterize, because virtually every member appears to have an accessory model. I regard θ' as representing innovations common to (at most) G1, P2, L2 and B, some of which are followed by MaDGe (see 4.4.2 below), and some by C (which I see as essentially a daughter of η, but for which a descendant of θ' close to G1 was apparently an accessory model). Of the main members of this group, G1 and L2 are sometimes strikingly close to P3; P2 also had an accessory model in a higher descendant of δ; and there are one or two hints that even B may have had relations outside θ' (on all these, see 4.7 below).

16 That ba has the missing lines provides another instance of an excerpting manuscript — in this case, a relatively late one (early thirteenth century) — with a source relatively high in the stemma. I have yet to determine the genetic affiliations of the exemplar of ba.
The following list of features of $\Theta'$ may include errors that occurred already in $\varepsilon$ (see the introductory paragraphs to 4.3.3 above and 4.4.2 below).

1.19.1 *ex quibus fluit humor similis quaerit Graeci uocant: similis $\gamma$ A C Ox P3' s. s.*

Ma *om. $\varepsilon$* (Gk I, 463, 3 εξ ὄν εξεισιν ύγρόν ἵχωρι παραπλησίων) $\Theta'$ (and independently $\eta'$) omits *similis*. Its presence in $\eta$ (A C), $\gamma$ (P1 M) and the Greek (παραπλήσιων) guarantee that it is original. Ox, P3' and the corrector of Ma will have inherited it from $\theta$ (and it could have been in $\gamma'$).

1.19.2 *cognosci ergo oportet: uero G1 P2 L2 B Ma Ge autem D C* (Gk I, 463, 5 διαγινώσκειν οὖν χρῆ)

$\Theta'$ replaces *ergo* (ὕψον) with *uero* (further altered to *autem* by D and C). Ox and P3' (one of them here followed by $\phi'$) will have inherited *ergo from $\theta$* (and it could have been in $\gamma'$).

1.85.11 *et si unus ex ipsis est qui molestatur humor aut duo commixti; mixti G1 C P2 B Ma Ge* (Gk II, 5, 13–14 καὶ πότερον εἰς ἐστιν ὅ λυπών χυμῶς ἦ δύο συμπελλεμένοι)

$\theta'$ (including C but not L2), Ma and Ge substitute *mixtii* for *commixtii* which matches the Greek and obviously fits better. Ma and Ge follow $\theta'$, while $\theta''$ and $\kappa$ (including D) follow $\theta$.

1.87.2 *Si autem colericus acer humor cum sanguine appareat mixtus: mixtus appareat G1 C P2 B Ma Ge* (Gk II, 5, 28–7, 1 εἰ δὲ καὶ χολωθεὶς καὶ δριμείς χυμοὶ σῶν τῷ αἵματι φαίνοντο)

$\theta'$ (including C but not L2), Ma and Ge transpose *appareat* and *mixtus*.

1.88.2 *Superinunctiones autem et inquimatismata +– sequenti sermone sunt ordinanda –+: superunctiones ε ὑπὲρ Ox P3 (Gk II, 7, 19 ἐπιχρίσμασι δὲ καὶ ἐγχυματισμοῖς τοίσδε) Admittedly a small discrepancy, but one that neatly characterizes the descendants of $\varepsilon$ except, as often, Ox and P3, whose readings derive from $\theta$ (and could have been in $\gamma'$).

2.1.1 *initium habet (scil. tussis) modo a calida distemperantia, est autem quando a frigida: est autem quando $\gamma$ $\theta'$, quandoque G1 C P2 L2 B, modo $\kappa$ $\phi$ (Gk II, 147, 5–6 πότε μέν γάρ ἄρχεται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας, ἐσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχρᾶς)

$\theta'$ (followed by C) replaces *est autem quando* (for Greek ἐσθ' ὅτε δὲ) with *quandoque*.17

2.2.5 *Sic enim erit cognoscenda calida distemperantia a praedictis signis: erit cognoscentia P2 B G1 L2 Ge cognoscetur C erit agnoscentur D Ma P3 (Gk II, 147, 24–5 οὕτω γάρ ἐστι τὴν διὰ θερμῆς δυσκρασίαν βῆκα ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων σημείων διαγινώσκειν)*

$\theta'$ (G1 P2 L2 B) and $\lambda$ (followed by Ge) replace *cognoscentia* with *cognoscentia*.

2.2.6 *Nihil igitur minus et a praecedenti qualitate calidi aeris: contingit tussis ex P2 D Ge contingit tussis Ma fit ex G1 L2 contingit tussis et fit ex B (Gk II, 147, 25–6 οὐδὲν δὲ ἦτον καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προηγησαμένων ἐξ ἐγκυκλίσεως) G1, P2, L2, B, Ma, D and Ge have additions in common (B apparently with a combination of G1 and P2). This is $\varepsilon$ minus P3, Ox and $\phi$, and the addition is probably best understood as an innovation of $\theta'$, with the readings of P3 and Ox deriving from $\theta$.

---

17 B actually has *quandoque autem*, which could be seen as a blend of two models(?).
2.4.2 materiales autem [si accesserit tussis] amitroteras, et non oportet <t>alia iterum dicere: (Gk II, 149, 12–14 διαφέρονσι δὲ τοῦ μάλλον τάς δραστικάς ἐξειν ἐναργήστατα σημεία, τάς δὲ ύλικάς ἀμυδρότερα καὶ οὐ χρή ταῦτα (ταῦτα? Fischer) πάλιν λέγειν)

The Latin tradition offers various explanatory notes to Greek ἀμυδρότερα, among which P2 and B alone have leuior ad curandum, and G1 alone the very similar leuis ad curandum. The Greek text was evidently totally misunderstood at this point.

2.5.2 Vnde et ex quibus transmittitur locis, haec omnia utique contemplari oportet: Vnde et ras. P2 om. G1 L2 B D (Vnde ... locis om. θ⁰) (Gk II, 149, 16–17 δὲ καὶ ἦξ ὀποίων ἐπιπέμπονται μορίων, κάνταυθα διορίζεσθαι δεὶ καὶ προσέχειν)

G1, P2, L2, B and D omit Vnde et (θ⁰ omits Vnde et ex quibus transmittitur locis). The error must therefore have been in θ'. D, unless erring independently, has the error from λ. θ will have inherited the missing words from ε (or found them in γ'), and made them available to Ox, Ge, and η. (If the erasure in P2 was of Vnde et, these words were presumably from δ: see 4.7 below).

2.36.2 maxime his qui nimis sensibilem habent stomachum, ita ut interdum etiam aliqui max deroepete moriantur: nimis sensibilem η (praeter C) u v1 nimis sunt debelem P1 nimis debilem M P3 sensibilem nimis θ' debilem nimis φ debilem uel sensibilem (uel s. s. s.) nimis Ge sensibilem L2 (Gk II, 279, 21 ἐὖν οὖν εὑρεθοῦσι τινὲς ἐξοντες τῆς γαστρός αἰσθητικῶν τὸ στόμα, παρανοικα ἀπόλλυνται) Whatever lies behind nimis (not in the Greek), sensibilem is to be preferred (for αἰσθητικῶν) and debilem is to be seen as a corruption of it (possibly via sunt debilem, as in P1). The other corruption evident here is the 'normalizing' of the order adjective + nimis in keeping with the habits of the translator (sensibilem nimis, debilem nimis). sensibilem nimis is in θ' (G1 P2 B and C) and possibly θ (Ma D Ge), in which case the reordering could have occurred already in ε. Ma, D and Ge, however, could as well reflect λ, in which case nimis sensibilem may have survived for Ox to find in η. Here again it looks as if the most likely model of φ is Ge.

2.37.5 Oportet autem his cum requieuerit + aut lenimentum acceperit + passio suaderes emper utcibos accipiant: his aut cum Ma L2 his autem cum G1 D his ut cum B his cum aut P2 φ his qui cum M v1 his qui Ox cum η' (cf. his et cum passio uel quieuerit P3) (Gk II, 281, 20–1 δεὶ δὲ τούτοις καὶ μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι τῆς ἐπιχεύσης διαθέσεως ἅπει ταχύτερον συμβουλεύειν ἐπιθειν)

This is messy, but what all the copies deriving from ε (except Ox) have in common is the insertion of a word for ‘either’ before requieuerint. Originally, there was probably a word corresponding to Greek καὶ, which may be reflected in et in P3 (and possibly in qui in M, v1 and Ox), and which, as it was not convincing Latin, was either dropped (in η) or changed to aut (in ε). P3 may have found et in one source and aut in another and revised the sentence to incorporate both, but Ox is surely following θ (following γ'), and I hence ascribe the insertion of ‘either’ to θ' rather than to ε.

18 cf. leuior facillor ad curandum Ma. i. leuis P3 m3(?) i. facilis ad cognoscendum Ox φ. 19 Possibly inuenti s(unt): cf. Greek εὑρεθοῦσι?
2.37.7 For the text and variants, see 4.8.2 below.
Here θ′ (followed by λ and hence Ma D Ge) makes another change in the word-order, moving the subordinate verb (ut assumant) next to the main verb suadendum est (which was certainly in δ); note also in *aqua calida aut frigida* (ε except P3) and *panem in aqua calida aut frigida infusum* (ε except Ox and P3).

2.158.6 Diabrosin dicunt quando *uena*, amisso nutrimento, *carnis* G1 P2 L2 B P3 Ma *extenuatur* η κ (!) (not in the Greek text)
The Latin presumably means: ‘They call *diabrosis* the case when the vein, because its nourishment has ceased, the flesh over it is extenuated’ (with *uena* nominative and change of construction). The nominative *uena* could explain the substitution of *carnis* for *caro*. It is possible that this substitution occurred in ε, and was preserved in θ′ and θ″, and that κ here made an independent correction back to *carnis* (which κ′ then better accommodated by changing *uena* to *uene*).

20 The remarkable presence in η and κ of *fit extenuata* for *extenuatur*, however, is not so easily explained. Independent innovation is unlikely, and there is no trace of the periphrastic passive in γ at this point. The only possible explanation is that δ and possibly ε had *fit extenuata*, that *extenuatur* is an innovation of θ′ followed by λ and Ma, and that P3 also had access to a descendant of θ′. (For another possible disagreement between κ and ε, see 2.271.13 under 4.3.3 above.)

4.4.2. λ Errs (MaDGe)
Further significance attaches to θ′ in that its lost daughter λ was known to Ma (a daughter of θ″) and to D and Ge (daughters of κ). This is the most economical explanation I can think of for cases where one or more of MaDGe (whom I have come to regard as a friend!) disagree with the other descendants of θ, in particular with Ox and P3 (see 4.4.3). I have as yet identified only one significant innovation which would distinguish λ, the accessory model of MaDGe, from θ′ (note also, however, 2.9.2 under 4.4.3). I represent λ as a daughter of θ′, as in this way some of the errors I for a long time ascribed to ε (including 1.19.1, 1.19.2, 1.88.2, 2.2.6) could in fact be errors of θ′. This may seem pedantic, but it allows direct knowledge of γ′ to be restricted to θ (and P3) among the descendants of ε, which considerably simplifies the stemma (see 4.7.2).

2.7.3 *Si autem et sitis sit nimia*, et frequenter ad *haec signa* et *calor sentiat multus in thorace*: et frequenter | frequenter et (etiam D) | O D Ox P3 | *post frequenter* | expirent (expirent s. s. Ma) Ma Ge etiam expirent D respirent et *φ* | ad *haec signa* om. P3 Ma D Ge | *calor multus sentitur* P3 Ma *φ* (Gk II, 151, 6 *ε* δε καὶ διψὴ σφόδρα συνέχοτο πρὸς τοῖς σμείοις τοῦτοις καὶ θέρμης αίσθησις σωτῆ γίνοιτο πολλή περὶ τοῦ θώρακο) θ transposes *et* and *frequenter*, but is followed only by O, Ox and P3 (and in part by D), as MaDGe (λ, which may be the third source of P3) omits *ad haec signa*, and adds *exspirent* (respirent *φ*) after *frequenter*. The Latin appears to be a translation of διψῆ

---

20 Or, less probably, κ followed γ′ (*carno γ*), but I am trying to restrict knowledge of γ′ to θ and P3.
21 P3 m3 adds *ad haec signa* in the margin with an indication that it belongs after Si autem.
22 φ could have got *respirent* from Ge (see 4.6 below).
σφόδρα συνεχώς τε. 23 θ" (Ma, P3 and hence φ) eliminates the hyperbaton (and the subjunctive) in calor sentiatur multus.

4.4.3. θ Errors

θ is the other daughter of ε, and the mother of θ" and κ (important, if indirect, sources of φ). Some errors in θ are also in O. Earlier I thought these must reflect independent use of γ' by θ and θ" and κ. I now think O might have known not (or not only) γ' but θ, and that θ knew γ'. (For some slight hints that O had direct knowledge of γ', see 4.8.3 below.)

The number of innovations attributable to θ has increased considerably following the reconstruction of λ and the recognition that agreements between Ox and P3 may reflect θ, whether or not they are shared with γ.

1.19.8 Minus autem frigidus melancolicus incest humor: Si autem minus Ox P3 | om. Ox P3 φ (Gk I, 463, 17–18 ήττον δὲ ψυχρά ἐφ’ ὄν μελαγχολώδες)

θ, here the common source of Ox and P3 alone, starts a new sentence with si autem minus. Ox and P3 also omit the final incest humor, and in this are followed by φ.

1.85.1 Iam enim in aliis tribus libris a me scripta sunt de oculorum passionibus qualiter oporteat cognosci in eis consistentes passiones, et causas eorum et curaiones: scriptis oculorum passiones et causas eorum qualiter inter se cognoscer eorum et curaiones Ox P3 (Gk II, 3, 2–3 Ἡδη μὲν οὖν ἐν ἀλλοις τρισὶ βιβλίοις ἀναγέραπται μοι περὶ τῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παθῶν)

θ, here the common source of Ox and P3, has substantially recast this opening sentence in a sort of tidying-up operation, making scriptis adjectival, and oculorum passiones the direct object of the following indirect question, omitting in eis consistentes passiones, and putting et causas eorum before the indirect question.

1.85.11 Aut enim ex sanguine nigro aut coleribus aut flegmate aut melancholia est quod fluit: aut ex Ox P3 | L2 φ (Gk II, 5, 12–13 ήττοι γὰρ σάμα μάλλον ἡ χολή ἡ φλέγμη ἡ μελαγχολίκας χυμός ἐστι τὸ ἐπαρεῖναν)

θ, here the common source of Ox and P3' (here followed by L2 and φ), omits enim. (P3, Ma, D and Ge could then have found enim in λ.)

1.85.11 et si unus ex ipsis est qui molestatur humor aut duo commixti: et si unus M et unus P1 Ox P3 | et aut unus η (A O Mu C) P3 aut unus D G1 aut et unus P2 aut etiam unus Ma L2 B φ an et unus Ge (Gk II, 5, 13–14 καὶ πότερον εἰς ἐστιν ὁ λυπῶν χυμός ἡ δύο σωματελεγμένοι)

Ox and P3' (and P1) omit si (πότερον(?) ). I take it that si is the original, automatic and nonsensical translation of Greek πότερον, variously corrected in the tradition.

2.1.3 Scire autem oportet et hoc quomodo differunt abinuicem tussiculae secundum causas singulas sed quoniam et secundum loca: et G1 P3 Ma | D Ox Ge sed et φ (Gk II, 147, 9–10 εἰδεναι δὲ δὲ καὶ τούτο, ὡς οὖ διαφερουσιν ἀλλήλων αἱ βῆχες κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν μόνην, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους)

23 This suggestion was inspired by Cloudy Fischer.

24 In view of the ages of the relevant manuscripts, it is worth bearing in mind the possibility that O was the source, rather than the recipient, of some of these shared readings. I am grateful to Michael Reeve for this observation.
\(\theta\) omitted sed quoniam, perhaps deliberately in order to improve the Latin; sed quoniam was in \(\gamma\) and \(\delta\), and the corrector of Ma will have found it in \(\theta'\). The Greek text has just \(\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha,^{25}\) but \(\delta\)ti may have followed in the translator’s Greek text. On the agreement of G1 with P3 and Ma', see 4.7.3. Note that \(\theta'\) and \(\phi\) have quoniam for propterea/propter quod in the next sentence, 2.1.4.

2.3.2 Et laeduntur ex frigidis et iuuantur ex calefactionibus, et acitionicum magis quam amaritudinem habere se sentiunt: se sentiunt habere P3 Ma Ox G2 (Gk II, 149, 4–6 καὶ βλάπτονται μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ψυχῶντων, ὀνίναιται δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν θερμαίνοντων, καὶ διόδος μᾶλλον ἢ πικρίας, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ, οἰσθάνονται)

\(\theta\), here the common source of \(\theta'\) and Ox, transposes habere and se sentiunt (unless the transpositions were made independently).

2.3.3 Et praecessit eos magis frigdor quam calor, et balneonon in tempore competenti et potionibus et cibis usi sunt frigidis: competenti tempore P3' Ma Ox \(\phi\) (Gk II, 149, 6–8 καὶ προηγεῖται μᾶλλον τούτως ψύξις ἢ ἐγκαυσίς καὶ λουτρῶν ἀνακάρων καὶ πομάτων καὶ ἐδεσμαίτων ψυχρῶν χρήσις)

\(\theta\), here the common source of \(\theta'\) and Ox, transposes tempore and competenti.

2.7.4 Si autem et colericumsputant nec nimiris grauiiter angustiam sentiunt+–se habere praecordiae loca → sed magis calida esse: in praecordiae loca P2 praecordie loca P1Ma C circa praecordiorum loca \(\theta'\) κ O in praecordiorum locis G1 L2 B Ge \(\phi\) [sed magis] magis \(\theta'\) κ \(\phi\) (Gk II, 151, 10–11 εἰ δὲ χολόδες ἀναπποίητο, μὴ πάνυ δὲ βάρους ἢ στενοχωρίας συναίσθησις γίνοιτο ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον θέρμης)

\(\theta\), followed by \(\theta'\), κ and O, inserts circa;\(^{26}\) and omits sed (as does \(\phi\)).

2.8.2 supercurrens <pus?> ex subitaneis mutatis euersionibus et sonos aurium cum obclusione saepius patiuntur: ex om. γ O P3 Ma D Ox | subitaneas mutatas euersiones (plus minus) γ O P3 Ma D (Ox has ablative) (Gk II, 151, 18–19 περιρρέοντος αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀθρόισις μεταστροφῆι καὶ ψυφούντος ἀκούειν πολλάκις)

The Latin text is uncertain here, but there is a clear division in the tradition between \(\theta\) and \(\gamma\) (and \(\Omega\)) without ex and with the accusative, and \(\delta\) (seen in \(\eta\) and \(\theta'\) – A Mu C G1 P2 L2 B – and \(\lambda\) followed by Ge) with ex + ablative.

2.8.3 manifeste confidendum est quia pus est quod in thorace continetur: est quod om. O \(\rho\) | non continetur O \(\rho\) (Gk II, 151, 22–3 δῆλον ὅτι ὀμολογοῦμεν πῦὸν ἐστὶ τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν τῷ θώρακι)

\(\theta\) (whence \(\theta'\) and \(\kappa\) and \(\Omega\)) omitted est quod; \(\theta\) probably also added non before continetur, but this was corrected by \(\kappa\) and belatedly in P3 (with dots under non, and est quod added by m2 in the margin). Again, Ge follows \(\lambda\).

2.9.1 Quodsi fyma meditauerit fieri in pulmone: editauerit et fuerit M medetauerit fierit P1 fuerit (post pulmone O P3 Ma) O P3 Ma D Ox euenerit fieri cett. (Gk II, 151, 26 Ἐπεὶ εἰς φῦμα [μὴ] μελετηθὲν ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι)

O agrees with both \(\theta'\) and \(\kappa\) (although Ge follows \(\lambda\) and preserves euenerit fieri) in replacing whichever main verb phrase was in this clause with a simple fuerit, and with

\(^{25}\) cf. just sed in \(\phi\), a possible hint (although a very slight one) that (a) a Greek text was consulted, or (b) \(\phi\) had a third Latin source, in addition to Ox and P3 (possibly B: see 4.8.9).

\(^{26}\) Alternatively, in is original and lost independently in P1 and \(\eta\), rather than introduced independently in M and P2: do we then have in + accusative of place where? Note that \(\epsilon\) replaced precordie with precordiorum. Again \(\phi\) requires a source other than Ox and P3, which here could be Ge or B.
θ" in moving it to the end of the clause, after in pulmone. Given that euenerit fieri — which is at least intelligible — was already in δ, it is probable that the more radical solution of O, θ" and κ is owed to θ (possibly from γ') and possible that it arose through the omission, whether accidental or deliberate, of the first of two future perfect verbs in a sequence something like that preserved in M (editaurerit et fuerit).

2.9.2 Neque enim contingere poterit nisi ex indigesto et necdum permixto fymate: enim hoc P3 Ma D Ge | poterit Ma poterat P1 potest cett.; post potest add. patienti O P3 Ma D Ox φ (praeter ed.) (Gk II, 153, 3–4 ούτε γάρ συμβήναι δυνήσεται ἐτι ἄπεπτου καὶ μηδέποι ἀποβεβλημένου τοῦ φλέγματος) θ inserts patienti, which is copied by O and survives in θ" and κ and hence φ (though Ge follows λ). The distribution of hoc after enim makes it look like an innovation of λ (in which case λ could be the third source of P3).

2.10.1 Quando autem desubito qui laborant sentiunt coangustata praecordia se habere et absque febris molestari et siti multa: absque aliquibus febris κ Ρ3 (a quibus febris P3') aliquibus febris O Ma (Gk II, 153, 8–9 Ὄπινικα δὲ άθρόος ο ἱκάμυνο αἰσθήται στενοχωρίας ἐκτὸς ὠχλήσεως πυρετοῦ καὶ δίνης πολλῆς)

θ substitutes aliquibus for absque. O, θ" and κ alone have aliquibus, either instead of or in addition to absque. The source of aliquibus is surely the correct absque itself. O and θ" (note P3' a quibus) reflect uncritical copying of θ; κ and P3 have reinserted absque from an accessory model, but without eliminating aliquibus.

2.10.1 sed habet etiam quendam raucorem cum tusse: et (om. Ma) acrorem add. θ" κ φ (om. L) (Gk II, 153, 9 έχη δὲ τινα κέρχχνον μετὰ βηχώς) θ adds et acrorem (or perhaps just acrorem, as in Ma) in the first instance probably as a gloss on raucorem.

2.11.3 Iste uir per multum tempus molestiam sustinens de tusse: per multa tempora O per multo tempore Mp per multum tempore P1 multo tempore κ (Gk II, 153, 22–3 οτος ο ἀνήρ πολλον χρόνον ὠχλήσεις ύπο της βηχώς) θ (perhaps following γ': cf. M) substitutes altero for alio, and is then followed by O, θ" and κ (but Ox, Ge and L2 hold themselves aloof, or make independent corrections: Ge could have followed λ, and L2 could have followed G1).

2.11.6 Redeamus igitur et de curis aliqua breuiter dicere non omitamus: cura M O P3' Ma curas P1 (not in Gk II, 155, 22)

θ (perhaps following γ': cf. M) substitutes the ablative for the accusative, and is then followed by O and κ but corrected by θ".

2.36.3 lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est ut faciant cardia cam passionem: stomachi θ" κ stomacho φ (Gk II, 279, 23–5 πολλάκις δὲ και ἔλεμθεις ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδρομόντες ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστροίς ἑγατάζονται καρδιακαίς διαθέσεις)}
θ presumably saw no sense in *ad stomachum* and so replaced it with *stomachi* (construing it, erroneously, with *ex inferioribus partibus*).

### 4.4.4. θ"

There are numerous significant secondary readings common to P3 and Ma, which oblige us to reconstruct yet another lost copy as the immediate common ancestor of P3 and Ma (θ" in the stemma). θ" represents an in many places substantial revision of the inherited text, as is clear especially from the longer extracts set out below.

2.1.1 [sed] quoniam initium habet (scil. *tussis*) modo a calida distemperantia: quoniam

P3 Ma (Gk II, 147, 5–6 ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχεται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας)

θ" deletes *sed*. Given the evidence of the manuscripts, *sed* must have been in the Latin version, but we are much better off without it, as the maker of θ" saw.

2.1.1 initium habet (scil. *tussis*) modo a calida distemperantia, est autem quando a frigida: ex (bis) P3 Ma (Gk II, 147, 5–6 ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχεταί ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας, ἐσθ’ ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχράς)

θ" twice substitutes *ex* for *a* (ἀπὸ).

2.1.2 et secundum humorum superfluentium <qualitates> similiter existit (scil. *tussis*):

humorum superfluentium γ humores superfluentes P3 Ma, humorum superfluitates *cett*. (Gk II, 147, 7–8 καὶ καθ’ ὑλὴν ἐπιρρυτον ώσσοτος συνίσταται)

As if with knowledge of both variants, θ" retains the adjectival participle of *g* but corrects it to an accusative after *secundum*.

2.3.1 Tussiunt etiam plurimi ex frigida distemperantia: Si autem tussis ex frigida

distemperantia ... ut P3 Ma (Gk II, 149, 2 ὅσοι δὲ βήσονται διὰ ψυχρῶν δυσκρασίων)

θ" completely rewrites this sentence, making it a conditional clause dependent on the statement of symptoms which follows.

2.5.2 Vnde et ex quibus transmittitur locis, haec omnia utique contemplari oportet: *om.*

P3 Ma (Gk II, 149, 16–17 οὔθεν δὲ καὶ εἰ ὅποιον ἐπιπέμπονται μορίων, κάννατα δι' ὀρίζουσθαι δεῖ καὶ προσέχειν)

θ" omits the opening of this sentence, if not by accident then on the grounds that this question was mentioned in the previous sentence.

2.7.2 si nihil dignum sputent uix respirantes, flegmonem necesse est de his omnibus signis suspicari nos in pulmone esse factum: *uix dignae respirantes P3 Ma* θ" (Gk II, 149, 5–6 εὶ καὶ μηδὲν ἀξίου ἀναπτύεται δυσπνούντων αὐτῶν, φλεγμονὴν εἰς ἀνάγκης εἰκότων τούτων ὑποπτεύειν ἡμᾶς περὶ τόν πνεύμων γεγενήθησε προσήκει)

θ" erroneously repeats (a form of) *dignum* with *respirantes*.

2.7.3 *et adhuc magis* existimari oportet ignitum esse flegmonem in pulmone: *om.* P3 Ma (Gk II, 151 ἐτι καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπονοεῖν δεῖ ζέουσαν εἶναι τὴν φλεγμονὴν περὶ τόν πνεύμων)

θ" omits *et adhuc magis*.

---

27 Puschmann reports *L άλλοτε* in place of *ποτὲ*, and I wonder whether the translator’s Greek text might not have had *άλλ’. οτι*, whence *sed quoniam*.

28 *θ* erroneously eliminates the first *dignum*. 
2.11.6–8 de curis aliqua breuiter dicere non omittamus. Ad autem facile inueniendum, per partes ad tussem adiutoria et expedientia et a multis probata scribam. Vnde in sequenti generaliter curas et ipsas differentias uobis exponam, ut non alibi indigentes adiutoria requiratis:

**P3** de curis (corr. ex cura m2) aliqua (corr. ex aliqual pro aliquid) breuiter dicere non obmittamus <add. m2 in marg.: Ad hec enim facile inueniendum sunt per partes ad tussem adiutoria expedientia et a multis probata> ut non alibi adiutoria requirantur unde in consequenti generaliter curas <scribam add. in marg. m3> et ipsas differentias uobis exponam <ut non alibi indigentes adiutoria requiratis add. in marg. m2>.

**P3’** de cura aliquid breuiter dicere non obmittamus ut non alibi adiutoria requirantur unde in consequenti generaliter curas et ipsas differentias uobis exponam.

**Ma** de cura aliquid breuiter dicere non omittamus ut non alibi adiutoria requirantur unde in consequenti generaliter curas et ipsas differentias uobis exponam.

(Gk II, 155, 22–8 πρὸς δὲ τὸ εὐχερός εὐφρίσκειν τὰς κατὰ μέρος ὑλῶς τῶν βησικῶν βοηθήματος καὶ ἀρμόζειν δύνασθαι — πρὸς τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς διαγνώσεως ὑπαγορευομένην διάθεσιν —, ἄκολουθον ἐνόμισα — μετὰ τὰς διαγνώσεις καὶ τὴν καθόλου ἀγωγὴν καὶ τὰς διαφοράς — ὑπὸ ἐκθέσει τῶν βοηθήματος μετὰ τῆς ἄκριβος αὐτῶν συστάθμιας, ὡστε μὴ παρ’ ἐτέρου δεῖται μανθάνειν, — ἄλλ’ ἐνέτειθεν ἀναλέγεσθαι τὸ ξηπόδυμον —.)

θ’ significantly revised the end of this chapter, as we see by comparing Ma with the original text of P3 (P3’ above). Note: cura for curis; aliquid for aliqua; the omission of a sentence after non obmittamus(!); the transposition of the last two clauses (unde . . . and ut non . . .); in consequenti for in sequenti:29 the omission of indigentes. P3’ and Ma are almost identical, and very different from any other surviving copy (including P1 and M, so that it is not likely that γ’ was the model for the revision).30

2.36.2 Contingit autem his quibus pessimi et uenenosi cum mordicatione stomachi ibidem colliguntur humores: ibidem colliguntur humores cum mordicatione stomachi Ma add. in marg. P3 m4 (Gk II, 279, 19–21 συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο, εἰ μοιχηροὶ καὶ δακνώδες καὶ ἱώδες ἀθροισθοῦσιν ἢ συρρηύοσθοιν ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρῶς χυμοῖ)

θ’ reversed the order of the two three-word phrases (cum mordicatione stomachi and ibidem colliguntur humores) and omitted what was then the last word, stomachi.

2.37.4 Ceterum autem oportet eis addere paulatim cibos qui tarde digeruntur: Oportet autem eis dare cibos paulatim Ma (P3 notes the variant addere, which cett. have except P1 M adhibere) (Gk II, 281, 15–16 λοιπὸν δὲ δεῖ προστιθέναι κατὰ μέρος αὐτοῖς, ὡς δυσμετάβλητα εἰσι) θ’ must have: (a) omitted ceterum and fronted oportet; (b) substituted dare for addere; (c) transposed paulatim and cibos.

---

29 I write these as two words for the purpose of showing how the variant arose.
30 The text against which P3 was corrected was close to κ’ or φ, which alone have scribam before curas, and of our surviving copies closest to Ge (note ad hec enim facile, and ipsarum differentias).
2.37.12 scio autem quia et anacardia antidotum ad tales passiones benefacit et pigra datum iuuat sed nullum sic sicut glicea adiuuat (Gk II, 283, 2–5 οἶδα δὲ, ὃτι καὶ ή δι᾿ ἄνακκαρδίαν πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖ καὶ ή πικρά, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν οὐτος (?) ὡς τὸ βοήθημα τοῦτο).

Ma Scio autem quia et antidotum hoc in plurimis aliis passionibus iuuat et pigra datum et

P3 [S. a. q. add. ante et pigra] plurimis aliis passionibus iuuat et pigra datum et

Ma anacardion iuuat sed non sicut glicea.

P3 anacardius on iuuat sed non sicut glicea.

θ” has revised this sentence in several important respects, and P3 and Ma reflect knowledge of the same, radically-altered model. Notice: (a) the order and placement of anacardia and pigra; (b) plurimis aliis passionibus for ad tales passiones; (c) the sequence of verbs iuuat – iuuat – NOTHING for benefacit – iuuat – adiuuat; (d) non for nullum. Each of these features is exclusive to, and identical in, P3 and Ma.

2.82 – 86 – 83 – 87 order of chapters

θ” transposes chs 83 (De lacte dando) and 86 (De cibo dissintericorum) of Book 2 (chs 84 and 85 being inventions of φ: see 4.5).

4.4.5. κ E errs

When D and Ge are not following λ, they appear to follow another daughter of θ, κ, which is also the source of Ox. The evidence for κ is, I confess, rather thin, mainly no doubt because D and Ge are contaminated, but it is still more than adequate to require the reconstruction of a further lost copy. (In addition to the passages set out below, note 2.158.6 in 4.4.1 and 2.271.13 under 4.3.3 above.)

1.87.3 mitigat et digerit satis igneos oculorum flegmones: totum igneum D Ox totos igneos L2 | flegmonem D Ox (urba satis et oculorum om. Ox) (Gk II, 7, 7 προσένει καὶ συμπέττει τὰς πάνω ξεύσας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν φλεγμονῶς) κ replaces satis igneos … flegmones with totum igneum … flegmonem. The fact that D has both satis and totum (and L2, satis totos), while Ox has just totum, perhaps suggests that totum had been added to κ (or earlier) in such a way that it could be, but need not be, read as a gloss or correction. I cannot explain the near-agreement of L2, which diminishes the probative power of this example for the establishment of κ.

1.87.4 postquam autem repressum fuerit reuma, cum melilota crocus et glaucion … superponantur: tunc D Ox (Gk II, 7, ΠΟ–ΠΠ τὸ σῶτο δὲ ποιόσα καὶ οἱ φοῖνικες μετὰ τοῦ ἐπέχειν τῶν ἐπιφανομένων ρεματισμῶν μετὰ τῶν μελλήστων (τοῦ –ου?) καὶ κρόκου καὶ γλαυκίων (–ου? Fischer))31 κ interprets cum as the conjunction, and substitutes tunc in order to have a main clause after the subordinate postquam-clause.

2.9.1 Quod si fyma meditauerit fieri in pulmone: fuerit D Ox (Gk II, 151, 26 ἐπιπερ εἰη φόμα [μὴ] μελετηθὲν ἐν τῷ πνεύμων) (On this passage, see above, 4.4.3.) θ (whether or not following γ’) substitutes fuerit for the main verb phrase and puts it at the end of the clause (in pulmone fuerit in θ” and O). κ moves fuerit away from the end of the clause, perhaps to prevent its juxtaposition with erit, which begins the next clause (erit omnino difficultas spirandi).

31 There are surely things wrong with the Greek text at this point, including ἐπιπερ probably for ἐφθάνον, participle of ἔση. I am indebted to Cloudy Fischer for helpful discussion of these points.
2.11.6 Redeamus igitur et de cura aliqua breuiter dicere non omittamus: Redeamus ad tussem D Ox (not in Gk II, 155, 22)
κ inserts ad tussem in this resumptive sentence which takes us back from the case-report of the man who coughed up a stone to remedies for the treatment of coughing.
2.236.2 extenduntur et nerui quos sindismos uocant dolores facere in pedibus solent nimios: nerui D Ox Ge|solet Ox Ge P3 ex corr. (Gk II, 501, 20–1 και διατείνον αὐτά τε καὶ τοὺς συνδέσμους ὀδών ἐργάζεσθαι πέφυκε σφοδράν)
Whatever the Latin was at this point, D, Ox and Ge all replace nerui (subject of solent?) with neruis (presumably dative of disadvantage after sanguis ... dolores facere ... solet). The change of solent to solet, more or less required by neruis, is made by Ox and Ge (κ'), for some reason not by D. (The corrector of P3 must have taken et nerui with extenduntur.)
2.271.1 Haec ergo per os sunt danda quae mitigare possunt dolores; per os sunt danda γ η G1 P3|sunt danda θ’ danda sunt D Ox danda L2 (Gk II, 573, 25 Τεῦμα μὲν οὖν παρηγορεῖν οἶδε διδόμενα διὰ στόματος)
The abbreviated writing of p(er) os sunt led to the phrase being read as possunt and corrected to sunt.32 κ transposes sunt danda.
2.271.9 turpidinem piscem maritimum uiuum: turpitudinem de D Ox Ge B (Gk II, 575, 20 τουρπαίνης θαλάσσιας ζώσης)
The writing of turpido for turpido looks like an error in κ, although it is shared also with B. The preposition de, also in L2 and Ma, and before the turp. word in G1 and P3, presumably reflects id est, which is in φ, and which was probably already in ε (note that P2 has a small erasure after turpidine, made perhaps after consultation of δ: on P2 and δ, see 4.7.1).

4.4.6. κ' Errs (Ox and Ge)
As we have seen, λ was one of the models of Ge, which as a result in places (e.g. 1.85ff.) agrees with Ma in particular. In most of the passages collated from Book 2, however, Ge agrees closely with Ox, often very strikingly. Since Ge shares errors with D and Ox, and thus appears to be a descendant of κ, these agreements with Ox are ascribed provisionally to a lost descendant of κ, κ' in the stemma. An alternative account would be to take them as features of κ, and assume that D uses another source in these places. (In addition to the passages set out here, note also 1.19.6 under 4.7.1 below.)
2.10.4 Sunt autem et alia de quibus in sequenti dicturi sumus, ubi de ulceratione et ruptione uenarum et diabroseos cogemur scribere: dicemus Ox Ge φ|dicturi sumus Ox Ge φ, dicturi sumus (sumus uel G1) cogimur scribere G1 P3 (Gk II, 153, 16–18 εἰσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα, περὶ ὧν ὑστερον λεχθήσεται, ἐνθα καὶ περὶ ἐλκώσεως καὶ ῥήξεως καὶ διαβρώσεως ἀναγκαζόμεθα γράφειν)

32 The fact that G1 and P3 have the correct reading makes it likely that θ had possunt (perhaps from γ'), which was wrongly changed by κ but correctly restored by the immediate common ancestor of G1 and P3 (while MaGe took sunt danda from λ).
It looks as if the common source of Ox, Ge and P3⁴ (θ? with Ma D following λ?) erroneously repeats *dicturi sumus* from the previous clause in place of *cogimur scribere*. 

κ', here followed by φ, achieves variation by replacing the first *dicturi sumus* with the synthetic future *dicemus*. P3 is able to improve this by adding *cogimur scribere* from a second source (not θ⁴, if θ was the source of the error in the first place, but λ?). Note the agreement in error of G1 with P3 (see 4.7.3).³³

2.235.2–5 ideo nullo modo ab artificibus medicinae sanari potest quia eius ignoratur natiuitas. (3) ego autem existimo ut quicumque bene potuerit natiuitatem cognosceri uel . . . species quaecumque fiunt . . . bene et cito posse curare et facilius a medicis . . . liberari (4) et sic postea curationes ipsas exponomus. (5) Credo enim quia si ea quae scripta tradimus diligentius attendantur [naturam uniuscuiusque] [uoluerit operari], multos poterit liberare: nullo modo ideo Ox Ge | eius om. Ox Ge | fiunt om. Ox Ge | a medicis et facile Ox Ge | ipsas om. Ox Ge | quia om. Ox Ge | naturam uniuscuiusque om. Ox Ge

I deliberately run several sentences together in order to show a series of agreements between Ox and Ge in rearrangements of, and omissions from the inherited text. Note also that towards the end of the passage from 2.236.2 quoted in 4.4.5 above, Ox and Ge alone have *solet in pedibus*; in 2.236.4 Ox and Ge alone have *ledens eodem modo* (*eodem modo ledens* cett.); in 2.236.5 Ox and Ge alone omit *mediocris/mediocriter* before *commotio*; in 2.236.6 Ox and Ge alone have *solum simplicem* (*simplicem solam* cett.), and they alone omit *aut calido et humido* from the list of types of *duplicata distemperantia*.

In 2.271 there are similar exclusive agreements between Ox and Ge, although less numerous. They alone have 2.271.5 *infundes in aquam* (for *in aqua(m) infundes*); they alone omit all of 2.271.12, and they alone insert *autem* after 2.271.13 *Sufficiat* (*Sufficiant* κ φ ?O).

4.5. THE φ-RECEPTION (G2 ed. L1)

The φ-recension was the latest and the most thorough-going. There are innovations exclusive to G2, L1 and ed. in almost every section of every chapter collated. Many are quite minor, but a good number involve important changes affecting vocabulary, word-order, and syntax, as well as insertions of new material, some of these extensive.

That G2, L1 and ed. are very closely related is immediately apparent from collation of even a short section of text. Provisionally, I represent L1 and ed. as in effect daughters of G2 because, while ed. and L1 each has many errors exclusive to itself (see section 4.9 below), I have yet to find places where G2 errs significantly and independently of ed. and L1. Lost copy φ survives from the time when I regarded G2, L1 and ed. as sisters. If G2 is correctly represented as the ancestor of L1 and ed., φ may be otiose. For the moment, I retain it as a convenient shorthand reference to this family.

In the following paragraphs, I first of all list innovations more or less peculiar to φ, and then (4.6) consider the sources of φ, of which there are at least two.

---

³³ Although in this particular case the agreement could be independent, in that the error could be essentially dittographic (the repetition of *dicturi sumus*) and corrected by each copyist taking another look at the exemplar.

I owe this observation to Michael Reeve.
1.85.10 [ante Prouidendum est autem unde prorumpat quod supercurrit:] Quandoque
enim contingit passio quia uitium est in qualitate humoris sola .i. quando est
humor maliciosus sed non multus quandoque e converso quandoque utroque
modo: haec verba habent soli
2.36.2 Contingit autem his quibus pessimi et uenenosi cum mordicatione stomachi
ibidem colliguntur humores: generantur ϕ (Gk II, 279, 19–21 συμβαίνει δὲ
tούτῳ, εἰ μοχθηροί καὶ δακνώδεις καὶ ίώδεις ἀθροισθῶσιν ἡ συρρεύσωσιν
ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρός χυμοί)
ϕ substitutes the banal generantur for the more accurate colliguntur (ἀθροισθῶσιν).
2.36.3 lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum
necesse est ut faciant cardiacam passionem: superiora sepius ϕ superiora G1 C
(Gk II, 279, 23–5 πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐλμινθές ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν
ἀναδραμόντες ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστρός ἐργάζονται καρδιακὰς διαθέσεις)
ϕ transposes saepius and superiora.
2.36.3 ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum: stomacho ϕ, stomachi θ" κ (Gk II, 279,
24 ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστρός)
(For a fuller text, see 4.4.3) ϕ ‘improves’ what is seen as a faulty construction facere
passionem ad + accusative by substituting the dative for ad + accusative.
2.37.1 Nam qui habent in stomacho mordicationem de malignis humoribus et propterea
sincopos patiuntur [Cap. 37. Curatio cardiae] imprimis oportet eis cibos offerri:
(Gk II, 281, 5–7 τοῖς οὖν ἔχουσι μοχθηροῖς καὶ δακνώδεις ἐν τῷ στόματι
tῆς γαστρός χυμοῖς καὶ διὰ τούτο συγκοπήναι κινδυνεύουσιν ἀρμόζει
πρῶτον αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων ἔκεινα τῶν ἐδεσμάτων προσφέρειν)
ϕ disastrously misplaces the title of what then becomes ch. 37 of Book 2 in the middle
of the first sentence!34
2.75–2.84–5
ϕ erroneously repeats ch. 2.75 (De potionibus et cathaplasmatis ad epaticam
dissinteriam) in the intrusive chapters (which occur only in ϕ) 2.84 (De potionibus ad
epaticam dissinteriam) and 2.85 (De embroca et cathaplasmate ad calidam epatis
distemperantiam).
2.158.7 Anastomosis autem dicunt cum ora uenarum uirtute amissa apertiora effecta et
laxior sanguinem refundunt intrinsecus et sic aut uomitur aut per uentrem
deducitur in secessus: extrinsecus G2 ed. exterius L1 (not in Gk II, 187, 11)
ϕ substitutes extrinsecus for intrinsecus; the latter is probably correct, as this is surely a
reference to internal bleeding (although it is possible that the writer had in mind blood
getting out of the vein35).
2.235.5 multos poterit liberare, et non solum eos quibus mox ab initio curationem
adhibet curationem: exhibit ϕ (Gk II, 501, 16–17 ὧφελήσει πολλοὺς οὐ
μόνον τοὺς ἄρχην ἔχοντας εἰς τὸ πᾶθος)

34 B, L2 and D have this title a little later (before 2.37.2 Infrigidant igitur), G1 and P3 (rightly) a little earlier,
before 2.37.1 Nam qui habent in stomacho . . ., where, according to Puschmann, p. 281 n. 1, the Greek manuscripts
have the title Πεῖρα καρδιακίας; P3 has Curatio cardiacorum, of which there is perhaps a reflection in Ma’s
otherwise inexplicable quorum, for qui. P3 also has Curatio cardiacorum where ϕ has it, and in red, but it is here
deleted in black. In the same place, Ge has Cura in red.
35 I owe this observation to Cloudy Fischer.
\[\phi\] substitutes \textit{exhibet} for \textit{adhibet}.

2.236.t. \textit{[ante Multa igitur sunt uitia:] Cap. 236 De causis podagre: haec verba habent soli G2 ed. L1 (not in Gk II, 501, 18)}

\(\phi\) inserts a chapter-break and a title occurring nowhere else in the Latin tradition nor in the Greek original.

2.236.6 Non enim solum oportet ut supercurrente materia reumatismi solent fieri sed et per simplicem solam qualitatem efficitur: \textit{om. \(\phi\)} (Gk II, 503, 2–3 \(\text{où \ μόνον \ δὲ \ διὰ \ ἐπίρροιαν \ υλῆς \ οἱ \ ρευματισμοὶ \ τοῖς \ ἄρθροις \ ἐπιγίνεσθαι \ πεφύκασιν, \ ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ \ ψυλῆν \ ποιότητα \ μόνην\})

\(\phi\) omits \textit{solam}.

4.6. THE SOURCES OF \(\phi\)

\(\phi\) appears to represent a recension which employed more than one exemplar of the text. One exemplar must have derived from \(\kappa\), and must have been particularly close to Ox and Ge. Another source of \(\phi\) must have been close to \(\theta^{6}\), and especially to P3. (There are possibly one or two hints that B was a third source of \(\phi\): I list them in 4.8.9 below, but remain to be convinced that they merit even a dotted line on the stemma.) It is noteworthy that, while \(\phi\) has many \(\gamma\)-errors and many good \(\gamma\)-readings, it never agrees alone with \(\gamma\), but nearly always with Ox and/or P3 as well.

4.6.1. \(\phi\) AND \(\kappa\) (OR \(\kappa^{\prime}\))

2.1.1 quoniam initium habet (scil. \textit{tussis}) modo a calida distemperantia, est autem quando a frigida aut humida aut etiam sicca: modo a (modo de D) D Ox Ge \(\phi\) (Gk II, 147, 5–6 \(\text{ποτὲ \ μὲν \ γάρ \ ἀρχεται \ ἀπὸ \ θερμῆς \ δυσκρασίασ, \ ἔσθ' \ ὅτε \ δὲ \ καὶ \ ἀπὸ \ ψυχρᾶς \ ή \ ξηρᾶς \ ή \ θυρᾶς\}) \(\kappa\) and \(\phi\) match the Latin form of the second alternative to that of the first (\textit{modo a X}, \textit{modo a Y}).

2.1.4 de qua re oportet nos accedere cum omni studio: nos oportet Ox \(\phi\) | attendere Ox \(\phi\) accedere D (Gk II, 147, 12–13 \(\text{δεῖ καὶ \ ἡμᾶς \ ἐλθεῖν \ μετὰ \ πάσης \ σπουδῆς\}) Ox and \(\phi\) transpose \textit{nos} and \textit{oportet}, and substitute \textit{attendere} for \textit{accedere} (Greek \textit{ἐλθεῖν}). \textit{Attendere} may be a correction (by Ox followed by \(\phi\)?) of \textit{accedere} (in D and perhaps in \(\kappa\)).

2.1.4 oportet nos accedere cum omni studio ad cognoscedam uniuscuiusque uritatem: \textit{uarietatem Mu C ε praeter B}, tussis urietatem Ox \(\phi\) (nothing corresponding in the Gk II, 147, 13–14\textsuperscript{36}) Ox and \(\phi\) insert \textit{tussis} before \textit{uarietatem}, the latter a corruption of \textit{ueritatem} (in view of its distribution, a polygenetic corruption, I think — but that may be cowardice on my part).

2.2.1 Quod si de calida distemperantia \textit{pura} uel simplici generata fuerit tussis: sola Ox \(\phi\) (Gk II, 147, 17 \(\text{ψιλῆς} \ τοῖν \ οὖν \ οὖσιν \ τής \ θερμῆς \ δυσκρασίας\)) Ox and \(\phi\) substitute \textit{sola} for \textit{pura}.

\textsuperscript{36} However, Cloudy Fischer suggests that Latin \textit{uniuscuiusque} may somehow reflect a part of Greek \textit{ὁποῖος} for \textit{ποιότης}. 
2.2.1 For the text and variants, see 4.7.3 below.
For sentiunt enim merito, the reading of Ox et in inicio sentiunt is strikingly similar to et merito sentiunt in φ. I would suggest that Ox and φ found et merito sentiunt in their common source, and that Ox then attempted to make some sense of the phrase.

2.3.1 Tussiunt etiam plurimi ex frigida distemperantia: quam plurimi Ox C φ (Gk II, 149, 2 ος δι βησόσωσι δια ψυχράν δυσκρασίαν)

Ox and φ (and presumably independently C) replace plurimi with quam plurimi, a common phrase in our translation.

2.3.4 Sic enim ex frigida distemperantia cognoscitur genera tussis: tussis generata cognoscitur Ox Ge tussis esse generata cognoscitur φ (Gk II, 149, 8–9 οὗτο μὲν αἱ δια ψυχράν αιτίαν ἡ θερμήν διαγινώσκονται βήχες)
κ' (Ox and Ge) transposes cognoscitur genera tussis, and φ takes this new word-order and inserts esse, thus making a nominative + infinitive construction.

2.4.2–5.1 material e sa utem [si accesserit tussis] amitroteras, et non oportet <t>alia iterum dicere. . . . (5. 1) Supercurrente igitur materia efficitur tussis: tussis efficitur Ox φ (Gk II, 149, 12–14 διαφέρουσι δὲ του μᾶλλον τάς δραστικὰς ἔχειν ἐναργηστάτα σημεία, τὰς δὲ ύλικὰς ἀμυδρότερα. καὶ οὐ χρὴ ταύτα πάλιν λέγειν)

The Latin tradition offers various explanatory notes to Greek ἀμυδρότερα, among which Ox and φ alone have facilis ad cognoscendum. Ox and φ also transpose efficitur and tussis.

2.5.2 et attendere seu de capite fluat qui mouet tussem, siue ex altero membro: qui ἰδ quod Ge L2 BM Ox (Gk II, 149, 17–18 καὶ προσέχειν εἶτε ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιρρεῖ τὸ κινοῦν τὴν βήχα εἶτε καὶ ἐξ ἔτέρων)

Ge, φ and the first corrector of P3 alone insert humor, necessary to make sense of qui. The Greek text would speak for the indeterminate neuter pronoun. (Neater Latin would be <id> quod, avoiding the possibility of taking quod with capite.)37 This and the next passage pose a problem for the stemma, requiring one of two additional hypotheses for which I have little, if any, independent evidence: either these innovations are of λ, Ma and D here follow θ and κ, respectively, and (additional hypothesis 1) P3 knew λ; or they are of κ, Ge, φ and P3 alone repeat the first main verb (suscipit) in the second clause. This and the next passage would seem to confirm the proximity of Ge to the κ-source of φ (but see the comment at the end of the preceding passage).

2.5.3 Etenim pulmo suscipit primum, est autem quando et thorax et latera uel praecordia et alia altera patiuntur membra: thorax suscipit Ge φ (Gk II, 149, 19–20 καὶ γὰρ ὁ πνεῦμον ἀδικεῖται πολλάκις· πρῶτος γὰρ ἔστιν, εἰτὰ ὁ θώραξ ἢ πλευρὸν ἢ τὸ διάφραγμα ἢ ἄλλο τι μόριον)

Ge and φ alone repeat the first main verb (suscipit) in the second clause. This and the next passage would seem to confirm the proximity of Ge to the κ-source of φ (but see the comment at the end of the preceding passage).

2.7.t.–2.7.1 Signa si de capite in pulmonem fluat (7.1) Quod si in pulmonem fluat: fluat humor P3 Ge φ | Quod si amplius Ge φ (nothing corresponding at Gk II, 151, 1 Φλεγμονίς ἐν τῷ πνεῦμον σημείωσις)

Ge, φ and P3 alone insert humor (as in 2.5.2 above). Ge and φ alone add amplius.

37 I owe this suggestion to Cloudy Fischer.
4.6.2. $\phi$ and $\theta''$, especially P3

2.1.4 *Propter quod* non una est causa tussis sed uaria: quoniam G1 P3 Ma $\phi$ (Gk II, 147, 12 ἐπει δόν όμω μίαν αἰτίαν ἢ βήξ, ἀλλὰ ποικίλην κέκτησαν)

$\theta''$ (and in this case G1) and $\phi$ replace *propter quod* with *quoniam*.

2.5.1 et exinde nascentiam tussis habet: tussis nascitur P3 Ma $\phi$ (Gk II, 149, 16 αἱ βήξες ... τὴν γένεσιν ἔχουσιν)

$\theta''$ and $\phi$ replace *nascentiam tussis habet* with the simpler *tussis nascitur*.

2.5.5 et omnino nihil praetermitti debet de tussis: praetermittendum est P3 Ma $\phi$ (Gk II, 149, 22 ὡς πανταχόθεν ἀπαράλειπτον εἶναι τὸν περὶ τῆς βήξες λόγον)

$\theta''$ and $\phi$ replace *praetermitti debet* with *praetermittendum (est)*.

2.7.3 Si autem et sitis sit nia, et frequenter ad haec signa et calor sentiatur multus in thorace: calor multus sentiatur P3 Ma $\phi$ (Gk II, 151, 6 εἴ δὲ καὶ δίπη σφοδρῶς συνέχοιτο πρὸς τοῖς συμπεριστασμοῖς τούτοις καὶ θέρμης αἰσθήσις αὐτῷ γίνοιτο πολλῆς περὶ τὸν θόρακα)

$\theta''$ and $\phi$ eliminate the hyperbaton (and the subjunctive) in *calor sentiatur multus*. (On this passage, see also 4.4.3 above.)

2.37.2 si is qui patitur sit temperantia satis calida, et in eius stomacho contineantur humores mordicantes et acres nimis: si in stomacho P3 $\phi$ (Gk II, 281, 12–14 εἴπερ οἱ πάσχοντες ἦσαν τῇ κράσει θερμῶν καὶ οἱ περιχώμενοι χυμοί δοκιμώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς ἀγαθοὶ)

P3 and $\phi$ alone omit *eius* and make a second conditional clause.

2.271.12 coques autem oleum sicut dictum est in hospitio pede plano mense Martio quinta feria: die iouis $\gamma$, feria quinta P3 $\phi$ (Gk II, 575, 27–8 ἔψε τὸ ἔλαιον, ὡς προγέγραπται, ἐν οἵκισιν κατωγαίῳ μηνὶ μαρτίῳ πέμπτῃ)

P3 and $\phi$ alone transpose *quinta* and *feria*.

4.7. The Principal Cases of Apparent Contamination

The tradition of the Latin Alexander is enormously complicated by contamination. In my judgement, (apart from the recension represented by $\phi$, at the very end of the manuscript tradition of the text) two of the daughters of $\eta$ (O and C) and all but one (B) of the descendants of $\epsilon$ made more or less extensive use of an accessory model (the most extensive contamination being apparent in, from left to right, C, P2, G1 and P3). Of the $\epsilon$-family, P2 appears to have known a copy close to $\delta$, while at a lower level G1, a daughter of $\theta'$, shares errors on the one hand with C (daughter of $\eta$), and on the other hand with daughters of $\theta''$, P3 in particular, and lower still L2 may be represented as following now G1 and now P3.

These individual cases apart, the single most important aspect of the contamination of this tradition lies in the presence of readings characteristic of $\gamma$ (or $\beta$) in O on the one hand and in nearly all of the descendants of $\theta$ on the other. On the stemma I have represented all of these cases of contamination as due to the accessory use of a lost daughter of $\gamma$, $\gamma'$, probably a sister of M, but the truth may of course have been much more complicated.

The contaminations, perhaps inevitably, have seriously delayed the present account of the relations between the manuscripts, and even now I can neither pretend to have
identified every case of contamination, nor be sure that I have nowhere called polygenesis contamina- tion. For now, I present the clearest instances illustrating the main lines of contamination in turn. I hope and trust that, as work on the edition proceeds, collation of further passages will bring further clarification of the uncertainties that I have tried to signal in my notes on the passages discussed in this chapter, and in the remaining problems noted in 4.8 below.

4.7.1. P2 and δ

To begin with, we find anumber of significant secondary readings shared by a group comprising all (or nearly all) the descendants of ε except P2. At an earlier stage of this project, I considered the possibility that not P2 but θ' was contaminated, i.e. that P2 was a second source of θ', intermediate between ε and θ', with a sister (then called ζ) the immediate ancestor of θ' and θ. Since, however, P2 agrees with δ rather than with ε when not agreeing with θ', I think we must take it that P2 had an accessory model in a descendant of δ higher than ε, which we may as well call δ.

1.19.6 Ceterum autem et quae praecesserunt causae, seu temperantia aegrotantis: considerande sunt cause G1 C L2 B P3 D φ cause sunt considerande Ma (considerande sunt habet P2 in marg.) cause attendere oportet (a. o. s. s. Ge) Ox Ge | distemperantia ε praeter P2 P3 Ox' Ge (Gk I, 463, 12–13 λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ τὰ προηγησάμενα αίτια, ἢ τε κράσις τοῦ πᾶσχοντος) ε inserts considerandaesunt (altered to attendere oportet by δ') (Ox Ge)) in order to make a complete sentence, but γ and η have the same verbless sentence as the Greek, which must be original. ε or θ' also changes temperantia to distemperantia (γ' showing the correct reading to θ and hence P3 and Ox'). In both cases, P2 agrees with, and is presumably following, δ.

1.19.8 sed et tactu cognoscere poteris: cognosci potest G1 L2 B Ma D Ge (Gk I, 463, 16 ἀπὸ τῆς ὀφθής δὲ διαγινόμεναι ἐστὶ σοι δυνατὸν) θ' (except P2) and λ (followed by Ma D Ge) change cognoscere poteris to cognosci potest. P2 follows δ, and Ox and P3 (and hence φ) follow θ.

1.85.9 Fit [et] enim plenitudo materiae supercurrens ut solum ex hoc uideas fieri dolorem et qualitate, saepius autem ex utrisque fit, ex qualitate scilicet et ex quantitate: post supercurrens habent verba dolorem efficit G1 BD dolorem facit C uel ita Ma Ge | post qualitate habent dolores efficiunt Ma dolorem efficit Ge | ut solum ex om. G1 C D (Gk II, 5, 7–9 καὶ πλήθος ὡλης ἐπιρρέον μόνον οἰδὲ ποιεῖν ὀδύνην καὶ ποιότης, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὸ συναμφότερον, καὶ ποιότης ὁμικαὶ ποσότης) After supercurrens, θ' (G1 and B, here followed by C) and D have ‘causes pain’, Ma and Ge have uel ita here and ‘cause(s) pain’ later, after qualitate (and φ in fact adds a longer explanatory note after quantitate). Presumably, Ma D Ge here follow λ, P2 here follows δ, P3 and Ox follow θ (and L2 follows P3?).

1.87.3 Lac mulieris cum oui uitello et oleo roseo superpositum +– –+ mitigat: uitello cocto (coctum P3 cocta D) θ' C θ' x (Gk II, 7, 6 Γάλα γυναικός μετὰ κρόκον όφον καὶ ροδίου διαστιθέμενον +– θαυμαστῶς +– προκύνει) ε inserts cocto (although curiously it is added in P3 Ma Ge, and is not in L2 or φ), but P2 follows δ.
1.87.4 *Ad autem* <eum> cui cum nimio flegmone uel tumore ingenti +– dolor fuerit ortus –+ bene facit crocus: Quando autem cum nimio G1 C P3 Ma Ge Ox Quando autem cum non nimio L2 B φ At autem cui cum (cum om. O) nimio A O Mu At autem cui non nimio P2 Quod si cui cum nimio D aut (aut om. M) qui cum nimio P1 M (Gk II, 7, 8–9 próς δε τὰς μεγίστας φλεγμονὰς καὶ ἐν ὅρ νῳ μείζονι ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ κρόκος)

ε replaces *At* with *Quando* and loses the relative pronoun, while P2 follows δ. After *At autem, cui cum* is probably right (as this sequence is also in γ), although *cui* lacks an antecedent. 38 (For further details, see my provisional text in 4.10.3 and notes ad loc.)

2.10.1 *sed habent etiam quendam raucorem cum tusse, interea et proiciunt humores: interius ε (cum O C) praeter P2 (Gk II, 153, 9–10 ἐχὴ δὲ τίνα κέραχον μετά βήχος, ἐσθ’ ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀναγωγὴν ὑγροῦ)

ε erroneously substitutes *interius* for *interea*, but P2 follows δ. While *interius* makes perfectly good sense, *interea* ‘sometimes’ (cf. 5.4, note ad loc.) is clearly demanded by the Greek (ἐσθ’ ὅτε).

2.37.1 *oportet eis cibos offerri qui et refrigerandi habeant aliquid et confortare possint: uirtutem ε praeter P2 (Gk II, 281, 7–8 ἀρμοζεῖ πρῶτον στιγμαί τῶν ἑπεξεργασμένων, ὅσα μετὰ τοῦ ψύχειν ἐτι (ἐχει τι Μ) καὶ βοῶνειν δύναται) With *habeant aliquid* cf. the reading of Greek ms. M ἔχει τι, 39 although Latin et ... et nicely translates Greek μετά ... ἐτι καί. The substitution of *uirutetem* for *aliquid* makes the text clearer and no less idiomatic. Once introduced, *uirutetem* was not likely to be corrected, and hence neatly characterizes ε, although again P2 follows δ.

2.37.4 *quaecumque ... uincere possunt malos qui continentur humores: malos humores qui continentur ε praeter P2 Ox (Gk II, 281, 19–20 ὅσα δύνανται ... νικάν τὴν κρατοῦσαν κακοχυμίαν)

The hyperbaton is so much a feature of the translator’s style that we can be confident that ε or θ’ has here normalized. P2 either reintroduced the hyperbaton himself, or took it from δ. 40

2.37.7 aut mela aut citri deforis mundaturam: citri β P2 citrie η Π2’ citr(i)um cett. | mundaturam (mundati ad P1) β η mundatum ε mundati P2 (Gk II, 281, 24 ἡ μῖλον ἡ κίτρων εκτὸς τού λέπους στιγμάτων)

The reinterpretation (thanks to the writing of *-tur- as *-ī*) of the last word as a past participle in agreement with *citr(i)um* — ‘peeled on the outside’ rather than ‘without its peel’ — may have occurred already in ε, but the readings of ε and P2 are nicely distinguished, and I take it from the presence of *citrie* in P2’ and η that δ had *citrie*, and that P2 knew δ. (I am not inclined to associate the readings of P1 and P2: P1’s *mundati ad* is probably a graphic corruption of *mundat(ur)a(m) + anticipation of the d of dieta.*)

2.37.11 *non solum cardialgis sanat (scil. glícia remedium) ... sed et alia plurima: alia multa θ’ praeter P2 Ox P3 (Gk II, 283, 2–3 οὐ μόνον γὰρ ἵσταται καρδιακάθισιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ... ἀλλὰ πλείστα)

38 Where does the negative come from in P2, B, L2 and φ? I can see that *cum* could be read as *cui n(on)*, so perhaps it reflects a dittography of *cum* which is then dealt with in various ways.

39 For this use of *aliquid*, cf. 1.63, 139, 142, 146, et passim.

40 As the stemma stands, either Ox reintroduced it himself, or the innovation was in θ’ (and P3 had access to it, say via λ), and Ox inherited the correct text via θ.
Given the Greek πλείστα and the distribution of the Latin variants, it is reasonable to suppose that θ' has normalized plurima to multa, while P2 has followed δ. Ox (and P3) would then have the correct reading from θ. (P3 is rather creative at this point but reflects a model containing plurima rather than multa: sed et plurimis aliis passionibus iuuat.)

2.236.6 non enim solum oportet, etc.: for the text and variants, see above under 'ε errs'. P2 alone of the descendants of ε has existimare oportet (oportet existimare ε) and reumatismum solum (solum reumatismum ε). P2's word-order may be due to reference to δ (which had solum oportet and reumatismi solent).

2.236.6 et per simplicem solam qualitatem efficitur (scil. reumatismus) id est per
distemperantias ipsarum (scil. qualitatum): distemperantias ipsas (distemper-
antiam ipsam L2) ε praeter G1 P2 (nothing corresponding in the Gk II, 503, 3–4)
ε changes ipsarum to ipsas, but P2 follows δ. As qualitas does not appear in the plural, it was all too easy to make ipsarum agree with the adjacent distemperantias (as L2 also does, making the phrase singular). Once the change was made, there was no reason to undo it, and so G1’s ipsarum is not easy to explain: it may reflect another agreement between G1 and P3, where ipsas is a correction, presumably of ipsarum.

4.7.2. θ, P3 and γ'

In a striking number of instances, there is agreement in error between at least one of the descendants of γ and at least one of the descendants of θ, above all Ox and/or P3, but in fact D, Ge and Ma (Ma more rarely) are also implicated. The question arises, how many members of the θ-family knew γ' directly? In principle, we could be generous, moderate, or parsimonious. In generous mood, we could allow all of them — the five surviving copies and the two lost copies θ'' and κ — as well as θ itself direct access to γ'. This is of course the easiest solution, but also the least satisfactory, not only because it makes the stemma virtually unreadable, but more importantly because it is historically implausible and moreover ignores certain clear patterns of agreement. A choice between the moderate and the parsimonious availability of γ' is, however, less obvious. For a long time I adopted the moderate approach: I observed that D quite often shared γ-errors alongside Ox and P3, Ge less often, and Ma more rarely still, and consequently allowed θ, κ, Ox and P3 each the possibility of following γ' independently. From the first, however, I was acutely aware of the complexity and apparent chaos that even this compromise brought to the stemma, and dissatisfied by an approach that was in reality arbitrary and only apparently principled. The reconstruction of λ as the accessory model of Ma, D, and Ge brought at last a realistic chance of making a parsimonious approach work, and it is this that I seek to represent — I hope consistently — in the present work. Given that Ma, D and Ge can reasonably be held to derive non-γ-readings from λ, daughter of θ', that there is some reason to think that P3 had a non-γ-source other than θ'', and that Ox is not obviously contaminated (while P3 very evidently is), I think we may account for all significant agreements between γ- and θ-family manuscripts by allowing θ itself and P3 alone among its descendants direct access to γ'.

41 Note also good readings by contamination, e.g. of P3 in 2.37.6, 10, 11 under 4.2.3 above.
1.85.1 qualiter oporteat cognosci in eis consistentes passiones, et causas eorum et curationes et diversitates colliriorum, et modus qualiter oporteat adhiberi:

modo nos qualiter M modum nos qualiter P1 modum qualiter nos Ox P3'

(nothing corresponding in Gk II, 3, 3–5 πῶς διαγινώσκειν χρή τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς συνιστάμενα πάθη καὶ τὰς αἰτίας τούτων καὶ τὰς θεραπείας καὶ περὶ διαφόρων κολλουρίων καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῶν)

γ and γ', and hence θ, Ox and P3', inserted nos with oportet(adhibere).

[1.85.4 Incipiamus ergo [nunc] iam dicere: iam γ Ox P3, iam nunc G1 C L2 φ (Gk II, 3, 8–9 ἀρξόμεθα οὖν ἤδη τοῦ λόγου)

γ and γ', and hence θ, Ox and P3, may here preserve a correct reading: nunc looks like a gloss on iam.]

1.85.6 Quando ergo dolores nimii et intolerabiles occupauerint oculos: dolor nimius .

-is MD Ox P3 doloris nimio . -is P1 (Gk II, 3, 11–5, 1 εἰ οὖν ὁδόναι σφοδραὶ καὶ ἀκαρτέρητοι περιέχουσι τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς)

γ and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3, substitute singular dolor nimius for plural dolores nimii.

1.85.6 non, sicut multi faciunt, narcoticis confectis praesumendum est uti colliriis:

praesumant γ Ox praesumendum P3 (Gk II, 5, 2–3 μὴ ὡς πολλοί τοῖς ναρκωτικοῖς σκευαζομένοις θαρρήσεις κολλουρίοις)

γ and Ox (presumably via θ) have praesumant for praesumendum est; or can this be by chance?

1.85.10 Prouidendum est autem unde prorumpat quod supercurrit .

et qualis utique superfluitas est: qualis γ Ox P3 (Gk II, 5, 9–11 ἔρωθα διὰ καὶ πόθεν ὄρμάται τὸ ἐπιρρέωσαν . . καὶ οὖν ἄρα τὸ ἐπιρρέον ἔστιν)

γ and γ', and hence θ, Ox and P3, omit et.

1.86.1 Si ergo sanguineus fuerit humor qui . . humor fuerit MD Ox P3 humor P3' (Gk II, 5, 19 Εἰ μὲν οὖν σιμιτακίος εἴῃ χυμὸς)

M and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3, transpose fuerit and humor (εἴῃ χυμός).

1.86.2 Rubra enim sunt omnia et sanguineo colore et ipsa facies rubra et in tumore magno sunt posita: nimio MD Ox P3 L2 φ omnia C (Gk II, 5, 20–1 ἐρωθρὰ γὰρ ἀπὰντα καὶ σιμιταδῆ καὶ τὸ πρὸσπον ἐρωθρὸν καὶ ἐν όγχῳ μείζονι)

M and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3 (and L2), substitute nimio for magno; nimio is perfectly idiomatic, but, in view of Greek μείζονι, surely secondary. If this is right, we have here an agreement in error setting M and γ' against P1 (which has magna).

1.86.2 et pigritia in omnibus consuetis actionibus accidit: omnis consuetas actionis P1 omnes consuetas actiones Μ omni consuetua actione D Ox omnibus consueta actione P3 (Gk II, 5, 22–3 καὶ ὄκνοι περὶ τὰς συνήθεις ἐνεργείας)

κ (D and Ox) and P3 agree in error in substituting singular consuetas actione for plural consuetis actionibis, and I wonder whether this was inspired by (or represents a correction of) the accusative plural *consuetas actiones in γ' via θ (cf. the evidence for γ provided by P1 and M) — especially if γ' had lost one or two final esses; the accusative plural could perfectly well have been in the original.

1.86.3 Et si in his neque mordicans lacrima neque acris uideatur: uel acris (agris P1

acres M) uidetur γ Ox P3 (Gk II, 5, 23–4 Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τούτους μὴδὲ τὸ δάκρυον δακνώδες καὶ δρόμῳ φαινοῖτο)

42 But note that P3' omits fuerit, and has just sanguineus humor qui.
In view of the Greek text, γ and γ', and hence θ, Ox and P3, probably here preserve the original reading — though parallels must be sought for neque ... neque and neque ...

1.87.1 Si enim sanguineus esse tibi manifestus fuerit flegmon: om. M Ox P3' (not in Gk II, 5, 27 Eī μὲν οὖν σαμιτικόν σοι φανείη τήν φλεγμονήν ἐργασάμενον αἰτίων)

M and γ', and hence θ, Ox and P3', omit esse. Again, M and γ' would agree in error against P1.

1.87.1 incidenda est una (magis) capitalis γ D Ox P3

γ and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3, preserve the correct word-order in this phrase. (On this passage, see above under ‘δ evils’.)

1.87.2 Si autem colericus et acer humor cum sanguine apparet mixtus: enim MD Ox P3 (Gk II, 5, 28–7, 1 εἰ δὲ καὶ χολόδεις καὶ δριμεῖς χυμοι)

M and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3, substitute enim for autem (most probably repeating enim from 1.87.1 Si enim sanguineus ...). Again, M and γ' would agree in error against P1.

1.87.3 Extrinsicus autem superponenda sunt adiutoria haec: igitur γ D Ox P3 φ (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 7, 5 Περί τῶν ἐξωθέν ἐπιτιθεμένων βοηθημάτων)

γ and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3, substitute igitur for autem.

1.87.4 Similiter autem et dactili faciunt — postquam autem repressum fuerit reuma:

postea repressa P1, postquam repressa M, postea cum repressa P3 (no exact correspondence in Gk II, 7, 10–11 τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ποιοῦσα καὶ οἱ φοίνικες μετά τοῦ ἐπέχειν τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον ῥέματισμόν)

Rightly or wrongly, γ and γ', and hence probably θ and P3, agree in omitting autem and in treating reuma as feminine. (The Latin version incorrectly takes Greek μετά + genitive as meaning 'after'.)

1.87.4 crocus et glaucion et ouorum uitella cocta et oleum roseum permixta superponantur: superimposita g et superimposita (superposita Ox) mitigant dolores OxP3L2 φ mitigant D (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 7, 11–12 μετὰ ... κρόκου καὶ γλαυκίου καὶ πυρρὸν ὤν ἐπτὰ ἐξεστῶν καὶ ῥοδίνου)

γ and γ', and hence θ, Ox and P3 (and L2), substitute superimposita for superponantur. θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3 (and L2) also reflect the supplying of a new main verb phrase, mitigant dolores, as the second participle would require: there is no hint of this in γ.

1.88.1 Cataplasmata igitur extrinsecus ad flegmonem talia qualia diximus sunt utenda:

que γ P3 (not in Gk II, 7, 18–19)

γ and γ', and hence P3, have que for qualia (que may very well be right).

2.36.2 For the text and variants, see 4.4.1 above.

P1, M and P3 alone have nimis debilem for nimis sensibilem, and presumably P3 here follows γ'.

2.37.2 si is qui patitur sit temperantia satis calida, et in eius stomaco continauntur humores mordicantes et acres nimis: distemperantia P3 D Ox Ge φ | acrissimi M accerimi P3 φ (Gk II, 281, 12–14 εἴπερ οἱ πάσχοντες ἢσαν τῇ κράσει θερμοὶ πάνυ καὶ οἱ περιεχόμενοι χυμοί δακνώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς ἄγαν)

43 Note that u and v1 here preserve the correct reading nimis sensibilem, which further supports the placing of γ' closer to γ than to u and v1, or even the idea that u, v1 and α all derive from α' (see 4.8.1).
In the second case, the common source of P3 and φ surely had access to a copy in which *acres nimirum* had been changed into a superlative form, perhaps in the first instance a barbarous one such as that in M. In the first case, *distemperantia* (for *temperantia*) was surely in θ and corrected by Ma alone of the descendants of θ, possibly by reference to λ. 2.158.3 sic curatio competens est adhibenda et differre non oportet: dilatare γ P3 (Gk II, 187, 6–7 καὶ οὖν τὴν θεραπεῖαν ἐπιδέχειν καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι) P1, M and P3 alone have dilatare for differre, and presumably P3 here follows γ’.

4.7.3. G1 and θ"", especially P3

A few significant innovations are exclusive to G1, P3 and Ma, and imply an accessory use by G1 of a daughter of θ"" (close to P3 in particular, see below). I have represented this with a dotted line on the stemma.

2.2.1 Quod si de calida distemperantia pura uel simplici generata fuerit tussis – sentiunt enim merito calorem quasi per aliquid qualitates taliter tussientes et respirantes – desiderium habent frigidi aeris: sentiunt enim merito γ η sentiunt et merito B P2 L2 et merito sentiunt φ merito sentiunt et Ge merito sentiunt G1 P3 Ma | quem super P1 quas per M quia per G1 P3’ Ma (dots under quia P3 m2) (Gk II, 147, 17–19 Ψιλής τοίνυν οὕσις τῆς θερμῆς δυσκρασίας αἰσθάνονται μὲν ἵσος διὰ τινὸς ποιότητος τουλάχιστος, οίνον δυσκρασίας θερμῆς, βήσοντες καὶ ἀναπνεῖν ἐπιθυμοῦσθαι ψυχρὸν ἄερα)

Although things are messy at this point and the Latin text (not to mention the Greek!) is far from clear (see 5.4 below and the notes ad loc.), we see that G1, P3 and Ma agree within the space of a few words in omitting *et* (or *enim*) and in substituting *quia* for *quasi*.

2.37.2 et panis in aqua frigida aut in calida aqua: in aqua calida aut (uel G1) frigida G1 P3 Ma (Gk II, 281, 12 καὶ ὀρειχαλκός εἰς ψυχρὸν καὶ ἑκρατεῖν)

While the Greek and the rest of the Latin tradition have ‘cold or hot’, G1, P3 and Ma (and I presume θ") have ‘hot or cold’. (On this passage, see also 4.3.3 above.)

G1 never agrees with Ma against P3, and that G1’s accessory model was especially close to P3 is suggested by the following agreements. Individually, I acknowledge, many of these are very slight, but taken together they are not negligible, and one in particular — 2.271.4 — is surely decisive. Note that in 1.19.3, 2.271.2–4, and 2.271.5, G1 and P3 agree also with a descendant of γ. (Cf. 2.271.1 under 4.4.5 above, and note ad loc.)

1.19.2 Est autem quod defluat humor G1 P3 (Gk I, 463, 4 ἔστι δὲ τὸ παραρρέον ὡτε μὲν χολόδες ...) 1.19.3 et subcolerico colore: cum colerico M G1 P3 (Gk I, 463, 7–8 καὶ ὑπὸχρον (ὑπόχολον Μf) τῇ χροίᾳ) 2.37.t. on the (correct) placement by G1 and P3 (perhaps by θ") of an additional title (Curatio cardiace G1 Curatio cardiaecorum P3) misplaced elsewhere in the tradition, see under 4.5 above.

2.158.7 et sic aut uominitur aut per uentrem deducitur (scil. sanguis) in secessus: per uominitum G1 per uominitur P3 (not in the Gk II, 187, 11)
G1 and P3 alone have have *per*. This could admittedly be a good correction, made independently by each, of the transmitted version, but it is certainly secondary: for *per uomitum aut per ventrem*, cf. e.g. 2.24 *ad fin.*, 2.54 *ad init.*

2.236.4 et flegma eodem modo laedens dolores fortissimos facit: fortissimos dolores G1 C P3 L2 (Gk II, 501, 23–4 ἐπὶ δὲ φλέγμα χαρῆσαι εἰς τοὺς εἰρημένους τόπους ὀδύνης ἵσχυροτέρας αἰτίον γίνεται)

The Greek word-order suggests that *dolores fortissimos* is original, but *fortissimos dolores* is better Latin. Was the improvement made independently by θ′ (whence G1, P3 and L2?) and C, or is this another agreement linking C with manuscripts outside η (see below)? Or was it just an accident? To what extent is the Greek word-order noun-adjective retained in the Latin translation?

2.236.6 et per simplicem solam qualitatem efficitur (scil. *reumatismus*): perficitur G1 P3 L2 (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 503, 3)

G1 and P3 have the certainly erroneous *perficitur* for *efficitur*. The *per-* was perhaps suggested by the preposition a few words earlier, in which case this could again involve independent error. This is perhaps supported by the fact that the error is shared also with L2; on the other hand, there are other places where L2 agrees in significant error with G1 and P3 (note especially the next three passages).

2.271.2 et hi in accessione dolores ferre non possunt: hi cum G1 P3′ L2 | accessionibus

G1 and P3 alone have *accessio in the plural, and they alone provide a logical link by means of the conjunction *cum* between this sentence and the next (which announces some pain-killing remedies).

2.271.2–4 cerotaria anodina quae mox sine dolore faciant. (3.) *Ordinamus cerotum quod dum in statu accessionis fuerit superpositum mox sine dolore locus efficitur* (4.) +← Recipit autem haec.—→ Croco opio + iii.: cerotaria anodina que mox sine dolore factant ordinamus. Quorum unum recipit opii croci G1 P3 L2 (Gk II, 575, 4–5 Κηροτῆ ἐν τῇ ἄκμη τῶν παροξυσμῶν ἐπιτιθέμενη, ἀνυώνους ποιοῦσα. + ← → Κρόκου, ὤπου μέχρινος, ἀνὰ οὐγγ. δ’)

This is a very striking set of exclusive agreements between G1 and P3 and L2. Notice (a) *quorum unum for cerotum quod dum*; (b) the lacuna (in statu ... *efficitur*); (c) the asyndeton after *recipit*; (d) the order of the first two ingredients of the recipe.44

2.271.5 Crocum et opium infundes in uino, panem uero in aqua infundes: uero γ G1 P3 L2] om. cett. | infundes] om. G1 P3 L2 C (Gk II, 575, 6–7 τὸν κρόκον καὶ τὸν ὁπὸν ἀπόβρεχε ἐν οἴνῳ, τὸν δὲ άρτον ὀδησστὶ)

Again, G1 and P3 and L2 are very close, and again a descendant of β is probably involved.

4.7.4. C and θ′, especially G1

C shares important η errors such as 2.236.2 *inimicos* (for *nimios*, see 4.3.1), and important correct η readings, such as 2.271.4 *paragoricis* (podagricis ε, see 4.3.3),

44 Note that the fourth feature, (d), is also in M, which also omits que mox sine dolore faciant ... *recipit autem hec*. Note also that que mox sine dolore faciant ordinamus is an addition in P3. It is likely that the source of G1, P3 and L2 here was an exemplar very like M (γ′), and that *quorum unum recipit* was an improvised filling of what was obviously a lacuna between cerotaria anodina and opii croci. An accessory model then gave P3 que mox sine dolore faciant ordinamus and (probably) a nonsensical *autem* added after *recipit* (although of course some changes/innovations could have been made without reference to another model!).
(and at e.g. 2.236.7 — although this is a very messy passage — C agrees perfectly with A), and therefore, if the agreements with \( \Theta' \) are significant, they presumably arise through contamination. In addition to the passages presented under 4.4.1 above, I note the following agreements in error with G1 in particular.

1.85.t. De oculorum passionibus: passionibus oculorum G1 C (Gk II, 3, 1 Περὶ ἡθεραπείας ὀφθαλμῶν)
The ancestor of G1, here followed by C, transposes oculorum and passionibus.

1.85.4 Incipiam ergo [nunc] iam dicere: iam nunc C G1 L2 φ, nunc iam plerique (Gk II, 3, 8–9 ἀρξόμεθα οὖν ἠδη τῶν λόγων)

G1 and C (and L2 and φ) agree in putting nunc, which may have begun as a gloss (it is not in γ or OX or P3), after iam, rather than before it as in the other descendants of δ.

2.5.1 et quod spuitur plenitudo: quod γ η P3 eo quod P2 ex eo quod cett. etiam C (Gk II, 149, 14–15 αὐτῷ τῶν ἄναπτυσθεὶς πλῆθος)

C shares in the elaboration of quod to ex eo quod, an innovation probably of e (note the further slight discrepancy between P2 and e (cf. 4.7.1 above): did δ have eo quod?).

2.36.4 lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus: om. G1 C (Gk II, 279, 23–4 πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐλλιμɛνες ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδραμόντες)
The ancestor of G1, here followed by C, omits saepius.

2.236.2 Etenim sanguis calidus supercurrens in articulorum cauitates: om. G1 C (Gk II, 501, 19 καὶ γὰρ αἷμα συρρέοντι ἐν τῇ τῶν ἄρθρων κοιλότητι θερμῶν)
The ancestor of G1, here followed by C, omits calidus.

2.271.9 coques lignis de uitibus, id est sarmentis, donec bulliat: om. G1 C L2 (Gk II, 575, 19–20 ἐνε ἣλυλοις ἀμπελίνοις, ἐκὸς οὐ βράσις σφοδρώς)
The ancestor of G1 and L2, here followed by C, omits id est sarmentis.

4.7.5. C and P3 (and/or φ)

Nearly all of the aberrant readings in C can be explained in terms of contamination with \( \Theta' \). Some, however, including some striking ones, unite C in error with P3 and φ, or with φ alone.

1.17 ad fin.45 Item aliud ad eas quae in capite scabias sunt. Rutam et stipteria teres cum melle, et ungues caput; antea tamen rades. Si autem recesserit a capite cutis, oliuea folia cocta [trita?] cum melle cataplasmabis: Item ... quae] Item C Iterum φ [in capite scabias sunt] uteres autem scabies capitis illinies C uteres scabies capitis sic curabis φ in capite scabies ueteres (uteres s. s.) sunt P3 | Si autem recesserit a capite cutis] si autem cutis recesserit a capite cortice C P3 φ | oliuea folia cocta [trita?] cum melle] cortice oliue et foliis coctis et (et s. s. P3) tritis cum melle C P3 φ (Gk I, 461, 7–10 Πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ψαρώδη καὶ ἵππωρά, Πήγανον καὶ στυπτηρίαν λεάνας μετὰ μέλιτος χρίς τὴν κεφαλὴν προξυρών· ἐὰν δ᾽ ἀφιστῆται τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ δέρμα, ἐλαίας φύλλα ἐθάξαι μετὰ μέλιτος κατάπλαττε)

This short recipe (omitted by ed.) throws up several significant agreements involving C, P3 and φ. C and φ alone abbreviate the beginning of the recipe, replacing the introductory relative clause with a main-verb instruction, and C and φ together with a

---

45 I have yet to subdivide 1.17, as I have collated only the recipe omitted by ed. See 4.10.1.
corrector of P3 insert ueteres before scabies. They also agree (together with D, Ox and Ge) in a dittography of cutis, whereby the second occurrence is reinterpreted as a form of cortex and as referring to the skin of the olives. Finally, they agree in resolving the asyndeton cocta trita by inserting et between the two participles. (For further details of this revealing passage — bearing also on other branches of the tradition — see 4.10.1.)

1.18.t. ex quibus tabes quaedam defluat: uelut quaedam tabes C φ (Gk I, 461, 12 ὅφ’ ὀν ἱχώρες ἀποτήκονται)

C and φ alone insert uelut and transpose tabes quaedam. This surely cannot be due to independent innovation.

1.19.2 cognoscı ergo oportet passionis ipsius proprietatem: cognoscere (agn- M P3) γ C P3 φ |ipsam passionem et C P3 φ ipsius passionis M (Gk I, 463, 5–6 διαγινόσκειν οὖν χρή το κυρίος αίτιον)

C, P3 and φ have the active infinitive (in common with γ and the Greek) and a reworking of passionis ipsius (conceivably based on γ’: cf. the word-order of M).

4.8. REMAINING PROBLEMS

Given the complexity of this tradition, and the inevitably provisional nature of some of the relations argued for in this chapter, it may be useful to rehearse briefly some of the outstanding problems and questions, the loose ends which I am yet unable to tie up. This I do in chronological order, by the age of the principal manuscript(s) concerned, beginning with the oldest.

4.8.1. γ, u, v1 and α: TWO PROBLEMS

With regard to β, γ and δ, it is important to note two potential problems with the stemma as at present proposed.

In the first place, there are two passages in which we have to reckon with the possibility that u and v1 alone preserve the correct reading. In this case, either γ and δ have erred independently, or the error was in α and the common ancestor of u and v1 descends not from α but from a very similar copy (α’). In the latter case, in sections 4.2 and 4.8.2 we are reconstructing not β and γ vs δ, but α vs α’: agreements in error between γ and u and v1 presumably reflect errors in α’ corrected not in α but in δ; correct readings shared by γ and u and v1 allow us to suppose error in δ, as before. (On the implications for the top of the stemma, cf. the remarks in 3.2.5 and 4.1.2 above.)

Here are the two passages in question.

2.36.3 cardiacas passiones Ox P3’ u v1: cardiacam passionem cett. (Gk II, 279, 25 καρδιακάς διαθέσεις)

In view of the plural in the Greek, u and v1 may be right (Ox and P3 getting the correct reading from γ’). (This is, admittedly, a small matter, but the pattern of agreements appears not haphazard.)

2.36.3 ita ut aliqui statim a lumbricorum mordicatione perant P3 u v1: statim a mord. lumbr. φ statim in malo (mala D Ox C B malo a Ma Ge) lumbr. mord. cett. (Gk II, 279, 25–281, 1 ὅστε τινὰς παρασεπτάκα τὸ ἐλμῖνθων δεκκυμένους ἀπόλλυσθαι)
Here again u and v1 may have the correct reading (which was preserved also in γ′, the descendant of β known to P3, which in turn transmitted it to φ, which normalized the word-order) as there is nothing in the Greek to warrant the words in malo. It is striking that the three unwanted syllables more or less exactly repeat three syllables in the sequence *statimalnumbricorum. Are we to reckon with some sort of dittography, perhaps caused by double reading/hearing of syllables in scriptio continua? The converse — haplography of e.g. *statī malulū bricorū — is also conceivable, but raises further problems, including the question of the meaning of in malo lumbricorum. We are not helped by the fact that the Latin Alexander appears not otherwise to use perire!

Secondly, while setting up g vs v1 and u as I do in the stemma, I must acknowledge and here highlight a possibly significant agreement (in error?) of M and v1:

2.235.3 Ego autem existimo ut ... bene et cito possit curari et facilius a medicis ab ipsis infirmitatibus liberare: et cito] citto P1 credo M v1 om. Pod. | possit P1 M P3 posunt Ox posse cett. (Gk II, 501, 12–14 ἐγὼ δὲ φημὶ ώς ... ἐκθήραιπενῶς ὁν βρόδιον ὑπὸ τῶν ιστρῶν γενήσεται)

M and v1 alone have credo for cito. On the other hand, of the copies deriving from β, only v1 changes possit (required after existimo ut) to posse (required with credo), and P1 agrees with M and v1 in omitting et (required by the substitution of credo for cito), so that the error may have occurred in β (bene credo possit) and have been faithfully copied in M, partly corrected in P1 (bene cito possit), and properly incorporated by means of a further change in v1 (bene credo posse) (cf. my provisional text in 4.10.6 and notes ad loc.).

4.8.2. Who Errs, β or δ?

For the record, I add a further set of passages in which the manuscripts show a clear β vs δ division but where I am not yet able to say with confidence which side of the tradition is in error. At some future date, some at least of these passages will serve for further definition of β and δ.

2.1.4 Propter quod non una est causa tussis sed uaria: propter quod γ O D, propterea A Μu C Ox Ge P2 L2 B, quoniam G1 Ma P3 φ (Gk II, 147, 12 ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐ ύ μίαν αἰτίαν ἢ βῆξ, ἀλλὰ ποικίλην κέκτηται)

η and θ′ (and perhaps θ whence κ′), and therefore δ already, have propterea, β has propter quod. The latter is much more common than the former in Α’s version of Books 1 and 2, but I cannot at this point decide between the two. θ′ (here preferred by G1) evidently innovates with quoniam. O may have found propter quod in γ′.

2.36.4 oportet non omnino existimandum: existimandum M u v1 existimandis P1 existimari P3 existimare cett. (Gk II, 281, 1–2 χρῆ μὴ πάντοτε νομίζειν)

Either δ has normalized an original gerundive, or β has vulgarized an original infinitive. The (near-)agreement of Ox with β may reflect use of γ′ by the maker of Ox.

46 I owe this suggestion to Cloudy Fischer.
47 Might malum lumbricorum have been a phrasal term of the type passio lumbricorum (Langslow, Medical Latin, 223, with references)? Are there parallels in the Latin Alexander?
48 D may be ignored, as he is indulging in free composition at this point, writing between quod and non the words per partes agnosceda sunt quia.
49 For oportet with the gerundive see Hofmann and Szantyr, 374 with literature.
2.37.7 his ergo hora tertia panem infusum in calida aqua [ut] adsumant aut in aqua frigida infusum P1 v1: sumant M P3 in calida ... infusum om. u
his ergo hora tertia suadendum (suad. est C) panem infusum ... ut assumant (assumere O50) ... infusum A O Mu C
his ergo hora tertia suadendum est ut assumant (accipiant B) panem ... infusum cett. praeter Ox P3 (Gk II, 281, 22–2 ἄλλα περί ὧν τρίτην ἢ τετάρτην ἄρτον εἰς εὐκρότου μαμάνειν ἢ εἰς ὑδρ ψυχρόν)
The difficulty here centres on suadendum est, which was certainly present in δ. We may suppose either:
(a) β (including γ’ reflected in P3) errs in losing suadendum est; P1 and v1 blindly preserve the tell-tale ut before assumant, but M and γ’ (cf. P3) drop the ut and change assumant to sumant; η (A O Mu C) preserves the correct reading (probably minus est, which is only in C) from δ, while ε normalizes the elaborate word-order and structure (which is in keeping with the Greek and probably original); or
(b) the jussive subjunctive (assumant) is original, and suadendum est is part of an attempt by δ to restore sense to a garbled text. In favour of (a) is the otherwise inexplicable ut before assumant in P1 and v1, but I leave both possibilities open for now. In either case, the Latin version, unlike the Greek, obviously began a new sentence here, with His ergo.

2.235.2 Relinquitur eius aliquid in ipsis locis, et ideo nullo modo ab artificibus medicine sanari potest; potuerunt P1 v1 poterunt M po poterit P3 (Gk II, 501, 11–12 ὑπόληψιν δὲ ἐκ τούτου τὸ πάθος ἀνικράν ἐκτήσατο, καὶ μὴδὲ ὀλὸς ὑπὸ τέρνης ἰατρικῆς ἰαθήναι ποτε δυνήθηκει)
The Greek means, ‘as a result, the disease [gout] acquired the unholy reputation that it had never actually been susceptible of being completely cured by the art of medicine’, and the Latin seems to be a bad mistranslation, which starts by misconstruing υπόληψιν as a part of υπολείπω. Given the confusion, it would be hazardous to favour any particular tense of posse. We can, however, be confident that δ had potest, while β (including γ’ reflected in P3) had the future or the perfect.

2.235.5 Credo enim quia si ea que scripta tradimus diligentius attendantur [naturam uniuscuique], multos poterit liberare: attendantur po( Gk II, 501, 15–16 ἐλπίζωτο γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐάν τις ἄριστως προσέχειν, ὑφελήσει πολλοὺς)
Provisionally (and tentatively), I take it that, given that there is nothing corresponding in the Greek, and that it adds nothing to the sense, the words uoluerit operari were inserted by δ rather than lost by β. The line would be that, following the corruption of attendantur into attendendo, it became apparent to the maker of δ, but not to the maker of β, that the si-clause had no finite verb, and uoluerit operari was added.
An intelligible alternative would be the text of η: Credo enim si (si quis η’) ea quae scripta tradimus, diligentius attendendo naturam uniuscuiusque, uoluerit operari, multos poterit liberare 'For I believe that if anyone wishes to apply the things which we are transmitting in writing, while by paying careful heed to the nature of each

50 cf. Greek λαμβάνειν!
individual (case/patient), he will be able to cure many people’. On this account, β omits uoluerit operari. In the text of A of Book 1, I have counted forty-two instances of ablative gerund + main verb.

In either case, I think it more probable that the indefinite pronoun as subject of uoluerit (quicunque repeated from 2.235.3) was added by ε rather than lost by η, δ might have understood the subject as unspecified ‘he’, the doctor. (See my provisional text in 4.10.6 and the notes ad loc.).

2.236.5 sed et grauitate sua facta sentitur <non> mediocris commotio: mediocris effecta

[Text continues with analysis of page content]
2.2.3 Quod si haec fuerint passi et sola distemperantia fuerit: fuerint passi et recte δ (A Mu P2) fuerit passus et P1 Μ O passo ex ε C (Gk II, 147, 21 et μὲν οὖν οὕτως εἰμὶ μόνη ψυχὴ ποιότης)

ε (θ and θ’, the latter followed by C [but P2 follows δ]) lost fuerint and then replaced passi et with passio ex. O here agrees in error with γ, and conceivably reflects γ’, although the substitution of singular for plural could be polygenetic.

2.3.1 Tussiunt etiam plurimi ex frigida distemperantia: Tussent P1 Tussem M Tusse O

Si autem tussis . . . fit P3 Ma | plurima O (Gk II, 149, 2 ὅσοι δὲ βῆσσουσι διὰ ψυχρὰν δυσκρασίαν)

γ and O (conceivably reflecting γ’) appear to share the replacement of the verb tussiunt by the noun tusse(m), although O alone tries to make the syntax work (with the ablative absolute Tusse . . . plurima . . . existente). The three variants, tussent, tussem and tusse (but is the first a possible form?) would have been pronounced very much alike. (On this passage, see also 4.4.4 above.)

4.8.4. η: A and Mu (?)

As for the relations between the copies descended from η, it is beyond doubt that O and Mu derive from a lost descendant of η (η’: see 4.3.2 above). The only other striking agreements in error within η would link A and Mu, but I have found to date only two such errors, and I think both of them, while prima facie quite telling, could have been made independently. Nevertheless, I am keeping an open mind on this point. The two shared errors in question are:

2.1.1 initium habet (scil. tussis) modo a calida distemperantia est autem quando a calida distemperantia est quoque quando a frigida (the dittography is only in A and Mu: A appears to have marked the error with ” after the second distemperantia; Mu does not mark it)

2.6.1 per uuam (gulam Mu) intra arteriam: in tracheam arteriam cett. (Gk II, 149, 25–6 κατὰ τὴν σταφυλῆν ἢ τὴν τραχεῖαν ἀρτηρίαν).

4.8.5. Contamination of Mu?

In only one passage (2.236.2, discussed under 4.3.1 and 4.3.3 above) have we seen grounds for suspecting that Mu had more than one model at any point. Further slight circumstantial evidence may be sought in the fact that some of the errors that Mu shares with O (reflecting error in η’: see 4.3.2 above) have been corrected in Mu, though it is not clear that the corrections must derive from another copy.

4.8.6. Contamination of Ox?

In such a contaminated tradition, it is something of a relief to be able to treat any manuscript as derived from a single source. Remarkably, of the surviving descendants of θ, only Ox is so far not demonstrably contaminated. One could take the view that Ox’s purity has been bought at a high price: θ must be regarded as heavily contaminated with readings from γ’, and some or all of Ma, D and Ge as copying λ whenever they disagree
with Ox (or Ox and P3), so that Ox can take all of its inherited readings from θ via κ. For the material so far collated, this seems to work well enough, but it bears repeating that we have noted difficulties with at least three passages in passing (see the next paragraph), and that further collation may yield patterns of agreement which require Ox (or κ₀ or κ) to have an alternative means of access to γ or ε or both.

4.8.7. A third source of P3?

As for Ox, so for P3, limiting direct knowledge of γ to θ and P3 itself has permitted a straightforward account of nearly all patterns of agreement so far encountered. In a few passages, however, it has seemed desirable to give P3 access to an ε or θ' reading which neither γ nor θ'' could make available. This often goes hand in hand with a complementary need to make a reading available to κ.⁵³ which is why I list the relevant passages together. The simplest solution would be to allow P3 a third source in λ. I list the passages where either this or contamination of Ox was mooted, in case there are more to be found:

1. 1.85.11 the recovery of enim (under 4.4.3 above).
2. 2.5.2 and 2.7.1–2.7.1 the two additions of humor (under 4.6.1 above).
3. 2.10.4 the recovery of cogimur scribere (under 4.4.6 above).
4. 2.37.4 the elimination of the hyperbaton (under 4.7.1 above).
5. 2.158.6 access to extenuatur (under 4.4.1 above).

4.8.8. Contamination of B?

Like Ox among the descendants of θ, B is alone among the daughters of θ' in having yielded so far no palpable evidence of contamination, and even B has shown one or two possible traces of the use of a second model, which I list here, in case there are more to be found:

1. 2.1.1 B’s quandoque autem appears to combine quandoque θ' with est autem quando γ η ε (under 4.4.1 above).
2. 2.2.6 B’s contingit tussis et fit ex appears to combine contingit tussis P2 Ma D Ge with fit ex G1 L2 (under 4.4.1 above).

4.8.9. B as a source of φ?

There are a few places where φ shows innovations which are neither in P3 nor in κ' (Ox and Ge) but which are attested elsewhere in the tradition, notably in B, and the question arises whether φ had a third source in B or a close congener. The agreements I have noted so far do not, I think, merit a line on the stemma, but I report them as a starting-point, in case there are more to be found.

1. 1.87.4 Ad autem <eum> cui cum nimio flegmone uel tumore ingenti +– dolor fuerit ortus –+ bene facit crocus: Quando autem cum non nimio L2 B φ (Gk Π, 7, 8–9 προς δε τας μεγιστας φλεγμονας κοι έν ὁγκῳ μείζων ποιει και ο κρόκος)

⁵³ Note especially 2.158.6 fit extenuata in, of all places, η and κ (discussed under 4.4.1 above).
A JUSTIFICATION OF AND COMMENTARY ON THE STEMMA

(For further details, see under 4.7.1 above.) The tradition is confused at this point. L2, B and f alone have Quando autem cum non nimio.

2.1.3 Scire autem oportet et hoc quomodo differunt ab inuicem tussiculae secundum causas singulas sed quoniam et secundum loca: et G1 P3 Ma’ D Ox Ge sed et f (Gk II, 147, 9–10 εἰδέναι δὲ δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦτο, ὡς οὐ δισφέρουσιν ἄλληλοιν αἱ βῆξες κατὰ τὴν αἵτινα μόνην, ἄλλα καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους)

For discussion of this passage see 4.4.3 above. Note that if sed in f is not by conjecture, the only descendants of ε with sed quoniam et at this point are P2, L2 and B.

2.3.1 De tusse quae ex frigida distemperantia fit: si … oritur B ϕ (Gk II, 149, 1 Περὶ βηχός διὰ ψυχρὰν δυσκρασιάν γινομένης)

B and f alone substitute si … oritur for quae … fit.

2.7.1 et lingua aspera et mela rubra: mela P1 A] mala cett. maxilla s. s. B ϕ (Gk II, 151, 3 γλώττα τραχεῖα καὶ μῆλα ἑρυθραὶ)

B and f alone gloss the erroneous mala with maxilla.

2.236.3 colericus humor saepius supercurrens super nerus aut inter ipsos residens: om.

B ϕ (Gk II, 501, 21 χόλη πολλάκις ἐπιρρείται μεταξὺ τῶν νεύρων)

B and f alone omit the preposition super, presumably in order to avoid repeating the preverb of supercurrens.

4.9. THE NATURE OF THE TEXT IN SINGLE MANUSCRIPTS AND INDIVIDUAL SECONDARY READINGS

Finally, I give a brief general impression of the nature and quality of each manuscript copy, and some illustration of significant secondary readings occurring in single manuscripts. These affect all the witnesses including the excerpts (u and v1) and the early printing (ed.), with the possible exception of G2, which is why G2 alone of the surviving copies is represented in the stemma as a sole source for later copies. For ease of reference, the manuscripts are arranged in alphabetical order by siglum, and in each case I give much briefer context than hitherto. (On spellings in the manuscripts, see 5.2 below.)

A

Consistent and reliable use of e caudata; very occasionally hypercorrect use of ae, e.g.

1.19.1 ipsae for ipsa; alone of the competently written manuscripts spells abundans without initial h-. Very accurate copying, very correct Latin, very little interference:

1.19.2 om. aut flegmaticum interdum etiam et melancholicum (Gk I, 463, 4–5)
1.86.3 flegmonem facit for facit flegmonem (but also in C, and possibly already in η)
2.7.4 om. grauiet (Gk II, 151, 10 πάνω)
2.10.1 . -que for et
2.37.6 adiumentum: iuuamentum ed., iuamen cett. (no direct match Gk II, 281, 21–2)
2.158.3 om. aegritudinum (Gk II, 187, 8 νοσημάτων)

B

Much use of abbreviations. Pretty accurate copying, with little interference:

1.19.1 Greci ycora for ycora Greci
1.19.8 si <tibi> locus appareat
Much use of abbreviations. Good copying, with little interference, including the occasional particle:

1.19.3 *si h(ab)undet h(umor) for abundans humor*
1.19.7 *fit for fuerit*
1.19.7 *aut melancolicus est for est aut melancolicus of η*
1.19.8 *si autem frigidior melancolicus (points under) flegmaticus est [h(umor)]*

2.37.13 *add. de acedine humorum [in stomacho existentium] cum mordicatione: non habent cett. (not in Gk II, 283, 6–7)*

C

Generally good copying and a good knowledge of Latin, but quite a bit of inventive interference:

1.85.1 *add. a me [plurima] scripta sunt: non habent cett. (not in Gk II, 3, 2)*
1.85.2 *hunc librum [curationum]*
1.85.8 *non enim una est [in hac passione] qualitas cause for non enim est una qualitas cause*

D

Essentially the text of φ with numerous errors, though (often, at least) with *mihi, nihil* for *michi, nichil* in G2 and L1:

1.18.t. *scissa for scissa*
1.19.5 *melancolicum for modicum*
1.19.8 *est humor for inest humor*
1.85.2 *que [horum] ad oculorum curationem*
1.85.9 *fieri dolores et aliquando ex qualitate qualitas sepius for fieri dolores et qualitates sepius in φ*
1.87.1 *capitis: capitalis cett. (Gk II, 5, 28 ὡμιαξάν (φλέβα))*
2.81 *om. cum insomnietae to end of chapter*
2.235.6 *agendo: attendendo cett. (Gk II, 501, 16 προσέχοι)*
2.236.2 *add. in articulis [seu articulorum] concaruitates: non habent cett. (Gk II, 501, 19 en τῇ τῶν ἀκριθῶν κοιλότητι)*

2.271.11 *mollificatium: mollissimum cett. (Gk II, 575, 27 ἀπαλωσάτην)*

---

54 But B and Ox are otherwise very different here.
G1
Much use of abbreviations. Good copying, though with a little modification:
1.85.1 scripta sunt a me for a me scripta sunt
1.85.1 monstratus for demonstratus
1.85.9 dolorem effic et qualitates doloris for fieri dolorem et qualitates
1.85.11 aut ex ventositate <spiritus>
1.87.3 uitello oui and 1.87.4 uitella ouorum for oui uitello, ouorum uitella
1.88.1 .i. infusiones written above talia
2.7.2 suspicari flegmonem: cett. have flegmonem at the start of the clause (as does Gk II, 151, 5)
2.8.t. humorum: humor cett. (no title in Gk II, 151, 12)
2.8.2 om. mutatis (°cf. Gk II, 151, 19 μεταστροφαιτίς)
2.11.3 om. non poterat fortiter extussire (Gk II, 153, 23–4 ούκ ἡδυνήθη τοῦ βήσσειν ἵχυρος ἀπαλλάγηναι)
2.11.7 aditus ad tussem: ad tussem adiutoria cett. (Gk II, 155, 23 τῶν βιχικῶν βοηθημάτων)

G2
A very good copy of φ, much preferable to ed. and L1. At 1.85.9 dolores et qualitas does not make sense, as dolores is accusative, so that qualitas is probably an instance of a very rare error in G2 (although the Greek has ποιότης here!).

L1
The text of φ with numerous errors of all sorts:
1.19.5 ditography of cuti
1.19.7–8 omission of si salsus . . . inest humor, in consequence of a big saut du même au même
1.85.2 unde nunc bene <hic> michi (text of φ)
1.85.2 careant: querant cett. (Gk II, 3, 8 ξητεῖν)
1.85.8 antecedentes: attendent(ε) cett. (Gk II, 5, 5 ἀποβλέποντα)
1.85.10 ditography of et qualis
1.85.11 aut colerico for aut coleribus
1.87.2 apparuerit maxime for appareat mixtus
1.88.t. omission of the last four words
2.37.2 add. [assumptus seu] acceptus: non habent cett.55 (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 281, 10)
2.235.1 om. <Podagre> passiones: habent cett. (Gk II, 501, 8 τῷ τῆς ποδάγρας πάθος)
2.235.5 om. uerum etiam diuturnas iam existentes> podagras: habent cett. (Gk II, 501, 17–18)
2.236.6 frequenter: sepies cett. (Gk II, 503, 5 πολλάκις)
2.271.7 om. rosei

55 Note, however, the reading asseptus in D, a blend of the two variants?
L2
Some abbreviations. Good copying with some intelligent corrections, the occasional transposition and omission:

1.19.8 potest cognosci: cognoscit potest θ' MadGe cognoscere poteris cett. (Gk I, 463, 16 διαγνωσκειν ἐστὶ σοι δυνατον)
1.85.4 incipiamus ergo iam nunc <dicere>
1.85.6 oculorum occupauerint for occupauerint oculos
1.85.10 aut ... aut ... aut ... uel ... aut for utrum ... aut ... aut ... aut ... aut
1.87.3 herbe uiole for uiule herbe
1.87.4 fuerit repressum for repressum fuerit
2.2.6 nihil enim minus: nihil igitur minus cett. (Gk II, 147, 23 οὐδὲν δὲ ἦττον)
2.5.2 itaque: utique cett. (a mistranslation of the first syllable of Gk II, 149, 16 κάνταδόθα)

M
An erratic copy, sometimes good, sometimes with crass errors betraying a basic ignorance of Latin, and omissions not always with the excuse of a saut du même au même:

1.18.1 ex quibus si talis quidem defluit humor for ex quibus tabes quedam defluit
1.19.4 non fuerit [fuerit] supitis est pignosus et glutinosus for non fuerit subtilis sed pinguis et glutinosus
1.19.6 que solent accesserint case sue for que precesserunt causae, seu
1.19.7 sic amarus fuerit coricus est humor for Gustus igitur si amarus fuerit, colericus est humor
1.19.7 omission of salsus autem ... melancholicus
1.19.8 si uissicula for si tibi locus
1.19.8 ends with the first instance of humor, omitting the last eleven words
1.85.1 om. passionibus <qualiter oporteat ... consistentibus passionibus>56 et causam: habent plerique (Gk II, 3, 3–4)
1.85.2 conscribam quid: constrieteque cett. (Gk II, 3, 6 συντόμως)
2.36.2–3 om. <stomachi ... et do>minantur: habent cett. (Gk II, 279, 19–20)
2.36.4 operibus: humoribus cett. (Gk II, 281, 2 χυμόν)
2.158.6 descendat: desudat cett. (this section not in Gk)

Ma
A very good copy, with some careful corrections and only very occasional omissions or transpositions:

1.19.4 flegmaticus humor <salsus> augmentatus
1.19.8 si autem flegmaticus frigidior <est> for si autem frigidior, flegmaticus est
1.87.5 cum sapa correctly, corrected from cum supradictis(!)
2.36.4 uentosis: uenenois cett. (Gk II, 281, 2 μοιχωρον)

56 I have made the last two words dative-ablative plural, as in P1, as this would explain M’s omission as another saut du même au même.
2.37.10–11 *om.* <malaxat . . . ad hec> optimum est <et non solum> (Gk II, 283, 1–2)
2.158.6 *mundatur:* nudatur *uel* nudata *cett.* (this section not in Gk)

**Mu**

A very good copy, with some use of abbreviations, although with many endings unclear because of the state of the manuscript. Little, if any, interference: unlike the corrector of A, did not mark the dittography in η at 2.1.1, but corrected the *demonstraturus* of η′ to *demonstratus* at 1.85.1; 1.19.5 *orum* for *horum.* Note above all the loss of a folio between fol. 40vb (2.147 *De potionibus ad splenem*) and 41ra (2.161 *Signa anastomoseos*).

**O**

A very good copy, with problems caused by the small size of the hand and damage to the manuscript. Some use of abbreviations, including non-standard ones, e.g. *mōs* for 1.85.1 *modus.* Occasional omissions and transpositions:

1.19.1 *capitis* *cute* for *cute* *capitis*
1.19.2 *cognosci* *ergo* <*oportet*>
1.85.2 *de his* *debeam* for *debeam* *de his*
1.85.8 *qualitatem* *cause;* <*et . . . cause;*> *sed multe,* a saut du même au même (Gk II, 5, 5–6)
1.86.3 *om.* *existima* <*qui fluit et facit flegmonem*> (Gk II, 5, 24–5)
1.88.2 *super inunctiones* written as two words
2.37.7 *om.* *mela* aut (Gk II, 281, 24 μηλιον η)
2.158.2 *que res:* querela (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 187, 6)
2.236.3 *neruos:* *ipsos* *cett.* (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 501, 21)

**Ox**

A messy copy, with numerous interventions, some quite intelligent, others apparently arbitrary:

1.18.1 *[ana † ii] delauabis*
1.18.2 *acri* for *acro*
1.19.1 *similis* [illi] *quod ycor* Greci *uocant*
1.19.3 *colericus* *igitur* *humor* *si h(ab)undat* for *colericus* *igitur* *abundans* *humor*
1.19.7 *Igitur si amarus fuerit* *gustus* *for* *Gustus igitur si amarus fuerit*
1.85.t. *De [diversis] oculorum passionibus*
1.85.9 *fieri* *dolores* *et sepium* *ex* *qualitate,* *sepium* *autem* *for* *fieri* *dolorem* *et* *qualitates,* *sepium* *autem*
1.85.12 *faciunt* <*dolorem* *uel* *tumorem*>
1.87.3 *iuuant* *for* *mitigat*
2.8.3 *om.* manifestum <*spuentes . . . manifeste considerandum*> *est: habent cett.* (Gk II, 151, 21–2)
2.36.4 *add.* [mordicationes et] *subitaneas* *sincopas:* *non habent cett.* (not in Gk II, 281, 2)
2.271.8 *om.* *Item aliud* cerotum ad podagram . . . *et sic* miscebis cerotum *et uteris.* (Gk II, 575, 12–17)
P1
Very occasional probable traces of an uncial exemplar: sineolas (for singulas); more frequent signs of careless reading of minuscule: mundati ad for mundatura(m), supra for rubra (on the spelling, see 5.2). The endings are all over the place, betraying a basic ignorance of Latin. Omissions, additions and other changes are also common:

1.19.1 tabum for tabem
1.19.5 si autem nihil <horum> fuerit
1.19.5 et sup(er)emittis cutem et constrictio for et supereminentia cuti et constricta
1.19.6 causes eu for cause seu
1.19.8 omission of sed . . . qualis sit
1.19.8 calidior enim si [fuerit] tibi locus apareat
1.85.8 unaq:q: causa adtendens currare < > sed multias et uarias s(unt)
1.85.12 contingit enim haec et bonum solum for contingit enim et unum solum
1.86.1 enim for ergo
1.86.2 supra for rubra
1.87.2 p:quad for postquam
2.158.7 relationes: relaxatioris M, laxiora cett. (this section not in Gk)
2.235.4 cognita enim: cognitiones cett. (Gk II, 501, 15 διαγνώστης)
2.235.5 habet: adhibet plerique recte (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 501, 17)
2.235.5 inexistendis: iam existentes cett. (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 501, 17–18)
2.271.5 om. donec . . . ceram (Gk II, 575, 7–8)

P2
Some use of abbreviations. A very good copy, showing very good knowledge of Latin, and evidence of careful correction, with only occasional error:

1.19.7 si acotosus, melancolicus, si salsus salsum flecma habundat, a good reconstruction of this corrupt passage
1.19.8 sed et tactu [melius] cognoscere poteris
1.85.10 unde autem est (est add.) corrected to autem est unde
1.86.1 flegmonem [tibi] fecerit, erit tibi
1.87.3 igneos oculorum [dolorum] flegmones
2.37.4 om. uincere (Gk II, 281, 20 υιάκνειν)
2.37.5 om. ut <citius> cibos accipient: habent cett. (Gk II, 281, 21 ταχύτερον)

P3
Apparently complete chaos because of all the different correctors’ hands and the infinite number of marginalia, but the quality of the copying, the correcting, and the philology is of the highest order throughout:

1.19.5 (in agreement with locus, the reading of γ for loca) supereminentis cutem et constrictus sic ut nichil ex hoc (hoc corr. ex his)

57 2.235.6 non solum eos quibus mox ab initio curationem adhibet (scil. medicus): cf. Gk II, 501, 17 οὐ μόνον τούς αὐγην ἔχοντας εἰς τὸ πάθος — but it is unlikely that habet in P1 is related to Greek ἔχοντας.
58 P2 inserts in stomaco uincere in smaller letters at line-end after humores.
1.85.4 solent contingere for contingere solent
1.85.7 ledunt for leserunt (lesit γ)
1.85.8 attendendo for attendens
1.85.13 ad unam “ergo” quanque earum, and 1.87.5 “fuerit” coctum carefully corrected
1.86.3 existimabis for existima (-ant γ)
1.88.1. humore sanguineo for sanguineo humore
2.6.t. de capite ... humores: ex capite ... humor cett. (Gk sg. II, 149, 24 ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιρρέει)
2.37.6 om. accepti (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 281, 22)
2.37.9 quod ita conficitur: cuius confectio recipit haec cett. (Gk II, 281, 26 οὔτερ ἢ σκευοσία ἔχει οὕτως)
2.271.2 debilitatem: imbecillitatem cett. (Gk II, 573, 26 τὸ ... πεπονθέναι)
2.36.4 lumbarum: lumbricorum cett. (Gk II, 281, 1 ἐλμίνθων)
2.37.7 om. in calida ... frigida infusum (Gk II, 281, 23 ἄρτον εἰς ἑυκρατον λαμβάνειν ἢ εἰς ὤδορ ψυχρόν)
2.37.9 aloe epantite ... feniculi radices cortices ... mel: feniculi radicum cortice ... aloe epatite ... melle attico (Gk II, 281, 28–30 μαράθρου ... ἠλόνης ... μέλιτος Ἄττικοῦ)
2.37.11 reumachus: stomachus cett. (not in Gk II, 283, 3)
2.37.13 om. sufficient haec ... de acredine (Gk II, 283, 5–7 τοσαύτα περὶ τῆς καρδιακῆς διαθέσεως εἰρήσθω τῆς γινομένης ἐπὶ δήξει τῶν δακνόντων καὶ μυχηρῶν χυμῶν)
2.37.14 om. last word humoribus (Gk II, 283, 9 χυμῶν)
2.36.2 moribus: uenenosis humoribus, vel sim. cett. (Gk II, 279, 23 χυμῶν) 59
2.37.5 causa: cibos cett. (nothing corresponding in the Gk II, 281, 20–1)
2.37.7 add. mala [non satis dulcia]: non habent cett. (Gk II, 281, 24 μηλῶν)
2.37.12 dianacardion: anacardion/-ium/-ia cett. (cf. Gk II, 283, 4 ἡ δι’ ἄνοκαρδίων) 60
2.236.3 om. diximus: habent cett. (not in Gk II, 501, 20)
2.236.7 om. oportet ergo ... quales sunt causarum: habent cett. (Gk II, 503, 5–7 δεῖ οὖν ἀκριβῶς, ὡς ἔδωκεν, ὑποτεύειν, ἥττες ἀκριβῶς ἔστιν ἡ ποιητική τοῦ πάθους αἰτία, καὶ τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν ἐπιθέρειν βοήθειαν)

4.10. A Provisional Text of the Chapters Collated and Referred to in Chapter 4

The stemma explained and defended in the present chapter was reconstructed principally on the basis of collation and close consideration of the manuscript versions of, in all, twenty-two chapters selected from Books 1 and 2 of the Latin Alexander.

59 Could uenenosis be secondary, an addition in α, v1 reflecting α’? ‘Poisonous’ is not in the Greek.
60 Another correct reading preserved in v1 alone!
Eleven of these — the first eleven chapters of Book 2, on coughing — have been worked up into a sample fragment, as it were, of the proposed edition, and are presented in Chapter 5. The other eleven chapters are presented here in a more rudimentary form, partly in order to facilitate the putting into context of the many individual passages discussed in the foregoing account of the relations between the manuscripts (in 4.1–4.9), and partly in the hope of stimulating from interested readers further comment on the business of reconstructing the Latin Alexander.

The Latin text presented here in these ‘appendices’ to Chapter 4 is, I stress, provisional. My original intention was to give just the corrected text of ms. A. In coming to views on ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ readings in certain key passages in the process of collating and relating the manuscripts, I made (I hope) progress towards reconstructing the text of the archetype for longer extracts, and it is the interim results of this work that I present: here and there, however, bias may remain towards readings of δ, η and Α in particular when these disagree with β.

While some passages are relatively straightforward, others are extremely confused either in the archetype or in the tradition or in both. What I print here in such cases is uncertain in the extreme, pending further work on other portions of the text — if, indeed, this will throw new light on the problems so far encountered. To take a more positive view, publishing these extracts in this rather raw and preliminary form will illustrate the nature and extent of the difficulties to be faced in reconstructing this text.

For the first passage only (4.10.1), which is much the shortest in terms of the amount of Latin text involved (a single recipe from 1.17), I offer, in addition to my provisional Latin text and Puschmann’s Greek text, a transcription of each manuscript version (which may be useful also for giving a ready impression of the orthography of each witness, to supplement 4.9 above and 5.2 below), as well as a commentary in the main text on the reconstruction of the text and its transmission. For the other pieces (4.10.2–4.10.7), I present only a provisional Latin text, Puschmann’s Greek text, and a few brief notes on text-critical and linguistic points.

4.10.1. Book 1.17

This short passage (a recipe omitted from the early printing, ed.) neatly illustrates many of the relationships between the surviving witnesses, and the puzzling position of ms. C in particular (cf. 4.7.4 and 4.7.5 above).

Below, after Puschmann’s Greek text (with some variants from ms. Mf), I offer my provisional text of the Latin version, with a select apparatus criticus and comments on each point. (For ease of reference, in such a short but confused extract, I append a transcription of each Latin manuscript version, in alphabetical order by siglum.) With regard to the form of the translator’s Greek text at this point, it is worth noting that the Latin version sides with Puschmann’s text and against ms. Mf on three or four points in as many lines (no indication of quantity after Πήγαρον; presence of και στυπτηρίαν; absence of τός τρίχας; preposition with μέλι). This is a salutary reminder that it will not do simply to equate the translator’s exemplar with Zipser’s α or a close congener of Mf (cf. the comparisons offered in 2.4.1 above).

(I, 461, 7–10) Πρός τά ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ψωρόδη καὶ ἰχώρωδη. Πήγαρον (ος cum mensura Mf) καὶ στυπτηρίαν (καὶ στ. om. Mf) λεάνας μετὰ μέλιτος χρίε τὴν
κεφαλὴν προξυρών (προξυρίσας τὰς τρίχας Μι)· ἐὰν δ’ ἀφιστῆται τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ δέρμα, ἑλάσαις φύλλα εὔθα μετὰ μέλιτος κατάπλαττε (μέλιτι καταπλάσσε Μι).

Item aliud ad eas quae in capite scabias sunt. Rutam et stipteria teres cum melle, et unges caput; antea tamen rades. Si autem recesserit a capite cutis, oliuae folia cocta

Item aliud ad P1M A P3] Item aliud OMu Item ad G1P2L2B Ma D0xGe (Item C Iterum G2 L1) | eas quae G1P2L2B Ma D0xGe| ea P1M eos quibus P3 quibus OMu om. A C φ

NB initium cap. in A C P3 φ:

Item aliud ad scabeas in capite A

Item ueteres autem scabies capitis illinies ut sunt C

Item aliud ad eos quibus in capite scabies ueteres (ueteres s. s.) sunt P3

Iterum ueteres scabies capitis sic curabis φ

Item aliud is not in the Greek, and Ox may alone have the right text. If Ox is right, however, it is probably by accident, for, given the agreement of A and γ, we must suppose that Item aliud was in α. As to the form of the pronoun, it may be no accident that ea in γ preserves the gender of the Greek (at least this is a possibility worth bearing in mind). If the neuter form is old, then e made the easy correction to the feminine (eas). P3 and independently η’ alter the wording slightly to make the heading refer to the patients rather than the disease. The variety of versions of this simple heading (note also A and C) may indicate damage or corruption at any rate in η (contrast A and η); cf. the next paragraph. In the attachment of ueteres to scabies, we see the first of several agreements between C, P3 and φ, as in 1.18–19.

in cap. scab. sunt P1M OMu P3’] in capite sunt scab. G1P2L2B Ma D0xGe scab. in capite A ueteres autem scab. capitis C ueteres scab. capitis φ ueteres add. super sunt P3

The Greek word-order is reflected in γ, η’ and P3 (presumably from γ’), and I take this to be original in the Latin, too. Something has probably gone wrong with the end of the heading after in capite (cf. Greek ψαφρόδη καὶ ιχφρόδη). Latin scab- presumably reflects Greek ψφρα-, If the Greek text is like that used by our translator(s), we should have expected Latin scabiosa <et icorosa>. It is conceivable that et icorosa lies behind the curious addition of ueteres in C, P3 and φ. An alternative, perhaps more likely, explanation is that it is a corrupt form of the word ueteris in the previous sentence (‘Vteris autem illo magis ad humidas et impetiginosas‘): C, P3, G2 and L1 all have ueteris correctly at this point, but it is striking that ueteris for uerteris is here attested both in the Liber passionalis (s. p. 309, where it is corrected from Vteris!) and in the oldest manuscript of the Tereoperica (Par. lat. 11219, f. 49ra ueteris).

unges scripsi] unguis M OMu unges C φ inunguis P1 P3GLOBALS A illinies cett. NB illinies ... unges] Item ueteres autem scabies capitis illinies ut sunt ruta et stipt(ε)τεa teres cum mell(e) et unges caput C

I would defend a form of ungu(u)o on the grounds that it is attested on both sides of the stemma (in descendants of γ and of η), while illinio is attested only in descendants of δ (A, C and ε). The fact that C has both verbs, about a line apart (with illinies coming a line too early), suggests that illinies was written as an alternative over unges in C’s exemplar but read with the preceding line by the copyist of C.

si autem rec. a cap. cutis (cortex pro cutis M) P1 MAOMu Ox] si autem cutis a cap. rec. G1P2B Ma D si autem cutis a cap. rec. cortice Ge si autem cutis rec. a cap. cortice C P3 φ.
Again, I follow the word-order attested in γ and η and in the Greek. I take it that ε ‘improved’ the order by putting the subject first and the verb last. The curious cortice (in C P3 DOxGe and φ; cf. corticibus in D and Ox) must surely reflect the corruption of cutis in γ’ (cotis → cortis → cortex/cortex; cf. cortix in M), interpreted as referring to the skins of the prescribed olives, and incorporated and adapted to the recipe by a majority of the descendants of ε. Note again the agreement of C P3 φ.


It seems that trita was, if not original (it is not in the Greek), added very early to the Latin version, in asyndeton with cocta. A perceived harshness in the asyndeton was eased in ε by moving trita to the end of the phrase, in C, P3 and φ by inserting et between cocta and trita. The assumption into the tradition of olive-skins (cortice, corticibus: see above), in addition to leaves, required the addition of another et.

The manuscript versions, in alphabetical order by siglum (with Lib. pass. and Ter. at the end):

A 4vb Item aliud ad scabæas in capite Rutam et stipteria teres cum melle; et inlines caput. Antea tamen rades. Si autem recesserit a capite cutis; oliue foliis coctis tritis cum melle cata plasmabis.

B 145r Item adeas que incapites sunt scabies. rutam teres et stipteram alumen (alumen s. s.) cum melle et illinies caput ante autem rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit oliue folis coctis cum melle tritis cathaplasmabis.

C 7v Item ueteres autem scabies capitis illinies ut sunt ruta et stipteram t(er)ea teres cum mell(e) et unges caput an(te)a t(ame)n rades. Si autem cutis recesserit a capite cortice oliue et foliis coctis et tritis cum mell(e) cathaplasmabis.

D 4vb Item adeas que incapites sunt scabies. rutam stipteream teres cum melle et illinies capud ante tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit oliue folis coctis et corticibus cum melle tritis cathaplasmabis.

ed. om.

Ge 148v Item adeas que incapites sunt scabies. rutam et stipteream teres cum melle et illinies capud. ante tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit cortice oliue et folis coctis cum melle tritis cathaplasmabis.

G1 5r et L2 6vb Item adeas que incapites sunt scabies rutam et stipteram t(er)eam t(er)es cum melle et illinies caput antea t(ame)n rades. Si autem cutis a (autem nondum a L2) capite recesserit oliue folis coctis cum melle tritis (tritis s. s. G1) cataplasmabis (catha- L2).

G2 15r et L1 13v Iterum ueteres scabies capitis sic curabis. rutam et stipteream teres cum melle et unges caput. antea tamen rades. Si autem cutis recesserit a capite cortice oliue et foliis coctis et tritis cum melle cataplasmabis (catha- L1).

Ma 6v Item adeas que incapites sunt scabies (sic uel fit). rutam et stipteream teres cum melle et illinies caput. Antea tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit oliue folis coctis cum melle tritis cataplasmabis.
Ad ulcera in capite spissa et rubra modica\textsuperscript{61} assimilantia titinulas ex quibus tabes quaedam defluit

1. Ante rades caput, et aqua $\rightarrow$ frigida $\rightarrow$ et nitro delauabis, et sic postea sulfure uiuo cum humana urina trito uteris.

$\rightarrow$ another recipe $\rightarrow$\textsuperscript{62}

2. Item aliud. Melanteria cum aceto $\rightarrow$ acro $\rightarrow$ inunges.

\textsuperscript{61} modice M. This is surely modica ulceræ= ἐξ ἄφθρα rather than modice assimilantia all for παραπληχρια.

\textsuperscript{62} Although he is reporting Greek ms. Mf at this point, Puschmann fails to say that this recipe is not in it.
1.19.t. De acorae

1. Acora passio est in ipsa\(^{65}\) cute capitis facta, parua foramina habens ex quibus fluit humor similis quod icor\(^{66}\) Graeci uocant, unde et ipsa passio acora appellatur,\(^{67}\) quod nos tabem dicimus.

2. Est autem quod defluit aut\(^{68}\) colericum aut flegmaticum interdum etiam et melancolicum.\(^{69}\) Cognosci\(^{70}\) ergo oportet passionis ipsius proprietatem, et ex hoc maxime curatio est adhibenda.

3. Colericus igitur abundans humor subtilior apparet\(^{71}\) et subcolerico\(^{72}\) colore.

4. Si autem non fuerit subtilis sed punguis et glutinosus, flegmaticus humor salsus\(^{73}\) augmentatus facit acoras.

5. Si autem nihil horum fuerit, sed apparent loca ex quibus fluit humor duriora magis\(^{74}\) et scridadia\(^{74}\) et supereminentia cuti et constrecta,\(^{75}\) ut nihil ex his defluat aut uix modicum, scias melancolicum esse humorem qui facit acoras.

---

\(^{63}\) Puschmann seems to say here (I, 461 n. 3) that he has followed Guinther's reconstruction of this sentence from the Latin mss. and Paul. Aeg. 3.3, as the Greek mss. are corrupt at this point. Note, however, that the sentence is perfectly legible in Mf, with the interesting variant in the specification of the source of the urine.

\(^{64}\) Latin acora, ae (f) for Greek άχωρ, -ος (m).

\(^{65}\) cute A

\(^{66}\) icor | ycor (-g- P1, -ch- G1) γ G1L2 Ox ycora (-ch- D) cett.

\(^{67}\) appellant περί prompted probably by the surrounding actives, uocant and dicim us.

\(^{68}\) ut M A

\(^{69}\) aut... melancolicum om. A

\(^{70}\) Active in γ, P3 and φ.

\(^{71}\) It is surprising not to be offered some form of consistential/consistere for Greek τῇ συστάσι.

\(^{72}\) cf. ισόμορον, the reading of Greek ms. Mf. cum for sub in M, G1 and P3 may illustrate the proximity of γ' to M rather than to P1.

\(^{73}\) cf. άλμυρόν in Greek ms. Mf.

\(^{74}\) This should perhaps be restored in the Greek text.

\(^{75}\) There may be a trace of the Greek comparative in constrictio P1, constricti M, but it may be that the comparative form was ignored.

\(^{76}\) uix γ B: uix et plerique om. φ. Cf. Greek μόλις άλιγν. 

---
1.85.1 A JUSTIFICATION OF AND COMMENTARY ON THE STEMMA

6. Ceterum autem et quae praecesserunt causae,\textsuperscript{77} seu temperantia aegrotantis et aetas siue gustus.

7. Gustus igitur si amarus fuerit, colericus est humor; salsus\textsuperscript{78} autem si fuerit,\textsuperscript{79} flegmaticus est; acetosus autem melancolicus.

8. Sed et tactu cognoscere poteris quae sit humor. Calidior enim si tibi locus apparendus est, colericus inest humor. Si autem frigidior, flegmaticus est. Minus autem frigidus, melancolicus inest humor. + – – +

4.10.3. Book 1.85–88.2

(A 28rb; B 154v; C 20v; D 24vb; ed. 16v; G1 22r; G2 76r; Ge 170r; L1 59v; L2 22vb; M 315b; Ma 29r; Mu 11vb; O 18a; Ox 22v; P1 162rb; P2 26r; P3 19r; Greek text II, 3 Puschmann)

1.85.4 De oculorum passionibus\textsuperscript{85}

1. Iam enim in alius tribus libris a me scriptum est\textsuperscript{86} de oculorum passionibus qualiter oporteat cognosciri, et causas eorum et curationes et

\textsuperscript{77} uerba considerande sunt (sunt considerande Ma) add. \(\varepsilon\) (etiam C) attendere oportet add. Ox Ge, \(\gamma\) and \(\eta\) have the same verbless sentence as the Greek. For the personal use of considerandus, cf. 1.124 –anda qualitas et quantitas (II, 105, 20 ἐπισκεπτέω).

\textsuperscript{78} salsus \(\eta\)

\textsuperscript{79} si fuerit P1 Ma om. cett.

\textsuperscript{80} These two words are omitted by \(\gamma\) and \(\eta\), who after flegmaticus est have just aut melancolicus. The earlier presence of acetosus may account for salsus in \(\eta\). All the descendants of \(\varepsilon\) (but not C) have acetosus (\(\iota\δ\\eta\nu\), LSJ, s.v. II.). On the medieval Latin terminology for the flavours, see Burnett, ‘Flavours’.

\textsuperscript{81} That M omits salsus … melancolicus perhaps indicates that est humor originally stood after melancolicus, as in the Greek, which would make M’s fault a saut du même au même.

\textsuperscript{82} Does inest reflect a misunderstanding of év’ on ét?\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{83} We expect a derivative, rather than just the base φλεγμα. -τόδες could easily have been lost by haplography before \(\iota\δ\\nu\).


\textsuperscript{85} scriptis Ox P3 scripta sunt cett.
duiversitates colliriorum, \textsuperscript{87} et modus\textsuperscript{88} qualiter oporteat adhiberi et qualiter conficiantur \textsuperscript{+} demonstratus est \textsuperscript{89}. 

2. Vnde nunc\textsuperscript{90} bene hoc\textsuperscript{91} mihi uisum est ut breuiter constringe de his dicere, ut legentes hunc librum \textsuperscript{+} non quaeant ex alio codice quae ad oculorum curationem sunt\textsuperscript{92} utilia. \textsuperscript{+} 

3. \textsuperscript{+} Oportet ergo prius singularum in oculis passionum signa cognosci et sic adhiberi curationem.\textsuperscript{+} 

4. Incipiamus ergo \textsuperscript{nunc}\textsuperscript{93} iam dicere de his quibus in oculis contingere \textsuperscript{solent} dolores. 

5. Nihil enim sic dolorosum est nec \textsuperscript{+} in alia passione \textsuperscript{+} sic urgetur artifex ut succurrat, quomodo in dolore nimio oculorum.

\textsuperscript{87} The accusatives causas, curationes and duiversitates are not appropriately governed by cognosci, and hang rather in the air.

\textsuperscript{88} Probably originally modos.

\textsuperscript{89} Added in the Latin along with the change of modos to modus.

\textsuperscript{90} cf. Greek ἀλλ' οὖν! Latin nunc could be for Greek νῦν (for οὖν), but the Latin fails to convey 'nevertheless'.

\textsuperscript{91} hic in φ matches Greek ενπόθα, but probably by chance. Could hoc be impersonal 'it'?

\textsuperscript{92} sint P2 Ge φ

\textsuperscript{93} Greek ήδη; nunc is absent in γ, and probably entered the tradition as a gloss.

\textsuperscript{94} eis A. The Greek refers to the pain, the Latin (with the addition of solent) to the patients.

\textsuperscript{95} θεραπευτευοντα

\textsuperscript{96} According to Puschmann (II, 3 n. 2), the foregoing sentence appears only in some of the Greek mss. including Mf, and is correctly omitted by L, as it is not original but (in Iwan Müller’s view) based on marginal notes, including ἐν δὐνατῷ τῆς. Puschmann prints it only in the note, and adds, ‘Vielleicht bietet der lat. Text (oportet ergo . . . curationes) einen Fingerzeig für den ursprünglichen Wortlaut dieser Stelle?’

\textsuperscript{97} Latin artifex here is preferable to τήν τέχνην, which should probably be corrected to τὸν τέχνην; cf. 1.85.13 below.

\textsuperscript{98} But the Greek phrase at this point looks very much like a gloss on ἀφαρτήρητοι.

9. Fit enim plenitudine materiae supercurrens, ut solum ex hoc uideas fieri dolorem et qualitatem. Saepeius autem ex utrisque fit, ex qualitate scilicet et ex quantitate.

10. Rouidendum est autem unde prorumpat quod supercurrit, utrum ex toto corpore aut de solo capite fluat, aut per arterias aut uenas — aut per utrasque ministretur — et quali utique superfluitas est.

11. Aut enim ex sanguine nigro aut coleribus aut flegmate aut melancolia est quod fluat et si unus ex ipsis est qui molestatur humor aut duo commixti.

12. Contingit enim et unum solum fluentem facere flegmonem et dolorem nimium, et duo simul permixti faciunt tumorem, ex quibus etiam differentia est causae.

13. Ad unumquemque eorum quaenecessariasuntartificemadhibereexpedit existimantem cognitionem singularum passionum.

(II, 3, 11–5, 17) 6. ei (ōtan 2203 M Mi) oūn oδύνα σφοδραί καί ακαρτέρητοι περιέχουσι τοὺς ὄσθαλμους, νoμή δυνασθαι καρτερεῖν τὸν πάσχοντα—, μὴ ὃς πολλοί τοῖς ναρκοτικοῖς +— εὔθυς Mi +— σκευαζομένοις θαρρήσεις κολλουρίως.

7. πολλοί γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ τολμήσαντες ἐγχέειν τὸ όπιον, πρὸς τὸ μηδὲν ὀλὸς παρηγορήσαι τὴν ὀδύνην ἐτί (ἐτὶ ὑπὸ L) καὶ μεγάλως (μᾶλλον Mi) ἔβλασαν. Ἐπισκέπτεσθαι οὖν δὲὶ τὴν ποιοῦσαν +— τὴν ὀδύνην Mi — αἰτίαν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀποβλέποντα οὖτο καὶ τὸ τῆς θεραπείας ὀρίζειν εἰδος: οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν ἐν το λοιύν

---

99 -at M P3' A P2 DOx -ant Mu -ere cett. om. O

100 Fit enim! Etenim γ Fit etenim η. The start of this sentence is very uncertain. The et (in the well-attested etenim) may have arisen from the Fit, which is needed as the main verb. In A, etenim normally comes first in its clause (although in a couple of cases it appears to come second, after a noun or an adjective.)

101 Latin qualitates, as if for Greek ποιήσεσας. That this was not corrected in the light of the next phrase suggests that the translator was working in haste at this point.

102 Here, as elsewhere in the Latin Alexander and the Latin Oribasius, utique−Greek ὁρα; cf. Langslow, "utique".

103 sit B

104 Probably, μᾶλλον somehow lies behind this (in medical terms, unwanted) epithet nigro, which evidently troubled a medieval redactor: the words uel puro are added above nigro in P3, and follow nigro in L2, B and φ. Excluding polygenesis, we can draw from this seemingly trifling matter the important inference for the stemma that φ was a source, rather than a user, of B.

105 For the plain ablative, cf. 1.37 'manifestum est uentositatem tumentis spiritus fieri' (Gk I. 487.21 ϕυσικόν εἴρηκεννυμφάδας γίνεται). Only G1, P3 and Ox have ex uentositate; (but perhaps from γ' via θ). The fact that we are here talking about causes makes the phonetically- and palaeographically-plausible nominative uentositas (e)spiritus less likely as the starting-point. For this translation, cf. Orib., Syn. 8. 41.1 La ex uentostate[m] spiritus=pνευμάτων ϕυσικόν.

106 et si unus M. I take that si is the original, automatic, and nonsensical translation of Greek πότερον, variously corrected in the tradition.

107 This may well originally have stood in the Greek.

108 In the Greek, the sentence does not end here. Might the absence from γ of igitur in the next line be a trace of an earlier Latin version closer to the Greek?

109 Did the translator mistake the Greek neuter for masculine? Only D and P2 have unumquodque.

110 igitur om. γ ergo D Ox P3

111 Only γ has the participle, necessary for the sense; the rest have existimare.
αἵτινς, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ καὶ ποικίλα. 9. καὶ πλῆθος ὅλης ἐπιρρέων μόνον οἴδε ποιεῖν ὀδύνην καὶ ποιότης, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὸ συναμφότερον, καὶ ποιότης ἁμα καὶ ποσότης. 10. θεωρεῖται δὲ καὶ πόθεν ὀρμᾶτα τὸ ἐπιρρέουσαν, ἀρὰ γε ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σῶματος ἢ ἐκ μόνης τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ πότερον διὰ τῶν ἀρτηριῶν ἐκχείρωμεν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν φλεβῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν ἀρὰ τὸ ἐπιρρέουσαν ἐστίν 11. ὁτιο γὰρ αἷμα μάλλον ἢ χολὴ ἢ φλέγμα ἢ μελαγχολικὸς χυμός ἡ ἐστί τὸ ἐπιρρέουσαν ἢ πνεῦμα φυσάδες· καὶ πότερον εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ λυπὸν χυμός ἢ δύο συμπεπλεγμένοι 12. ἐνδέχεται γὰρ καὶ ἕνα μόνον ἐπιρρέουσαν ποιήσαι φλεγμονήν καὶ ὀδύνην σφοδρὰν καὶ δύο ἁμα καὶ σύνθετον ἐργάσασθαι. 13. πρὸς ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν ἀνάγκη τὸν τεχνητὸν ἐφαρμόζεσθαι. ἤγεισθω δὲ ἢ διάγνωσις ὀδηγοῦσα εἰς τὴν ὀρθὴν θεραπείαν.

1.86.1.t. Signa quando sanguineus humor facit flegmonem
1. Si ergo sanguineus fuerit humor qui supercurrens flegmonem fecerit, erit tibi manifesta cognitio ex specie ipsius flegmonis.

(ΠΙ, 5, 18–25) t. Περὶ διαγνώσεως τοῦ εἰναὶ τὸν ποιήσαντα τὴν φλεγμονὴν αἰματικῶν χυμῶν καὶ μόνον ἀπὸ τὸ ὀξύτατον τῆς φλεγμονῆς ἐργασάμενος.
1. Ei μὲν οὖν αἰματικὸς εἰς χυμός ἐπιρρέως καὶ τὴν φλεγμονὴν ἐργασάμενος, ἔσται δὴ ὅλον σοι ἐκ τοῦ εἶδος αὐτῆς τῆς φλεγμονῆς. 2. ἐνδέχεται γὰρ ἄπαντα καὶ αἰματῳδὴ καὶ τὸ πόρισων ἐνυθρόν καὶ ἐν ὑπὸ μείζον καὶ αἱ φλέβες ἐνυθροῖσθαι καὶ βάρος συναισθησις καὶ ἤκον περὶ τὰς συνηθεῖς ἐνεργείας. 3. εἰ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοις μηδὲ τὸ δάκρυνον δακρύωδες καὶ δριμὸν φαινοντο, ἐτι καὶ μᾶλλον αἰματικῶν εἰναὶ νόμιζε τὸ ἐπιρρέουσαν αἵτιν καὶ ποιήσαν τὴν φλεγμονὴν.

1.87.t. Curatio flegmonis de sanguine facti
1. Si enim sanguineus esse tibi manifestus fuerit flegmon, incidenda est uena magis capitalis. 120

114 Pace Puschmann, Mf at this point jumps to II, 21, 11.
115 uenas afferent plenas M: uenas apparent eius plenas P1: might apertius somehow reflect eius, which corresponds to nothing in the Greek and might have been originally an addition above apparent? K.-D. Fischer suggests uene apparentes et plene (5).
116 There is no verb in the Greek for the whole of this section.
117 Understandably, uel is normalized to neque in all but γ and, I suppose, γ', whence Ox and P3 find it in B. For the very common use of uel=et in Late Latin, see Hofmann and Szantyr, 502 (their examples begin with Marcell. med.).
118 flegmonem facit AC
119 incidenda A
120 The word-order of the last phrase is not nice but is that of γ and γ' (reflected in P3L2 DOx) and the Greek.
2. Si autem colericus acer humor cum sanguine apparet mixtus, et catharticum postquam flebotomaueris dabis et colliris uteris intrinsecus +– –+ qui digerere possint flegmonas, quorum etiam confectiones uobis tradere non omissam.


1. Ei mèn ouΘ αιματικόν ουι φανει τό την φλεγμονήν ἐργασάμενον αίτιον, τέμνειν χρη τήν φλέβα την ωμίας. 2. ει δὲ καὶ χολόδεις καὶ δριμεῖς χυμοί σὺν τό αἷματι φαίνοντο, καὶ κάθαρσιν μετ᾽ ὀλίγον τῆς φλεβοτομίας παραλάμβανε καὶ βοηθήσας χρῶ, ἐνδοθεῖ +– μὲν τοὺς ἀόρθοκαί καὶ πραυτάκαί, –+ ἔξωθεν δὲ τοῖς συμπάπτετε δυναμένοις τὰς φλεγμονὰς, ὡν καὶ τὰς σκευεσίας ὡμὲν εὐκηρύσθημε. 3. Περὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἐπιτιθεμένων βοηθημάτων. Γάλα γυναικὸς μετὰ κρόκων ὕδων καὶ ροδίνου διατίθενται +–θαυμαστός–+ πραυνὲς καὶ συμπάπτετε τὰς πάνω ξεούσας τῶν φθαλάμων φλεγμονάς, ωμίας δὲ καὶ τοῦ ίου τὰ φύλλα. 4. πρὸς δὲ τὰς μεγίστας φλεγμόνας καὶ ἐν ὑγκω μείζων ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ κρόκος μετὰ ψυχῶν καὶ τῶν κρόκων τῶν ὕδων –καὶ ροδίνου. –+ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ποιοῦσι καὶ οἱ φοινίκες 128 μετὰ τοῦ ἐπέχειν τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον ρυθματισμὸν μετὰ τῶν μελιλώτων καὶ κρόκου καὶ γλαυκίων καὶ πυρρόν 129 ὕδων ἐφθόνοι [ἐκξεστῶν] 130 καὶ ροδίνου. +– →

121 More specific than the Greek βοηθήματα.
122 Saut du même au même, whether in the translation or in the translator’s Greek text. θε added uel extrinsecus (cf. interius uel exterius Ge).
123 igitur γ᾽
124 For this intransitive use, cf. 1.131 ‘quemadmodum in oculis frequens praestat inunctio’ (not in Greek). For praestare in transitive use, cf. e.g. 2.43=Gk II, 293, 2 παρέχει; 2.73 (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 401, 26).
125 Ad scripsit At η P2, Greek προς; addidi sensus causa. Cf. 1.15 At autem (A: Ad ed.)=I, 459, 9 πρὸς δὲ. [It is also possible that at reflects an old abbreviation for autem, which was somehow repeated. I owe this suggestion to Cloudy Fischer. Cf. 2.164 De leguminibus. At offerenda sunt (A: De leg. off. autem sunt ed.)=II, 193, 14 τὸν δὲ ὄσπηρον προσφέρεσθεν.) A common opening in the Latin version is Ad eos autem, but for Ad autem ... , cf. 2.243 Ad autem non nimiam ... (A)=II, 515, 14 πρὸς δὲ τὸς μὴ πάνω ... I cannot parallel Ad autem cum ...; Ad eos autem quibus ... would be idiomatic, but is not reflected in the tradition!
126 A mistranslation of μετὰ + genitive as ‘after’.
127 Usually for Greek ἐκφήμι σις, e.g. at 1.66=Gk I, 549, 10; 1.70=Gk I, 555, 9; 1.114=Gk II, 87, 22; 1.127=Gk II, 115, 3; 1.128=Gk II, 121, 1; for γλυκό at 1.127=Gk II, 113, 22. Cf. Orib. Eup. 4.15.4 αὐνάλοβαν μελιλώτων ἀφεστίμησι ἢ γλυκεί (Αα cum sapa, La aut sapa). Cf. also Cass. Fel. 29.14 Fraisse ‘melilotum ... in passo coctum.’
128 This phrase goes better after ρυθματισμῶν.
129 This variation in the word for ‘yolk’ so soon after two occurrences of κρόκων may be an hint that μετὰ ... ροδίνου is an addition, albeit one old enough to be in the Latin translator’s text.
130 Obviously a gloss, which is drawn into the text. The obscure word that it glosses is ‘corrected’ to ἐκτα.
De cardiaca passione

1. Cardiaca passio stomachi causa est.

2. Ad cardiaca passionem tum adhumores et dominatorem, tum ad vitium et degere morimur, tum ad sensibilitatem et morimur.

3. Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est ut faciant cardiacam passionem et cum angustia +

4.10.4. Buch 2, 36–7


Book 2.36–7

(Chapter 4)

1.88.t.

1. De colliris mutatis in doloribus ocularum ex sanguine humore factis +

1. Campitamulatam "et minus ex sanguine humore factis +

2. Superflumones autem et iniuriamus "et sequenti sermonem sunt ordinanda. +

1. Eripissma enim "et non ferentes insustentabilem morimur. +

2. Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est faciant cardiacam passionem et cum angustia +

3. Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est faciant cardiacam passionem et cum angustia +

4.10.4. Buch 2, 36–7


Book 2.36–7

(Chapter 4)

1.88.t.

1. De colliris + mutatis in doloribus ocularum ex sanguine humore factis +

1. Campitamulatam "et minor ex sanguine humore factis +

2. Superflumones autem et iniuriamus "et sequenti sermonem sunt ordinanda. +

1. Eripissma enim "et non ferentes insustentabilem morimur. +

2. Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est faciant cardiacam passionem et cum angustia +

3. Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est faciant cardiacam passionem et cum angustia +

4.10.4. Buch 2, 36–7


Book 2.36–7

(Chapter 4)

1.88.t.
2.37.2  A JUSTIFICATION OF AND COMMENTARY ON THE STEMMA 163

→ sincopos\textsuperscript{143} ingerant, ita ut aliqui statim\textsuperscript{144} a lumbricum mordicationem pereant.\textsuperscript{145}

4. Propter quod\textsuperscript{146} oportet non omnino\textsuperscript{147} existimare a pessimis + et uenenosis → humoribus fieri subitaneas sincopas stomachi, in\textsuperscript{148} qua re etiam lumbricum signa sunt requirenda. + → \textsuperscript{149}

\[\text{(II, 279, 19–281, 5) t. Peri καρδιακής διαθέσεως}\]

1. Καὶ ἡ καρδιακὴ διάθεσις τοῦ στομάχου πάθος ἐστὶ. 2. συμβαίνει δὲ τούτῳ, εἰ μοχθηροί καὶ δακνώδεις καὶ ἱώδεις ἀθροισθῶσιν ἡ συρρεέσσωσιν ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοί, ἕαν οὖν εὐρεθοῦσι τινὲς ἐξοντες τῆς γαστρὸς αἰσθητικῶν τὸ στόμα, παραστικὰ ἀπόλυται μὴ δυνηθητὲς ὑπενεχεῖν τὴν ἀμετρὸν δήξειν τῶν χυμῶν. 3. πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐλμινθὲς ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδραμὸντες ἐπὶ τῷ στόμα τῆς γαστρὸς ἐργάζονται καρδιακάς διαθέσεις καὶ λειπθυμίας + → ὀμηροὺς καὶ συγκόπας, ὅπως τινὸς (II, 281) παραστικά ὤβ’ ἐλμινθὸν δακυνομένους ἀπόλυσθαι. 4. διὰ τούτῳ οὖν χρῆ ἡ πάντοτε νομίζειν ὑπὸ μοχθηρόν + → χυμῶν γίνεσθαι αἰφνιδίους συγκόπας τοῦ στόματος τῆς γαστρὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐλμινθῶν σημεῖα ξείνειν + ὤστε γὰρ καὶ τὰ θηρίω ταῦτα θανάτους αἰφνιδίους ἐργάζονται καὶ συγκόπας οὐδὲν ἤττον τῶν ὀλέθριων χυμῶν. +

2.37.t.  [Curatio cardiace]\textsuperscript{150}

1. Nam\textsuperscript{151} qui habent in stomacho mordicationem de malignis humoribus et propterea sincopos patiuntur, inprimis oportet eis cibos offerri qui et refrigerandi habeant aliquid,\textsuperscript{152} et confortare possint locum qui solutus est. 2. Infrigdant igitur bene et corroborant\textsuperscript{153} malogranati grana assumpta, siue sucus eorum acceptus, sed et mela\textsuperscript{154} non satis dulcia sed mediocriter stiptica, et pira et persica\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{143} sincopos A O u P2 Ge (cf. sint copius P1 sine opus v1). Cf. sincopas in the next sentence.

\textsuperscript{144} statim may be a hallmark of this translator. In A it occurs only twice in Book 1 and nine times (including this passage) in Book 2, compared with countless occurrences of mori.

\textsuperscript{145} The Latin Alexander seems otherwise not to use perire, and the word is probably used here in the interests of variatio sermonis, after 2.36.2 moriantur. Contrast 1.113, where mori is used three times in quick succession, although the Greek has three different expressions (II, 79, 7; 12; 18).

\textsuperscript{146} Unanimously attested here, although elsewhere often with the variant propterea. In Book 1, A attests propter quod twenty-four times, propterea eight times and propter hoc three times.

\textsuperscript{147} A favourite word in the Latin Alexander, though here inferior to Greek πάντοτε.

\textsuperscript{148} in qua re is unparallelled in Books 1 and 2 in A, although de qua re and pro qua re are quite common.

\textsuperscript{149} The Greek sentence here omitted repeats what has gone before, and may be a later gloss.

\textsuperscript{150} This title is in G1, B, D and φ only, in G1 at this point, in φ, before Inprimis oportet, in B and D, later still, before Infrigdant igitur. Like G1, P3 has a title at this point, a much longer one: Curatio cardiaorum qui habent ... patiuntur.

\textsuperscript{151} I incline to read this particle, although it can be reconstructed only for β, as this translator seems to begin every sentence with a particle. (It is also in Os, with a red dot above the N.)

\textsuperscript{152} With habeant aliquid cf. the reading of Greek ms. Μ ἐξείς τί, although Latin et ... and not the variatio also between assumptus and acceptus a few words later, perhaps another feature of this translator’s style.

\textsuperscript{153} cf. 2.37.1 confortare and note the variatio also between assumptus and acceptus a few words later, perhaps another feature of this translator’s style.

\textsuperscript{154} Ms A favours mela over mala by 3:1 in Book 1, but mala over mela by 16:11 in Book 2 (although in the latter many instances of mala are in the sections from Philumenus and Philagrius).

\textsuperscript{155} persice η; another example of a divergent a-stem noun in η.
et duracina et uuae quae austerum alicui et stipticum habent, et panis in aqua frigida aut in calida aqua, s is qui patitur sit temperantia satis calida, et in eius stomacho continentur humores mordicantes et acres nimis.

1. Huic ergo ab initio hunc oportet uti qui cardialgiam patitur.

2. Ceterum autem oportet eis addere paulatim cibos qui tarde digeruntur + – +, quale est [→ de piscibus – +] bulba et pectines et astaci et isicia et pectines et ciricia et uentes anserini et pedes porcini et quaecumque non facile corrumpuntur sed repugnando uincere possunt malos qui continentur humores.

3. Oportet autem his, cum requieuerit aut lenimentum acceperit – + passio, suadere semper ut citius cibos accipiant.

4. Nullum enim est aliud maius iuuamen quam cibi qui tarde digeruntur et difficile corrumpuntur accepti.
His ergo hora tertia suadendum panem infusion in calida aqua ut assumant aut in aqua frigida infusion aut mela aut citri deforis mundaturam.

Diaeta enim haec expedit eis qui cardialgiam patiuntur.

Adiutorium autem magnum est glicia, cuius confectio recipit haec: Aceti sext. unum semis, feniculi radicis corticis vi, aloe epitite iii, melle attico lib. iS.

Conficies ut mos est, et dabis ex eo coclearia duo aut tria. Malaxat autem et confortat uentrem.

Hoc enim medicamen optimum est, et non solum cardialgias sanat sed et inchoantem epilempsiam et ypocondriacas passiones vel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est, sed et alia plurima de quibus nunc non est tempus ad commemorandum.

Note again the chiastic repetition (cf. 2.37.2 above).

Merland, Oribasius, 167 implies that in Oribasius deforis is only an adverb (as in Alexander at e.g. 2.143 impositus deforis, 2.238 deforis desparso). Here it seems at first sight to be a preposition + accusative extra in the sense of praeter, sine (Hofmann and Szantyr, 230–1); cf. 2.200 (A) melones praeter semina, II, 495, 8–9, and the problem of the case of citrium (or citria f.?), clearly genitive in b and h. This problem obviously prompted the rest of the tradition to substitute the accusative citrium, change mundaturam to the participle mundatum ’peeled’ and take deforis as the adverb. An alternative, to save the reading of a, is to take deforis almost as adjectival, ’of a citron the outside skin’.

Adiutorium autem magnum est glicia, cuius confectio recipit haec: Aceti sext. unum semis, feniculi radicis corticis vi, aloe epitite iii, melle attico lib. iS.

Conficies ut mos est, et dabis ex eo coclearia duo aut tria. Malaxat autem et confortat uentrem.

Hoc enim medicamen optimum est, et non solum cardialgias sanat sed et inchoantem epilempsiam et ypocondriacas passiones vel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est, sed et alia plurima de quibus nunc non est tempus ad commemorandum.

Did the translator’s original have μέρα, perfectly idiomatic in Greek (attested in Pseudo-Democritus, Oribasius, Rufus)?

Here and at 2.37.12 below, the tradition points fairly clearly to a glacial-ea for Greek γάλακτο. The transfer to the 1st declension is striking.

In this recipe, the Latin gives more detail than the Greek.

radicis corticis -um -ibus A OMu P2. Fennel-root is called for already at Cato, Agr. 127.1, but it is harder to parallel the use of the skin of the root (cortex). The Latin and the Greek disagree on the amount. The Latin tradition is unanimous.

conficis β autem om. β: was it lost because abbreviated to at immediately after -at of malacat? Or was it originally not there, as in the particle-less Greek?

ad haec is not in the Greek. The Latin tradition is divided between hoc and haec, both branches being split, and some mss. having just an abbreviation (b with a dot, or a stroke through the tail).

cardiacam M DOx P3 Ma: this time P1 and u (u has cardiam et alias) reflect the correct reading as well as v1. Again, then, if DOx P3 Ma took cardiacam from γ’, we see the proximity of γ’ to M.

This construction may be another tell-tale of this translator.
12. Scio autem quia et anacardion\textsuperscript{186} → antidotum\textsuperscript{187} ad tales passiones bene facit et pigra data\textsuperscript{188} iuat sed nullum sic sicut glicia adiuaunt\textsuperscript{189}.

13. Sufficiant haec de cardiacis dicta quae fiunt\textsuperscript{190} de acredine → humorum cum mordicatione.

14. Ceterum uero de his dicendum quae proueniunt in stomacho simptomata aut ex qualitate\textsuperscript{191} [accidentium]\textsuperscript{192} aut ex aegritudinibus diuersis augmentantibus\textsuperscript{193} humoribus.

(II, 281, 25–283, 9) 9. tōn ðe boðthimatōn ēstīn aútois ēpitiēdein to glukō leugōmenon fārmakon, ōuper ð ērvnavia ēchei oútous ð dēxous ἕστ. a′ s\textsuperscript{6} marābōrou oun. a′ ēlōpis ougg. γ′ μέλιτος Ἀτππικοῦ λιτρ. α′ s\textsuperscript{6}. 10. ð dōsis koξhλ. β′ ð γ′. małâtei kai tonoi tīn γαστέρα. 11. toúto to boðthimia kallīstōn ēstīn ou mónon γār ἴαται καρδιαλγίαι, ἀλλά kai árχωμένας ἐπιληψίας kai ὑποχωνδριάκλας διαθέσεις → kai ἀλλα πλείστα, ón ouk ēstī kairōs mēnīmoneunein vōn. 12. ðída ð, ðt kai ð dē ἀνακαρδίαν πρός tα τοιάτα ποιεῖ kai ð πικρά, ἀλλά ðdēn ouτous ὡς to boðthimia tōuto. 13. τοσιύτα περὶ tῆς καρδιακῆς διαθέσεως εἱρήσῳ tῆς γινόμενης ἐπί δήξει τῶν δακκόντων + kai μοχθηρῶν → χυμῶν. 14. λοιπο̺n ð kai περὶ tῶν ἄλλων εἰπομεν ὑῶν συμβαινοντῶν ἐν τῷ στόματὶ tῆς γαστρῶς συμπτωμάτων ð δία ποιότητα ð δία ποσότητα πλεοναζόντων χυμῶν.

4.10.5. Book 2.158

(A 98ra; B 175v; C 59v; D 92vb; ed. 61v; G1 83v; G2 281r; Ge 100r; L1 213v; L2 78rb; M 401b; Ma 107r; Mu om.; O 59b; Ox 81v; P1 212va; P2 85v; P3 74v; Greek text II, 187 Puschmann)

2.158.t. Ad empoiticos

1. Non scio si est alia peior passio ista.\textsuperscript{194} id est qui sanguinem expuant, non ob\textsuperscript{195} hoc solum quia ipsa per se euacuando occidere potest hominem, sed quia pessima et diuturna → cum terribili mentis turbatione\textsuperscript{196} → passio generatur.

\textsuperscript{186} anacardion β anacardium plerique, anacardia η and, surely independently, P1 (onicardia). Again, η goes in for a 1st declension form.

\textsuperscript{187} antidotum P1 v1: there is no ὀντίστος in the Greek. Can we trust P1’s -us? Probably not! Equally, v1’s dianacardion antitodus looks freakishly learned and should probably be ignored.

\textsuperscript{188} data β P2 Ox] datum cett. Neither is satisfactory. We may have lost antidotum after pigra.

\textsuperscript{189} Another instance of variatio sermonis (adiuavit → iuat) in this translator?

\textsuperscript{190} fiunt β γ γ′ Ox P3’ Ma] fit cett. There is no trace of qui in the tradition, so that we must either understand passionibus with cardiacis, or take que as the all-purpose relative. It was presumably the form of the relative that prompted several copyists to correct cardiacis to cardaca and fiunt to fit.

\textsuperscript{191} qualitate u 9[1] -ibus cett. Cf. the singular in the Greek.

\textsuperscript{192} This may have entered the Latin tradition as a gloss on simptomata. The Latin suddenly falls apart and departs dramatically from the Greek. On the other hand, the Greek appears to lack the article before poiótita, poiótita kai πλεοναζοντων. The appearance of Latin aegritudines out of the blue makes one suspect that the translator’s Greek text had voōtita. What does diuersis translate? Might there have been dittography of the first part of Greek πλεοναζοντων?

\textsuperscript{193} augmentantibus β] -atis cett. It is easier to suppose that the perfect replaced the present than vice versa, especially as the Greek text has the present participle, πλεοναζοντων.

\textsuperscript{194} ista] ab ista (abstam P1) γ P3

\textsuperscript{195} ob] enim γ. In A, in all of Books 1 and 2, ob occurs only here and at 2.199 ad fin., where it is difficult to see what it is translating of Gk II, 493, 22.

\textsuperscript{196} turbatione] perturbatione A Ox Ge. Cf. Fischer (‘Lib. Byz.’, 290) on the phrase cum terribili mentis alienatione in parallel passages of Theodorus and the Liber Byzantii. What on earth is this phrase doing here?
2. Quam plurime\textsuperscript{197} ergo festinare oportet inprimis\textsuperscript{198} mox cognoscere passionem unde contingit\textsuperscript{199} causa aut in quo loco querela facta est.

3. +Quibus agnitis–+ sic curatio competens est adhibenda et differri\textsuperscript{200} non oportet, quia omnium aegritudinum\textsuperscript{201} est pessima +– –+.

4. Ante omnia scire oportet quia tribus causis sputum vel vomitum sanguinis cognoscendum\textsuperscript{202} est fieri, id est per rixin et diabrosin et anastomosin quae Graeci uocant.

5. Rixin dicunt cum vena crepuerit.

6. Diabrosin dicunt quando vena, amisso nutrimento, caro desuper ipsam extenuatur, et vena nudata subtiliorque effecta, eius tunica as ei psa comesta, multum desudat sanguinem, et sic effusus intrinsecus per os\textsuperscript{209} redditur.

7. Anastomosin autem dicunt cum ora vennarum, irtute amissa, apertiora effecta et laxiora sanguinem refundunt intrinsecus, et sic aut uomitur aut per uentrem deducitur in secessus.–+

8. Cognosces autem unamquamque passionem generatam his signis.

1. Όυκ οὔδα πάθος εί οὔτως ἄλλο χαλεπόν ἐστιν ώς ή τοῦ αἴματος πτύσις; οὐ γάρ αὐτό καθ’ αὐτό τὴν κέννοσιν ἀμέτρων ἐπιθέτων ἀναιρεῖ πέφυκεν, ἀλλὰ κακίστων καὶ χρονίων αἰτίων + – γίνεται νοσημάτων. 2. ώς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ παυοῦσιν οὖν δὲι διὰ ταῦτα διαγινώσκειν τὸ πάθος τοῦτο πρότερον, πόθεν ἔσχε τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ἐν ποιῷ τόπῳ συμβέβηκε, 3. + – καὶ οὔτω τὴν θεραπείαν ἐπιθέτων καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ πάντων τῶν νοσημάτων ἐστίν ή ἀναβολὴ κακῶν πάνω, + πολὺ δὲ πλέον ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ αἴματος ἐξαγωγῆς.–4. εἰδέναι τοῖνοι χρῆ τοῦτο πρὸ πάντων, ὡς διὰ τρεῖς αἰτίας ή τοῦ αἴματος ἀνάπτυσις ἐγνώσθη γινομένη, διὰ τε ῞ρηξὶν ἀγγείων, δι’ ἀνάβρωσιν καὶ δι’ ἀναστόμωσιν.

++ 5. –+ +– ++ 6. –+ +– ++ 7. –+ 8. γνορίσεις δὲ ἐκαστὸν τῶν πόνων\textsuperscript{210} οὔτως.
2.235.t. De podagra

1. Podagrae passionem sciri oportet ante omnia quia ex multis et ex diuersis causis habit consistentiam, unde existimo quia propter varietatem natuiatis eius neque cognoscitur omnino neque curari potest perfectius.

2. Relinquitur enim eiusmodi aliquid in ipsis locis, et idque nullum modo ab artificibus medicinae sanari potest quia eiusmodi ignoratur natuiitas.

3. Ego autem existimo ut quicumque eius bene potuerit natuiitas eius neque curari et facilius a medicis ab ipsis infirmitatibus liberari.

4. Dicamus igitur primo cognitiones ipsarum et sic postea curationes ipsas exponemus.

---

212 -es read. We really do not want the plural, which may easily have arisen from -en before -s, especially as the disease is referred back to with singular eius, cognoscitur, potest. The form with -ica (podagricum), which must have been in β and Pod., deserves serious consideration. The type -aica passio is paralleled e.g. at 2.36 cardiuca passio, and is common in Cassius Felix (see Langslow, Medical Latin, Index, s.v. ‘passio + -ica’). On the other hand, podagrae passionem nicely reflects the Greek το τις ποδαγρας παιδος.

213 β appears to have had diuersarum causarum; P3, Ox and φ have causis, but all could have it from γ', and δ may have lost causis (causarum?). Are there parallels for the abstract use of the adjective (mala et diuersa)? The genitive diuersarum causarum is worth considering as a literal translation of διαμορφων αυτων without attention to its construction, although M and v1 repeat ex before diuersarum.

214 Probably here and certainly in the next sentence, where Greek has the aorist stem of δηναια (both times the ‘medical’ gnomic aorist), some or all of the descendants of β have stem pot(u)er for potest.

215 The start of a terrible misunderstanding (the translator seeing, or understanding, ἐποδείξειν for ὑπόδειξεν?). The Latin just about makes sense, but bears no relation to the Greek. What went wrong?

216 enim eius Fischer] eius A enim cett. If this is our superior translator, we want a particle, and eius nicely refers back to the disease.

217 The translator’s way back from desperation onto terra firma.

218 Correctly for Greek ἡπειρος ηλικη ‘not at all’.

219 Elsewhere (e.g. 1.85.13) the Greek has τῆς, here the Latin has the practitioners, the Greek, the art (cf. 1.85.5).

220 ignoratuir natuiitas M v1 P3’] ignoratuir natuiitas P1 (making genitive forms to agree with eius?) ignoratuir natuiitas cett. This is a rather otiose repetition of the second part of 2.235.1. It looks as if β had ignoratuir natuiitas, and my instinct is to prefer the singular. Is the plural otherwise attested?

221 Not in the Greek and presumably picked up from the sentence before. Again, I prefer the singular with β.

222 et cito] cito P1 credo M v1 om. Pod. Three possibilities: (a) credo is right, and was inserted to give the sentence structure when existimo at eighteen words earlier was in danger of being forgotten; then P1 and the rest agree in error against η και τις P1 and v1, and either P1 is contaminated or I must redraw the stemma!: (b) cito is right, bene et cito being another double translation of the superior translator; M and v1 would then agree in error against P1, unless we regard credo as an easy error for the no-longer-familiar adverbial form cito; (c) both are secondary, and Pod. preserves the original reading (bene posse curare). The fact that Pod. tends to summarize and abbreviate the Latin Alexander is a slight argument in favour of cito in Pod.’s exemplar, as a second adverb parallel to bene would have been much more easily omitted than credo.

223 If possit is for Greek δυνατος, this may be another sign of a superior translator, as elsewhere we might have expected the mechanical use of utique (cf. Langslow, ‘utique’). On the Greek use of future + ἀτικος, see Swyzer and Debrunner, II, 351–2 with literature.

224 ab ... liberari is not in the Greek. It is a common conclusion in the Latin version, occurring at least seventeen times in Book 1 alone. It illustrates the repetitiveness, variatio sermonis and fullness of expression characteristic of the superior translator.

225 Note the chiastic word-order, another feature of the superior translator.
5. Credo enim quia si ea quae scripta tradimus diligentius attendantur [naturam uniuscuiusque] [voluerit operari], multos poterit liberare, et non solum eos quibus mox ab initio curationem adhibet 231. multos poterit liberare. 232

(II, 501, 8–19) t. Peri podagra{3}

1. To the podagra{3} pathos eideinai chre pro ose paidan wos ek pollan Kai diaphorop aitioin ehxei tin sustasin, obeh, oimai, dia to poikilon tis geneseos oude diagnoshtinai kalois outhe therapeias teleiai hundybei epitychein. 2. upolimnvin de ek tou to podos anenvan ekstastato, kai miode olos upo teichis iatrikis iathnai poti dunthnai. ++ ++ 3. egw oufhi, wos, eigne diagnositeit kalois ai te diaphorai kai to eide autis, oras te kai oia tygchanei, euszerapiautoi an radios upo ton iatrion genesthai ++ ++. 4. eipomev ouv ton hedi tais diagnostesis auton, eis ouw to tais therapeias. 5. elppizeito (elppizoei) gar oti tois gegevameneis ean tis akriboi prosxeici, ofelhisei pollous our monon touz archin exontas eis to podos, alloa kai touz hedi kevronikotatais ev autia.

2.236.i. 234

1. Multa igitur sunt uita in his qui insanables possident podagras. 236
2. Et enim sanguis calidus supercurrens in articulorum cau
tates, extenduntur, et nerui quos sindismos uocant dolores facere in pedibus solent 239 nimios.

---

226. Sg. 1 indicative for sg 3 imperative elppizeito — or did the translator’s text have elppizoei? This is the only occurrence of sg. 1 creo in Books 1 and 2. elppizoei recurs at II, 109, 24, but is not translated. The Greek sg. 3 imperative is otherwise correctly understood and rendered with a sg. 3 jussive subjunctive, gerundive + esse or a jussive future. At II, 551, 28, the only other place where tis is the subject of the sg. 3 imperative, tis precedes. It would probably be better to read elppizoei in the Greek text!

227. attendantur scripsi ut [Pod.] -endo alpha. The gerund/participle is an easy corruption of the pl. 3 passive. Perhaps the common phrase naturam uniuscuiusque was added to provide a clear object for attendendo. For attendo=prosechs, cf. I, 137=II, 127, 20; 2.5.2=II, 149, 17; for prosechs of attending to a prescription, cf. II, 309, 13 (unfortunately not translated at 2.47).

228. For this phrase, cf. I, 35. fin.=I, 487, 11ff.; I, 131, twice (from Galen, not Alexander); compare also 1.144 ‘(curabis) si prius ad causam attendas et naturam ipsius passionis’.

229. In general I remain very uncertain about this sentence. The text printed here dispenses with the elements not in the Greek text, but the translator’s text may have had more (or the translator may have added to what he found). The bracketed words (naturam uniuscuiusque, voluerit, operari) are all used elsewhere by the translator. cf. the remarks on this passage in 4.8.2 above.

230. At first sight, the Greek would have been accurately and adequately translated with liberabit. But in the text here printed poterit must be impersonal (cf. however note 229).

231. The subject of adhibet must be the doctor (cf. habet in Pl, which could be impersonal, ‘there is’). The Greek phrase tois archin exontas eis to podos denotes the patients, but seems very odd.

232. The disease in Latin (and plural), the patients in Greek and Pod. However, the failure of Pod. to supply the right correction of uitia in 2.236 makes it clear that the maker did not have access to a sensible Greek text.

233. Again, not in the Greek: cf. notes 221, 224. Note the chiasmus and the variatio sermonis (poterit liberare ... iuare poterit).

234. New chapter and title, De causis podagrarum, only in phi.

235. This looks suspiciously like Greek oitou! The Latin is barely intelligible.

236. Again, the Latin appears to have the plural where the Greek has singular (the singular forms in M insanabilis ... podagra carry very little, if any, weight). Presumably, insanabilis is for a form of Greek ianitois, and possident for to Santo (the first syllable of tis Santo perhaps being read as the enclitic and not translated).

237. I take this as nominative absolute, and understand causitates with extenduntur.

238. neris k

239. The subject of solent must surely be neris. The Greek would be best rendered with solet, which is in Ox, Ge and P3 ex corr., and could go back to γ'.
3. Similiter autem et colericus humor saepius supercurrents super nruos aut inter ipsos residiens, et maximem in his quos sindismos diximus uocari qui et ossibus uicini sunt, ardorem simul et tensionem loci qui dolent infert et magnos dolores.

(II, 501, 19–24) 1. pollla men oon eisain aitia ta tyn aniaan tiktonta podagran 2. kai gar aima sypre-san en t tyn arbron kolosti therion kai diateivan svnta te kai tois svndesmous odoyn ergazhsetai pefukue sulpharon. 3. oimias kai colhe polllkis epivneisa metaxw ton neiron kai + + svndesmion + + kai to flegyn omo kai diateivein epiferein oide megalyas odoynas.


5. Facit etiam sic et melancolicus humor: et non solum infrigdat et opprimit sed et gravitare sua facta sentit non mediocris effecta Mv 1 mediocris
diagmita sentitur. O proet ergo diligent, ut dictum est, omnia contemplari. Non enim oportet ut supercurrente materia reumatismi solent. Fieri sed et per simplicem solam qualitatem efficitur, id est per distemperantias ipsarum quae fiunt ex calido, frigido, sicco et humido et duplicata distemperantia, id est aut calido et sicco, aut calido et humido, aut frigido et humido, aut certe frigido et sicco.

7. Oportet ergo diligenter, ut dictum est, omnia contemplar quales sunt causarum singularum qualitates uel quantitates, et sic singularum causarum expedientem apponere curationem.

240 Another nice chiasmus, supercurrents . . . residiens.
241 tensionem] tensionem η P2 B Ma (?).
242 This suggests that the translator read Greek τὸτ] instead of τὸτρ.
243 There is no support in the manuscripts for the tempting change to instrumental ablative frigure, so I presume that the translator read Greek oia τε την ψιχει with what precedes.
244 angustata γι] coangustata Pod. angustan cett. Alternatively, perhaps: et angustar loca et tendit, allowing a main verb for each Greek infinitive. Greek διατηρεῖ to (judge from ms. A at least) is sometimes extendi (with 2.236.2 above, cf. e.g. 2.195=II, 491, 1) and sometimes just tendo (with 2.236.3 tension above, cf. e.g. 1.94=II, 31, 5, 7); at 2.185, it is first extenditur and then tenditur in the space of five lines (II, 477, 3, 7).
245 mediocris] mediocris effecta M v1 Pod. mediocriter effecta P1 mediocriter cett. om. Ox Ge. In the Latin Alexander, mediocris, -iter is the standard equivalent of μέτρον, -τος and occurs (as adjective and adverb) nearly 100 times. The occurrence of non mediocris = oο μέτρος at 2.30=II, 265, 11 and 3.58=I, 361, 7 makes it unlikely that the omission of the negative here was an error of the translator, but it could have failed in his Greek manuscript. I remain uncertain whether to regard effecta (β Ped.) as original.
246 Presumably, somehow for Greek δεί, whether from δε or διά.
247 supercurrente] supra- η.
248 Apparently, oporet at + indicative (corrected to soleant by D and Ge).
249 Understand qualitatem, I suppose.
250 The tradition makes a real rash of this list of qualities and combinations. I give the version of v1, changing only nominative (calidus, etc. — evidently present in β) to ablative (sicco, etc.) in the second part (after duplicata distemperantia, which I take to be instrumental ablative, parallel to per distemperantias ipsarum).
251 distemperationibus] -antiis O P2 B Ma D Ge Ox. The commoner word must have been restored more than once (probably by O, B and Ox). distemperatio must be right (being in γ and η), but is really very rare. ThLL cites only Ps. Garg. Mart p. 211, 20 (in a recipe which is also in Oribas., Syn. 3.66, p. 919). Its use here might be another instance of this translator’s taste for variatio sermonis.
252 The tradition is unanimous on contemplari. Of five other occurrences of Greek όπωστεϊν in the Therapeutica, four are translated, one with existimare (1.76=I, 593, 13), two with suspicari (1.140=II, 143, 20; 2.7.2=II, 151, 5), and one with a combination, existimanda suspicio (2.214=II, 357, 30). In the Greek here, note the repetition of όπως — is this to be defended on the grounds that it is used in two different senses?
253 A formula not in the Greek; presumably, qualitas was prompted by the first part of Greek ποιητηκαί?
254 A final chiasmus (causarum singularum . . . singularum causarum) followed by a formula ending with hyperbaton (expedientem apponere curationem).
4.10.7. Book 2.271

(A 129ra; B 200r; C 75v; Ch 128r; D 122rb; ed. 82v; G1 110v; G2 367v; Ge 128v; L1 281r; L2 102ra; M 442a; Ma 143v; Mu 54va; O 74a; Ox 107v; P1 233rb; P2 109v; P3 101v; Greek text II, 573, 24 Puschmann)

2.271.3 A JUSTIFICATION OF AND COMMENTARY ON THE STEMMA 171

(II, 501, 24–503, 7) 4. ἐτι δὲ φλέγμα χωρήσαν εἰς τοὺς εἰρημένους τόπους ὀδύνης ἱσχυρότερος αἰτίον γίνεται ἀμα τῇ ψυχεὶ καὶ τῷ στενοχορεῖν καὶ διαστείνειν αὐτῶς. 5. οὖν δὲ καὶ ὁ μελαχολικὸς χυμὸς οὐ μονὸν τῷ ψυχεῖν καὶ θλίβειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ βάρους ἐπιτελεῖν αἰσθησιν, οὐ μετρίους ἐργάζεται τοὺς παροξυσμοὺς. 6. οὐ μονὸν δὲ δία ἐπίρροιαν ὠλὴ τις ρευματισμοὶ +– τοῖς ἄρθροις +– επιγίνεσθαι πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψυλῆν ποιότητα μόνην +– +– καὶ θερμήν καὶ ψυχράν (ψυχήν Μ· ἐτι δὲ ξηρότης τε καὶ υγρότης αἰτία γίνονται πολλάκις ρευματισμοῖν. +– +– 7. δεῖ οὖν ἀκρίβως, ὡς ἔδομεν, ὑποπτεύειν, ἣτις ἀκρίβως ἐστὶν η ποιητικὴ τοῦ πάθους αἰτία, καὶ τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν ἐπιφέρειν βοήθειαν.

4.10.7. Book 2.271

De localibus adiutoriis mitigatiuis et anodinis255

1. Hae ergo per os256 sunt danda257 quae mitigare possunt258 dolores.
2. Qui autem propter stomachi imbecillitatem259 non possunt continere ut accipiant,260 sed mox ut261 biberint in uumitum concitantur, seu pro262 timore aliquo siue pe263 suspensionem aliquam medicaminum264 +– et hi in accessione dolores ferre non possunt +–265 aliquam266 debemus267 ubis exponere, quae in ratione et experimento utilissima nobis +– contra dolores +– esse uidentur, +– cerotaria anodina, quae mox sine dolore faciant ordinamus +–.268
3. Cerotum, quod dum in statu accessionis fuerit superpositum, mox sine dolore locus efficitur.

255 et anodinis γ Ch DGeOx om. A (τ?: titulum om. O Mu C Ma L2) G1 θ φ
256 os or γ
257 The gerundive is rather stronger than the statement os oδε in the Greek.
258 possunt] -int γ. The subjunctive in γ is striking; usually, δ has the subjunctive and γ, the indicative!
259 imbecillatatem] debilitatatem P3 L2
260 ut accipient] quod accipient A: a good correction by A, but ut must have been in α, the phrase meaning 'cannot control themselves so that they can eat'. Note se continere in P3 L2.
261 For mox ut ‘as soon as’, see Hofmann and Szantyr, 637, citing late authors from Florus on (and noting ut mox in Cael. Aur.).
262 pro] per γ. The two prepositions fall together in part in Late Latin and Romance; see Hofmann and Szantyr, 270.
263 pro] pro A Ch G1P3 Ox
264 Here medicamina is perhaps to be understood as a collective, =φαρμακεία. Cf. medicamen =θεραπεία in Ps, Sor., Isag. and the pseudo-Herophilean letter to King Antiochus (Fischer and von Staden, 95).
265 This addition may refer back to 2.266 ‘Quoniam multi a magnitudine passionis urgentur, quoniam(!) non possunt nimios ferre dolores, a nobis anodina requirant medicamina’ (= II, 561, 13–15).
266 I run on, as there is no trace of a sentence-particle, although the structure of the ‘sentence’ is loose, to put it mildly. Latin aliqua could be a faint reflection of Greek ἀλλάς.
267 Rather different from Greek ἐπιστοδόχος, unless the latter has developed nuances of obligation in the later language.
268 The words cerotaria . . . faciant resemble an additional sub-heading in the Latin. Note that even P1 reflects a subjunctive (faciat).
4. Recipit autem haece: \[ ^{269} \text{croco}^{270} \text{ opio ana} \div iii,^{271} \text{ panis L i,} \text{ cera L i,} \text{ oleo sext.} \]
5. Crocum \[ ^{272} \text{et opium infundes in uino; panem uero}^{273} \text{ in aqua infundes et exprimens manibus admisscebis ubi crocus et opium trita sunt, et iterum teres}^{274} \text{ donec omnia misceantur, sic postea ceram} \rightarrow^{275} \text{solutam supernittens teres}^{276} \text{ et uteris.} \]

(II, 573, 24–575, 8) t. Peri toipikôn bòtìmítòuv parthgoreív dòunaménon

1. Taútà mév ónún parthgorein òiôde didómena diá stómatoç. 2. pòs de toûs mà anântéxontas, eîte diá tòv stómachòv pevounènai kai mà òunóthkai krathei tì tòv prosofereoménon, áll‘ eîthès eîs èmeton òrhmà, eîte diá fòðon kai èpòумènà tînà phàrmakêkèias állês, èspouðasà mév èkthèsai ùmîn, ã kai tò lògò kai tà pèira chrîsmìa ùmîn àpèdeîxhè ìnta, èòousi de óúta. 3. Khrôthè èn tà ákûmà tòn pàrakósmiòv èpitìthèmènà, á nóðóvôn pouòusa. 4. Kròkou, ópòû mîkònov, ãnà òýgh. ð’, ãrton, khrôu, ãnà litp. ã‘, èlalou ëxet. ã‘. 5. tòn kròkon kai tòn ðòvón àpòbrèxe èn òýnva, tòn de ãrton ùdati. kai èkpièssàs èpîmèlòs miçû tò òþò kai tò kròkô preleleitaîmènòs. èîta tàv khrôn ↔ ìmetà tàv èlalou ↔ òthèzàs miçû tòs ðòîpòkàv.

6. Item aliud cerotum simile quod in statu passionis adhibeatur.\[ ^{277} \text{Cera} \div iii, \text{ litargiro} \div ii, \text{ pismithio} \div ii, \text{ strigni suco L i,} \text{ oleo rosaceo L i.} \text{ Supermittes}^{278} \text{ sucum donec totum}^{279} \text{ colligitur, et sic uteris.} \]
7. Item aliud cerotum.\[ ^{280} \text{Et ipsum mitigatium}^{281} \text{ est: facit enim}^{282} \text{ ad omnem inflammationem}^{283} \text{ ignitam. Opium soluens}^{284} \text{ cum lacte muliebri, addes}^{285} \text{ olei rosei} \div vi, \text{ cera} \div vi, \text{ et sic miscabis}^{286} \text{ cerotum et uteris.} \rightarrow → \]

(II, 575, 9–17) 6. 'Eôrêa khrôthê òmòísàs èn tà ákûmà èpîtìthèssai dòunamèn. Khrôu òýgh. ã‘ (ð’ M), lìtharqûrò, þùmîtmîov, ãnà òýgh. ð’, ròdînov, stóûxhòv xûlòv, ãnà

269 Recipit autem haece must be for Greek ἐχοῦσι δὲ οὕτω, which Puschmann prints at the end of the preceding section.
270 For the moment, I am writing ingredients in the form suggested by the tradition, alternately (apparently) ablative, genitive, accusative, even nominative. This is an issue which I deliberately postpone for now.
271 This is a great deal of saffron, unless some other ingredient is intended. A very similar recipe in Orissorsus (Eur., 4.116.14) also prescribes four ounces, although in Paul of Aegina (3.78.8) only one ounce is called for.
272 Crocum enim ñ (A OMu Ch C) v (Ox Ge) — presumably, the particle was added twice, independently?
273 uero G1P3
274 terens ñ D — perhaps rightly.
275 We seem to have forgotten the oil, unless it is taken for granted that it is used to melt the wax. (On the ratio of wax to oil to be used for different types of application, see Orb., Eur., 4.118.)
276 terens A
277 adhibeatur] -etur γ ed.
278 -ens ñ
279 Did the translator see πῶς in his Greek version? (Cf. 2.271.10 omnes carnes and note ad loc.). Greek ἀνακύουθῃ would account both for ἀν λοيث and for the variant ἀν λείοθῃ that he reports, neither of which is satisfactory.
280 cerotum ad podagram A Ch C
281 ipse mitigatius γ: perhaps we should reckon with cerotus (masculine) in the early tradition of Alexander, as in the Latin Orissorsus (Mæland, Orissorsus, 64).
282 enim om. γ
283 cf. the chapters on coughing, where φλεγμόνη is not translated but borrowed (e.g. 2.7, including in the phrase 2.7.3 ignitus flegmo-ζηώσα φλεγμόνη). Is there a difference of sense, e.g. internal (flegmo) vs external (inflammatio)?
284 soluens ñ P2 Ø D Ge (om. Ox)] solues cett. Compare Greek λείον, which (pace Puschmann) cannot mean 'dissolve'.
285 addes om. γ
286 miscibus (-is) γ P3 — misces could be a 3rd-conj. future; cf. Viänäinen, Lat. vulg., 145.
8. Item aliud cerotum ad podagram\(^{287}\) mirabile experimentatum \(\rightarrow\). Mittens\(^{288}\) in caccabo oleum commune sext. ii, coques lignis de uitibus, id est de sarmentis, donec bulliat \(\rightarrow\).  

9. Et \(\rightarrow\) ubi iam desierit\(^{289}\) bullire,\(\rightarrow\) torpedinem\(^{290}\) [piscem] maritimum uiuum\(^{291}\) pensantem\(^{292}\) L i mittes in ipso oleo et coques donec iterum\(^{293}\) bullitionem faciat\(^{294}\) secundam aut tertia." 

10. Et post hoc supernitter asphalaci\(^{295}\) (animalis quem aliqui madamus\(^{296}\) uocant) sanguinem \(\div\) iiiii, et simul coques cum torpedine donec discoquatur et soluantur\(^{297}\) omnes carnes\(^{298}\) eius. 

11. Et sublatum ab igne cum refrigerauerit colabis\(^{299}\) et mittes in alio\(^{300}\) uase,\(^{301}\) et cum opus fuerit accipies ex\(^{302}\) ipso oleo quantum sufficiat ad\(^{303}\) utendum, et miscebis ceram et resolues in trulla et facies\(^{304}\) cerotum mollissimum et lineto inductum superpones. 

12. Coques autem oleum sicut dictum est\(^{305}\) in hospitio pede plano\(^{306}\) mense Martio quinta feria.\(^{307}\) Sic enim facta coctio multum ualere\(^{308}\) potest.

---

\(^{287}\) ad podagram \(\gamma\) \(\eta\) (not C) G1  
\(^{288}\) Mittens \(\eta\) P2 P3] mittes \(\text{cett}\). Only experience will show whether this is right, but I have already the impression that the pattern present participle + finite main verb may be right for the first two instructions. 
\(^{289}\) desierit[\(\text{desinet}\)] M - it P1  
\(^{290}\) torpedinem \(\delta\) \| turbid- \(\text{plerique}\) turpitudinem de D Ox Ge B (!) torpedinis . \(\phi\). On the use of the stringray in medicine, see Göksen. 
\(^{292}\) pensans \(\gamma\) om. \(\text{cett}\). Cf. Greek \(\text{ζωσης}\).  
\(^{293}\) omnes \(\gamma\) \(\text{om. cett}\). Cf. Greek \(\text{ζωσης}\). 
\(^{294}\) Strictly otiose in the Latin, given \(\text{secundam aut tertia}\. Could iterum have anything to do with Greek \(\text{τὸ μέτρον}\)? \(\text{τὸ μέτρον}\) itself strange: might it have been added as a noun phrase to agree with \(\text{δεύτερον \(\text{η τρίτον}\)}, when the latter were no longer understood as adverbs? 
\(^{295}\) Again, the tradition is unusually unanimous over \(\text{donec} + subjunctive. 
\(^{296}\) asphalaci\(\text{\(\sim\)}\) asfalacus (-iкус P1) \(\gamma\) (Greek genitive singular). 
\(^{297}\) madamus scripsi \(\text{madamus}\) \(\text{manda(m)um \(\eta\) marida(n)um cett.} 
\(^{298}\) dissoluantur A  
\(^{299}\) omnes \(\gamma\) \(\text{om. \(\text{cett}\). Cf. Greek}\). It is tempting simply to regard \(\text{omnes}\) as an addition of \(\delta\), but this passage bears comparison with 2.271.6, where again a word for ‘whole, all’ in the Latin (\(\text{totum colligatur}\) stands opposite not \(\text{πᾶν}\) but \(\text{αιν}\) in the Greek \(\text{αιν λυθη}\)). So, too, here: \(\text{soluantur omnes carnes}: \text{αιν} \text{αναλώθωσιν οι \(\text{πάρκες\).} 
\(^{300}\)  
\(^{301}\) colabis trad. et P3\(\text{\text{\(\sim\)}\) colas \(\text{\(\phi\)}\) \(\text{P3}}\)  
\(^{302}\) Reflecting Greek \(\text{ουλίνων\).} 
\(^{303}\) uaso Mu asculo P1  
\(^{304}\) ex \(\gamma\) \(\eta\) de cett.  
\(^{305}\) ad om. A (by haplography after \(\text{sufficiat).} 
\(^{306}\) et facies) faciens A G1 P2  
\(^{307}\) sicut dictum est \(\gamma\) om. \(\text{cett}\). Cf. Greek \(\text{ως προφέραται}\). 
\(^{308}\) plano plane (plene A) \(\eta\) P2 D \(\phi\). The \(\text{ThLL, s.v. hospitium, 3043, 69, cites this passage as the only instance of hospitium denoting a ‘hypogeum’}. If this interpretation is correct, plainly, it must depend on the whole phrase hospitia pede plano, and not just the single word hospitio. The Greek must indeed refer to an underground room, but the Latin would naturally mean ‘a room at ground level’ (with an inversion of the phrase \(\text{plano pede}\) attested already in Varro and Vertuevius). 
\(^{309}\) die Iouis \(\gamma\) the Latin, in either version, must mean ‘Thursday’ (on this use of \(\text{feria, cf. ThLL, s.v., 505, 18ff)} .); both Puschmann and Thorndike, \(\text{History, I, 582 take Greek \text{πέμπτη to mean ‘the 5th of the month’ (i.e. the recipe may be made on only one day each year).} 
\(^{310}\) ulare]\(\text{\(\sim\)}\) iuare \(\epsilon\) Ch(!). While \(\text{multum iuare}\) is a frequent collocation in the Latin Alexander, \(\text{ulare}\) occurs apparently only here. And the Latin Alexander, \(\text{ulare}\) occurs only here. 

(II, 575, 18–29) 8. Κηρωτή θαυμαστή καὶ διὰ πείρας, ἤ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ προσεμαρτύρησαν. — Βαλὼν εἰς κάκαβον ἐλαῖον κοινοῦ ἕξε. β' ἐγε ξύλοις ἀμπελίνοις, ἐως οὗ βράσῃ + σφοδρῶς —. 9. καὶ ἐπίβαλε τουρπαίης θαλασσίας ζωσις λιτρ. α'/ καὶ ἔγε, ἐως οὗ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ προειρημένου ἐλαίου βράσῃ δεύτερον ἢ τρίτον. 10. είτα ἐπίβαλε ἀσφάλακος (τοῦ ζώου ὃ τινες παλαιμίδα καλοῦσι) τοῦ αἵματος ύγγ. δ'/ καὶ συνέγει τῇ τουρπαίῃ, ἐως ἄν ἀναλυθὼς αἱ σάρκες αὐτῆς. 11. καὶ ἐπάρας μετὰ ταύτα ψύξεν καὶ διήθησαν καὶ ἀνατίθει εἰς ύδειν τοῦ ἀγγείον. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς χρήσεως λαβὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἐλαίου ὅσον ἐξαρκεῖ πρὸς τὴν χρήσιν, μίσης κηρὸν καὶ λύσας ποίει κηρωτὴν ἀπαλωτάτην καὶ εἰς ὅθονον ἐπιπλάσας ἐπίθες. 12. ἔγε δὲ τὸ ἐλαιον, ως προγέρασπε, ἐν οἰκήματι κατοικοῦν, μηνὶ μαρτίῳ πέμπτη μηδαμῶς ὑπερτιθέμενος τὴν ἡμέραν· οὕτω γάρ ποιῶν ἐπιτεύξῃ.

13. Sufficiat haec de anodinis et paragoricis cataplasmatibus309 dixisse.

(II, 575, 29–30) 13. τοσαύτα περὶ τῶν ἀνωδύνων καὶ παρηγορικῶν ἐπιπλασμάτων μοι λέλεκται.

+—EXPLICIT LIBER SECVNDVS: INCIPIVNT CAPITVLA LIBRI TERTII.→

309 Note the contrast between Latin cataplasma and Greek ἐπιπλάσμα (as at 1.88.1, above).