

CHAPTER 2. THE GREEK *THERAPEUTICA* AND THE LATIN VERSION

2.1. THE MANUSCRIPT-TRADITION OF THE GREEK *THERAPEUTICA*

In the context of editing the pseudonymous *De oculis* (p. 4 above), Barbara Zipser has recently considered the tradition of the *Therapeutica* as a whole, and has come to some important conclusions.¹ She lists eighteen manuscripts in which the Greek *Therapeutica* is transmitted in whole or in part.² On the basis of the collation of several passages, the arrangement of the *Therapeutica*, and the form and context of its transmission in all or most of the manuscripts, she establishes a stemma (*non vidi*) comprising four branches (her α , μ , π and L (= Laur. Plut. 74.10)), of which π and L constitute a sub-branch deriving from a complete copy intermediate between the acephalous μ and her archetype, the common ancestor of μ and the fragmentary α .³ She shows that α , of which the Greek text is 'etwas eckig aber inhaltlich sehr gut', presents in numerous places superior readings (including *lectiones difficiliores*), and often agrees with the Latin Alexander against the rest of the Greek tradition.⁴ Unfortunately, α contains of the Greek *Therapeutica* only Book 1 complete, together with extracts from Books 2 and 6. At the other extreme are π and L, which represent the results of at least one redaction, and present a text of which the Greek has been corrected and the content often trivialized. Regrettably, descendants of π , which according to Zipser came to constitute the *vulgata* version of the text, form the basis not only of the early printings of the *Therapeutica* but also of Puschmann's edition.

The consequences of these findings for the present work are essentially two-fold. On the one hand, by reconstructing part of the history of the Greek text, and by documenting the flawed principles of Puschmann's edition, Zipser has at last properly demonstrated the need for a new edition of the Greek *Therapeutica*; it follows that the authority of Puschmann's text is reduced, both in general and as a secondary witness for the text of the Latin Alexander. On the other hand, it is clear — and we may rejoice — that the Greek text used by the maker(s) of the Latin Alexander belonged to a superior branch of the Greek tradition. Especially given the fragmentary state of this branch among the surviving Greek manuscripts, this considerably increases the importance of the Latin Alexander as a witness for the Greek text.

2.2. EDITIONS OF THE GREEK *THERAPEUTICA*

The first edition of the Greek *Therapeutica* was made by Jacques Goupyl (and printed by Robert Étienne) in Paris in 1548.⁵ It was based on one (or more) of the

¹ I am very grateful to Barbara Zipser for letting me see some of her findings before their publication, and for several discussions of them in person with her. On the Greek manuscripts, see also Puschmann, I, 87–91.

² Zipser, xi–xii; she eliminates from the list of seventeen given by Diels, *Handschriften*, II, 11, the Par. Suppl. gr. 764, and adds Vat. gr. 1896 and Marc. gr. II 171.

³ Zipser, xix–xxxvii; she seems to date her archetype to the tenth century, but if her α descends from her archetype and the Latin translator's copy from α (or even an ancestor of α), this needs to be brought forward by at least two centuries.

⁴ Zipser, xxviii, xxxvii–xxxviii.

⁵ *Alexandri Tralliani medici lib. XII. Rhazae de pestilentia libellus ex Syrorum lingua in Graecam translatus. Iacobi Gouphyli in eosdem castigationes.*

manuscripts deriving from Zipser's π (above),⁶ and ignored the Latin tradition. (Like the common ancestor of Zipser's π and L, and the manuscripts deriving from it, it includes, beside Alexander, the Greek translation of Rhazes' work *Περὶ λοιμικῆς*.)

The second edition followed only eight years later, in 1556, the work of Johann Winter (or Winther — Ioannes Guint(h)erius) of Andernach, personal physician to the French king Francis I.⁷ Winter added his own Latin translation (first published separately in 1549), which is praised by Puschmann (I, 98), but he also silently translated into Greek and included in his Greek text those parts of the Latin Alexander which are not in the Greek original, which makes his edition full of surprises!⁸

Further editions were planned by Jac. Gronovius (1645–1702), Perizonius (1651–1715), both professors in Leiden, the Englishman Edward Milwards,⁹ and Charles Daremberg. None was realized, with the result that Puschmann's was the first edition for more than three hundred years.¹⁰

Puschmann inspected, and presumably collated, virtually all the Greek manuscripts of Alexander then known (and a small number of the Latin as well¹¹). He thus had access to all the branches of the family identified by Zipser, and his conclusions about the relations between the manuscripts match Zipser's closely: in a series of all-too-brief remarks (I, 89–91) he in effect establishes three branches, (in Zipser's terms) α , μ and L/ π (he does not distinguish L and π); that α and μ , although very different, have a common ancestor; and that α (represented by Marc. gr. 295, his Mf) belongs especially closely with the Latin version. Then, however, apparently without considering the relations between his hyparchetypes, and without giving reasons for his decision,¹² Puschmann chose to base himself on the late recension represented by L/ π (giving pride of place (I, 91) to the Laurentianus, Plut. 74.10, and Par. gr. 2201), using the other manuscripts only as sources of improvements to the text or of variants to report.

The extent to which Puschmann has rearranged the contents of π (here used in abbreviated reference to the common ancestor of Zipser's π and L) is immediately apparent from Table 2.1, which gives an overview of the contents of both Greek and Latin versions, including sections occurring only in the one or the other.¹³ Possibly inspired by the Latin tradition (see II, 105 n. 5) Puschmann, like Winter before him, moved the chapters on parotis forward from between synanche and pleuritis to the end

⁶ See Puschmann, I, 97–8; Zipser, xvii.

⁷ *Alexandri Tralliani Medici libri duodecim, graece et latine, multo quam antea auctiores et integriores*: Johanne Guinterio Andernaco interprete et emendatore, etc. Henricus Petrus, Basel 1556. For a list of later editions, see Puschmann, I, 98–9, and Wust, 80–2.

⁸ Most dramatically, Winter's edition gives the impression that we have large extracts from the lost authors Philumenus and Philagrius in Greek. Puschmann unmasks Winter, but defends and eulogizes him, *Nachträge*, v, 8–12. See also Masullo, 34–5, and n. 84.

⁹ Milwards, 12, 189; Puschmann, I, 100.

¹⁰ Meyer, II, 390; Puschmann, I, 101.

¹¹ Masullo, 36, thinks it improbable that Puschmann collated the Latin manuscripts personally, even for his edition (in the *Nachträge*) of the fragments of Philumenus and Philagrius, and states that the variant readings he reports in the Philagrius-chapters are frequently erroneous; Zipser (personal communication) reports the same for the chapters of the Greek text that she has collated.

¹² One might guess that he rejects μ because it 'macht den Eindruck der Interpolation' (I, 91), and α because it is fragmentary and so different from the rest of the Greek tradition.

¹³ Zipser, xxxiv–xxxv, gives a useful overview of the arrangement of the contents of the Greek manuscripts, which goes well beyond what Puschmann offers in his notes.

Table 2.1: Overview of the contents of the Latin Alexander compared with the arrangement of Puschmann's edition and the Greek manuscripts (for the Greek sigla, see p. 13, for the Latin (P1, A, M), p. 38)

Book 1

| chs in <i>ed.</i> (P1) | Subject | Puschmann | Pu. | Gk mss. |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|------|---|
| 1–20 (1–19) | Diseases of the hair and scalp | I, 441–65 | Bk 1 | Bk 1 (all branches, incl. α) |
| 21–33 (20–32) | Headache: <i>cephalargia</i> | I, 465–483 | | |
| 34–44 (33–43) | <i>cephalea</i> | I, 485–499 | | |
| 45–51 (44–49) | <i>emigranium</i> | I, 499–509 | | |
| 52–58 (50–56) | <i>Phrenesis</i> | I, 509–527 | | |
| 59–60 (57–58) | <i>Lethargus</i> | I, 527–535 | | |
| 61–74 (59–70) | Epilepsy | I, 535–567 +575 | | |
| not in the Latin | further remedies | I, 567–573 | | |
| 75–84 (71–80) | <i>Melancholia</i> | I, 591–617 | Bk 2 | Bk 2 (all branches, incl. α [a frg. only]) |
| 85–107 (81–104) | Eye-diseases | II, 3–69 | | |
| 108–130 (105–127) | Ear-diseases, <i>incl. parotis</i> | II, 71–105 | Bk 3 | Bk 3 π L Bk 2 μ |
| | | II, 105–25 Περὶ παρωτίδων | | Bk 4 π L Bk 3 μ |
| 131–135 (128–132) | Nose, face and teeth | not in the Greek | | |
| 136–142 (133–138) | <i>Synanche</i> | II, 125–145 | Bk 4 | Bk 4 |
| 143–149 (139–145) | <i>Pleuritis</i> | II, 229–243 | Bk 6 | Bk 6 π L Bk 5 μ |

Book 2

| chs in <i>ed.</i> (A) | Subject | Puschmann | Pu. | Gk mss. |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|--|
| 1–13 (1–12) | Coughing | II, 147–167 + 185 | Bk 5 | Bk 5 π L Bk 4 μ |
| not in the Latin | further remedies for coughing | II, 169–183 | | |
| 14–50 (13–47) | Diseases of the digestive tract | II, 245–313 | Bk 7 | Bk 7 π L Bk 6 μ and, frg. only, α |
| not in the Latin | Περὶ λυγμοῦ | II, 313–19 | | |
| 51–56 (48–52) | <i>Cholera</i> | II, 321–335 | Bk 8 | |
| 57–78 (53–69) | Diseases of the liver | II, 379–413 | Bk 9 | |
| 79–103 (70–79) | PHILUMENUS, on the stomach and intestines | not in the Greek | | |
| 104–150 (80–99) | PHILAGRIUS, on the spleen | not in the Greek | | |
| 151–157 (100–105) | Dropsy | II, 439–461 | Bk 10 | Bk 8 π L Bk 7 μ |

Book 2: Continued

| chs in <i>ed.</i> (A) | Subject | Puschmann | Pu. | Gk mss. |
|-------------------------|--|-------------|-------|---------------------|
| 158–177 (106–114) | Those spitting blood | II, 187–209 | Bk 5 | Bk 7 π L Bk 6 μ |
| not in the Latin | Περὶ ἐμπυηματικῶν | II, 211–27 | | |
| 178–203 (115–128) | Diseases of the kidneys, bladder and genitals | II, 463–501 | Bk 11 | Bk 8 π L Bk 7 μ |
| 204–234 (129–133) | Colic | II, 335–377 | Bk 8 | Bk 9 π L Bk 8 μ |
| not in the Latin | Περὶ δυσεντερίας | II, 415–439 | Bk 9 | Bk 10 |
| | Περὶ παρέσεως | II, 575–91 | Bk 1 | |
| 235–271 (134–146) | Gout | II, 501–575 | Bk 12 | Bk 11 π L Bk 9 μ |

Book 3

| chs in <i>ed.</i> (M) | Subject | Puschmann | Pu. | Gk mss. |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| pr. (1) | Prologue, to Cosmas | I, 289 | | |
| 1–9 (2–10) | <i>Ephemeræ febres</i> | I, 291–311 | sep. Bk, placed first | Bk 12 π L Bk 11 μ |
| 10–20 (11–21) | Fevers from corruption | I, 311–27 | | |
| 21–26 (22–27) | <i>Syncope in fevers</i> | I, 329–37 | | |
| 27–45 (28–46) | Fainting | I, 337–47 | | |
| 46–66 (47–64) | <i>Hecticae febres</i> | I, 349–69 | | |
| not in the Latin | Περὶ τριταίου | I, 371–85 | | |
| | Περὶ ἀμφημερινοῦ | I, 385–407 | | |
| | Περὶ τεταρταίου | I, 407–39 | | |

of the book on diseases of the ears.¹⁴ Compared with π, then, Puschmann's Book 3 is relatively long, his Book 4 relatively short, and Puschmann similarly extended Book 5 by making it end with the chapters on αἱμοπτυϊκοί and ἐμπυηματικοί, which form the start of Book 7 in π. π's Book 7 is further shortened by the removal of cholera to Puschmann's Book 8 (mainly on colic, which is covered in Book 9 in π), and of liver-diseases to Puschmann's Book 9 (which also contains dysentery, the first part of Book 10 in the manuscripts, the other part of which, on paresis, Puschmann moved to between epilepsy and melancholy, at the end of his Book 1!). Puschmann divided Book 8 of π

¹⁴ All the Greek manuscripts have *parotis* after *synanche*; Puschmann's arrangement here agrees with the Latin.

into two parts, namely his Book 10 on dropsy and his Book 11 on kidneys, bladder, and genitals, and finished with his Book 12 on gout (= Book 11 in π), having thus made twelve books out of eleven in π (and only ten in μ ¹⁵). (For a much more detailed survey of the Latin Alexander, see the Appendix to this book.)

The most dramatic aspect of Puschmann's rearrangement, however, concerns the book on fevers, together with the preface to Cosmas. As already noted, in the Greek (as in the Latin) manuscripts, these come at the end and together constitute the last book of the *Therapeutica* (Book 12 in π , Book 11 in μ , Book 3 in the Latin version). Puschmann brought them both right to the front, and printed the book on fevers (preceded by the preface to Cosmas) as a separate work before Book 1 of the *Therapeutica*.

2.3. GENERAL COMPARISON OF THE LATIN VERSION WITH THE GREEK

2.3.1. CONTENT AND ARRANGEMENT

With regard to the order of the material, the Latin version agrees with the Greek tradition most importantly in broad terms in the sequence of major components: diseases from head to toe — preface to Cosmas — fevers. The book on fevers (Book 3 of the Latin Alexander) stops abruptly at the end of the section on hectic fevers, and we have no trace of a Latin translation of Alexander on tertian, quotidian, and quartan fevers. The Latin preface to Cosmas is hardly more than a brief summary of the Greek, as we shall see in detail below (p. 32).

Book 1 of the Latin Alexander — all but the last seven chapters (1.143–9 on pleuritis: see below) — corresponds closely to Books 1–4 of the Greek tradition, covering, broadly speaking, diseases of the head. Both traditions treat almost the same material: there are some minor omissions of Greek material from the Latin, and the more significant addition of five chapters (1.131–5) on diseases of the nose, face, and teeth (see below, p. 25), which are placed appropriately between ears and throat. Diseases are dealt with in the same order in Greek and Latin, with two exceptions: (a) parotitis comes at the end of ears in the Latin (as in Paul. Aeg. 3.23.13) but after synanche in the Greek tradition; and (b) in the Latin version, pleuritis (the Greek Book 6) comes before rather than after coughing (the Greek Book 5, the start of the Latin Book 2) — here Paul agrees with the Greek Alexander, treating coughing (3.28) before pleuritis (3.33).

The remainder of the Latin Book 2 (2.14ff.) corresponds to Books 7–11 of the Greek tradition. Again there are important omissions: seven pages of further remedies against coughing (part of the Greek Book 5), the chapters on hiccoughing and suppurations in the lung (both from Book 7), and those on dysentery and on paralysis (the whole of the Greek Book 10); but again, there are equally important additions, in the extensive extracts from Philumenus on dysentery (replacing Alexander on dysentery) and diseases of the intestine, and those from Philagrius on diseases of the spleen. This supplementary material from Philumenus and Philagrius is placed,

¹⁵ According to Zipser, xxxvi, xxxviii, the shift of books in μ (and, she believes, α) — leading to μ (and, in Book 6, α) being a book behind π/L in the numeration — was caused by the interpolation without the marking of book-divisions of two books *De oculis* between Alexander on the eyes and Alexander on the ears.

appropriately enough, between diseases of the liver and dropsy. This leaves colic (treated next to dysentery in the Greek Alexander, Paul. Aeg. 3.42–3) rather isolated between genitals and gout, but this is a consequence of the treatment in the Greek of diseases of the genitals immediately after those of the bladder and the kidneys: in Paul. Aeg. we have all the internal organs dealt with together (3.37–46: in the sequence stomach — intestines — kidneys and bladder — liver) followed closely by dropsy (3.48) and much later by diseases of the genitals (3.54–9). The only significant departure from the Greek in the order of the diseases in the Latin version is that the chapter on those spitting blood comes oddly between dropsy and diseases of the kidneys, much later than in the Greek Alexander, where (as in Paul. Aeg. 3.31) haemoptysis is treated among the diseases of the thorax and immediately precedes suppurations in the lung. Whether the omission of the latter from the Latin version is related to the misplacement of haemoptysis, we may only speculate. With these few exceptions, then, the Latin Alexander presents in Books 1 and 2 a largely sensible *a capite ad calcem* ordering.

2.3.2. LENGTH

It is important to stress that the Latin Alexander is not so much shorter than the Greek as is often stated or implied.¹⁶ The Greek text occupies in Puschmann's edition 457 pages. By my calculations, which at this stage necessarily involve some estimation, the Latin Alexander as a whole is only about 7 per cent shorter than the Greek, and even if one disallows the extensive excerpts from Philumenus and Philagrius, and other additions, notably the chapters on the nose, face, and teeth (1.131–5), the Latin still accounts for about 80 per cent of the Greek Alexander.¹⁷

2.3.3. THE DIVISION INTO BOOKS

With one single exception, all of the mainstream Latin manuscripts, from Paris, lat. 9332 (around A.D. 800) to London, Harley 4914 (after 1500), transmit the Latin Alexander in three books (1: hair-loss to pleuritis; 2: coughing to gout; 3: fevers); the end of the third book is explicitly noted also by the scribe of one of the oldest excerpting manuscripts, Vat. regin. lat. 1143 (below, p. 97). On the origin of this division we can only speculate. The book on fevers is self-contained and requires no further comment, but there is no natural break between Books 1 and 2, unless we imagine an earlier version with pleuritis in Book 2, which would allow us to characterize Book 1 as diseases of the head.

At some point before 1200, the Latin Alexander was rearranged into seven books — perhaps more than once. A redivision into seven books is physically exemplified in only one surviving manuscript, Paris lat. 6882 (my P3). Book 1 is divided in two

¹⁶ I have found this acknowledged only in Thorndike, *History*, I, 577 n. 8 ('not as abbreviated as one might infer from Rose').

¹⁷ Translated into Latin are about 364 of the 457 pages of Puschmann; the excerpts from Philumenus and Philagrius occupy 57 Puschmann pages (in the *Nachträge*), the chapters on the nose, face and teeth, a further 6, yielding a total of 427 Puschmann pages for the Latin Alexander as a whole.

(1.1–84, diseases of the head and nervous diseases; 1.85–149, diseases of the eyes, ears, nose, face and teeth, synanche, and pleuritis); Book 2 is divided into four books (2.1–78, coughing to diseases of the liver; 2.79–157, Philumenus, Philagrius, and dropsy; 2.158–234, those spitting blood to colic; 2.235–71, gout); Book 3 is left untouched as Book 7. The contents are unaffected by this redivision. If the intention was to produce more thematically-coherent books, this was achieved only for new Book 6 (on gout; and perhaps for new Book 1, on the head and nervous diseases). The effect of the redivision was simply to produce a series of books of more uniform and manageable size. The choice of the number seven may be in direct imitation of earlier medical classics, in particular the encyclopaedia of Paul of Aegina, the early medieval Galenic and pseudo-Galenic ensemble, and Gariopontus' *Passionarius* (see 3.2.6, below).

The name of Gariopontus occurs in an apparent reference to a second rearrangement of the material of the Latin Alexander contained in the first four folios of another manuscript copy (also now in Paris) of the three-book Latin version (Par. lat. 6881, my P2). The content and import of this 'preface' remain to be elucidated: they are beyond my competence, even now that a fresh autopsy has solved the problems posed by the poor legibility of the microfilm of these four folios. I now incline to think that the work in seven books referred to here ('Diuiditur autem hoc opus in VII libros') is not simply a version of Alexander but a compilation, otherwise unknown, made from several works including that of Alexander ('Opus istud compilatum est ex diuersorum auctorum operibus.s.g.(?) Pauli Alexandri Theodosii prsc(?) (Prisci?) et Democriti'); this would be in spite of the prominence accorded Alexander in the opening sentence of this 'preface',¹⁸ and in spite of the fact that these folios stand before a roughly-contemporary manuscript copy of Alexander alone. It is thinkable that the author of this 'preface' regarded the Latin Alexander as a compilation, but the content of each of the seven books is then summarized in such a way that one wonders whether this really can be the Latin Alexander of the rest of the tradition.¹⁹ There are similarities (e.g. Book 2 beginning with coughing; the incorporation of a book of Philumenus), but some important differences, too (e.g. the removal of the book on diseases of the eyes;

¹⁸ Par. lat. 6881, f. 1ra: 'Cum post tempora Ypocratis plurimi auctores tam ueteres quam moderni in phisica facultate studuisse inueniantur, secundus post Galienum excellentiorem locum obtinuisse creditur Ale[n]xander, qui, rogatus a discipulis suis Cosma et Damiano, paucarum egritudinum sed earum plenissime causas et significationes exposuit <et> curas, subitiens eas qui(dem?) nn (?) quas uel ipse probauerat uel ab amicis probatas acceperat.'

¹⁹ Par. lat. 6881, f. 1vb: 'Continet iamque primus liber tractatum passionum capitis et parcium capiti adiacentium ut aurium dentium uue faucium atque genarum. Liber autem oculorum depertus (decerptus?) est ex hoc libro et per se inuenitur. Secundus continet passiones cordis pulmonis eparis stomachi diafragmatis atque costarum. Tercius uero splenis intestinorum renum uesice et uirge. Quartus a(utem?) scie(ntiam) genuum articularum manuum et pedum et partium tractatus particularium. Quintus continet tractatum omnium et uniuersalium nisi febrium et cardiace passionis. Huic et alligatus liber est Filomini(?) (flonu or flomi?). Sextus autem est scientia febrium et criticorum dierum et cardia[r]ce. Septimus uero de sinthomatibus febrium?et sig(nis?) (or dig(erit), or ag(it)?). Sed quia in hoc libro ... [numerous further medical definitions and notes] ... f. 2va ... Variis et c(?) ostenso de passionibus capitis et parcium cerebri transiturus ad passiones parcium capitis adiacentium repetit de dolore capitis ... Postquam eg(it) de passionibus capitis, ag(it) de c(ausis) parcium capitis adiacentium dicens. *Aurium* et c(ausa?) ex reumatismo.i. ex fluxu ... Hic fuit appositus tractatus oculorum sed fuit subtractus a quodam medico Sequitur tractatus dentium ... [more notes and definitions] ... f. 2vb Secundus incipit. Tussis est motus spiritalis uirtutis ad expellendam s(upe)r fluitatem insp(irit)ualibus habundantem uel comprimentem ... f. 3ra ... Tertius. typus a figura. *Vulneratio corporis* in cruribus et tibiis nascitur. In hoc tractatu splenis ferrum ponitur pro qualibe (chalybe?) ... f. 3va ... Quartus. *Seri(um?)*.i. carum (??) *Psialgia* ... *Podagraca(?)* ... [I cannot find Quintus!] f. 4rb ... SEXTVS. dieticos. dicte congrue interfontes (sontes, or inidentes?) ... f. 4va ... Septimus. In hoc libro tractat de febribus uel? sinthomatibus in est quod inducit de dol(ore) capitis et si similiter uideatur ...'

the apparent division of fevers between Books 6 and 7; the inclusion of *cardiaci* with fevers in Book 6). At all events, it is hard to imagine that this is a summary of the seven-book version copied by the original maker of P3 (above), so that — even granted the possibility that the ‘preface’ to P2 is describing a version of the Latin Alexander²⁰ — we should have to reckon, as noted, with more than one redivision into seven books. In view of the puzzling order of the transmitted parts of both Greek and Latin Alexanders (*a capite ad calcem* — preface — fevers), it is interesting to note the reference in P2’s ‘preface’ to an earlier version of the work commented on in which, as in Puschmann’s edition of the Greek Alexander, the treatment of fevers was placed first. It is stated explicitly that the order of the work discussed has been subject to change (‘Ordo uero alius est secundum modernos alius fuit secundum antiquos’): while ‘Priscianus’ put the treatment of diseases affecting the whole body (i.e. mainly fevers) before those affecting particular parts (‘Priscianus etenim, qui[bus] operis institutor extitit, tractatum uniuersalium passionum praemisit particularibus’), Gariopontus of Salerno reversed the order (‘Gariopontus uero Salernitanus transmutauit ordinem et praemisit tractatum particularium’). Further research is needed on the background and the implications of the first four folios of Par. lat. 6881.

Apart from P3 (and possibly P2), however, there is no evidence of a Latin version of Alexander in other than the standard three-book arrangement.²¹

2.4. OTHER DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE LATIN VERSION AND THE GREEK

Discrepancies between the Latin Alexander and the Greek original are broadly speaking of three sorts: either the Latin version has material not in the Greek; or the Greek original has material not in the Latin; or corresponding passages of the ‘same’ text differ in the two versions. It will be part of the job of the full edition of the Latin Alexander to indicate all such differences. For present purposes, I content myself with brief description and illustration of the ways in which the Latin version departs from the Greek. I begin with departures in corresponding passages of the ‘same’ text, as this type of discrepancy illustrates also the first two types in miniature and, more significantly, raises an important uncertainty which must be kept in mind when we consider major instances of Latin or Greek material apparently unmatched in the other version.

2.4.1. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LATIN AND GREEK VERSIONS OF THE ‘SAME’ TEXT

Much of the Latin Alexander looks like a word-for-word translation of the Greek. Often, however, there are differences between the two versions, ranging in scope from a single word (even a single grammatical feature, e.g. singular vs. plural or present vs. future) to a passage of several sentences. The possible reasons for the Latin version on a given occasion saying something different from what the Greek says at the same point are essentially three: either the makers of the Latin version misunderstood

²⁰ As far as I can see, although P2 contains only this ‘preface’ and the three-book Latin Alexander, the preface makes no mention of a version in three books.

²¹ The reference in the chapters of the Latin Alexander from Philagrius to ‘the fourth book on gout’ (2.122: ‘in quarto libro de podagricis’; cf. also 2.112: ‘sicut dictum est in podagrica cura’), while consistent with the book-division of the work described in the preface to P2, is most probably original to Philagrius on the spleen, rather than added by the maker of the Latin Alexander. We are fortunate enough to know that Philagrius wrote a work on gout in at least five books. Cf. Orib., *Syn.* 9.59 (p. 312, 1 Raeder) = Philagrius, frg. 8 Masullo. Masullo, 75–124 collects the fragments on gout.

the Greek; or they had before them a version of the Greek text different from that edited by Puschmann; or they or later redactors revised the Latin text. Let us look straightaway at an example, from early in Book 1 of the Latin version (= Book 1 Greek).

| | |
|--|--|
| 1.4 <i>ad fin.</i> and 1.5 <i>ad init.</i> (text of Angers 457 [A]) | Puschmann's Greek text I, 445, 7–447, 7 |
| 1. Stercus autem catti cum aceto illitum bene operatur. +–I, 445, 8–9 (also Mf) –+ | 1. Ἄλλο. Κόπρον αἰλούρου μετ' ὄξους κατάχριε· καλόν ἐστι +– καὶ πάνυ φυσικὴν ἀντιπάθειαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ πάθος.–+ |
| 2. Nucibus integris ustis et cum oleo tritis inunge; ante radens ipsa loca. +– Et euforbium tritum cum oleo et illitum frequenter multis sanauit.–+ | 3. Περὶ συνθέτων βοηθημάτων. |
| 3. (1.5. t.) De compositis medicamentis +– ad tineam capitis–+ | 6. Χαλκοῦ κεκαυμένου δραχ. β' θείου ἀπύρου δραχ. β' ἀσφοδέλου δραχ. β' λειάνας σὺν κρόκῳ ῥῶν καὶ ἀνατρίψας τὸν τόπον χρίε. |
| 4. +– Operatiua enim sunt et compositis medicamenta quae ab antiquis dicta sunt, multa sunt ex simplicibus confecta; sed omnia scribere superfluum est. Sed ea tantum tradimus quae experimentata habemus uel probata a certis amicis qui nobis ea tradiderunt medicis. | 2. Ἄλλο. Κάρυα βασιλικὰ καύσας ὀλόκληρα λείου μετ' ἐλαίου καὶ κατάχριε προξυρήσας τὸν τόπον.–+ –+ |
| 5. Recipit autem unum ex his haec. –+ Adipe ursino ÷ I. adarcis ÷ I. fimo murium ÷ III. pice liquida ÷ III. oleo usto ex lucerna ÷ IS. teres; et omnia miscens lines. Sed antea rades capitis loca; et sic perunges ipsa loca; +– et miraberis quomodo curabit tineam capitis. etiam si antiquissima sit. –+ | +– 4. –+ |
| 6. Item aliud. Calcu cicaumeno ÷ II. sulphure uiuo ÷ II. asfodillo <radicibus> II. teres cum uitellis ouorum et fricando caput uteris. | 5. +– –+ Ἄλλο. Στέατος ἄρκτειοῦ οὐγγ. β' ἀδάρκης οὐγγ. γ' μυοχόδων οὐγγ. γ' πίσης ὑγρᾶς οὐγγ. γ' λυχνελαίου ἀπὸ καύματος δραχ. α' s" ἀναλαμβάνων τὸν τόπον προξυρῶν χρίε.–+ –+ |
| 7. Item aliud Aceto acro ÷ I. allio ÷ I. oleo roseo ÷ I. fricabis locum cum panno laneo; et sic linens +– mirabiliter faciet.–+ | 7. Ἄλλο. Ὅξους δριμέος οὐγγ. α' σκορόδων οὐγγ. α' ῥοδίνου ἐλαίου οὐγγ. α' τρίψας τὸν τόπον ῥάκει ἐρίου κατάχριε.–+ –+ |
| 8. Item aliud +– ualde mirabile –+ Ranarum +– ustarum cinere –+ ÷ III. murium fimo ÷ I. pice liquida ÷ I. cedria quod sufficit. +– –+ +– hoc enim etiam si diurnae sint sanat alopiacias.–+ | 8. Ἄλλο. Βατράχων +– + οὐγγ. γ' μυοχόδων οὐγγ. α' καλάμου φλοιοῦ τέφρας οὐγγ. α: πίσης ὑγρᾶς οὐγγ. α' πράσου σπέρματος οὐγγ. α'. κεδρέα ἀναλάμβανε +– καὶ οὕτω περίχριε.–+ +– –+ |

The differences between Puschmann's Greek text and the Latin version affect virtually every sentence of this short passage, and exemplify the various types of divergence to be encountered in systematic comparison of the two texts. The passage also illustrates the special position of Greek manuscript Mf (Marc.gr.295), which, while sometimes agreeing with the rest of the Greek tradition against the Latin, more often agrees with the Latin against Puschmann's edition of the Greek version.

In the passage quoted above, Mf agrees with the rest of the Greek tradition (numbers refer to sections of the chapter):

- (a) 1, in having a second sentence in the recommendation which is not in the Latin;
- (b) 2, in the designation κάρυα βασιλικὰ (the Latin has just *nucibus*);

- (c) **2**, in the omission of the second recipe in **2** ('Et euforbium . . .');
- (d) **6**, in making **6** follow **1** (although in the placement of the title **3**, Mf agrees with the Latin version);
- (e) **8**, in having ἀναλάμβανε after κεδρέα (contrast Latin 'cedria quod sufficit').

On the other hand, Mf agrees with the Latin version against the other Greek manuscripts:

- (a) **3**, in making the title follow **2**;
- (b) **4** and **5**, in containing text corresponding to **4** and the first sentence of **5** in the Latin;
- (c) **5**, in prescribing one ounce of ἀδάρκη, rather than three;
- (d) **5**, in having the recommendation at the end of **5**, as in the Latin;
- (e) **6**, in having ῥιζῶν, κρόκοις, χρῶ: cf. Latin *radicibus, uitellis, uteris*;
- (f) **7**, in having a recommendation at the end of **7** (θαυμάσεις) similar to that in the Latin ('mirabiliter faciet');
- (g) **8**, in having two words²² after ἄλλο almost certainly corresponding to Latin 'ualde mirabile';
- (h) **8**, in having κεκαυμένων after βατράχων:²³ cf. Latin 'ranarum ustarum';
- (i) **8**, in concluding this recipe with a sentence corresponding to the Latin version, and not the Greek.

Reading on through the next few chapters of Book 1, we see that these findings are repeated, and for longer stretches of text. So, for example, on the one hand, the Latin chapters 1.7 and 1.8 are absent from all the Greek manuscripts, including (as far as I can see) Greek manuscript Mf. On the other hand, Mf alone has text to match the following passage towards the end of 1.6 of the Latin version (what would be between lines 6 and 7 of I, 451 Puschmann):

1.6 Haec scientes, dicere oportet ad unamquamque passionem expedientia adiutoria. Diuersa enim et quam plurima sunt scripta ad fluxus capillorum. Quae ergo noscimus esse probabilia et experimentata, uel a nobilissimis et caris amicis didicimus, haec etiam uobis fideliter tradimus cum quibusdam unctionibus prouisis composita medicamenta. Quod laudauit Galienus fieri ad rarefactos poros uel condensatam cutem de ladano medicamento confectum, quod hoc modo fit.

And likewise Mf alone has text corresponding to 1.9 of the Latin version (what would be before line 1 of I, 453 Puschmann):

1.9 (entire) Cogimur saepius ab amicis ut nigros faciamus capillos, et maxime a potentibus aut regibus, interdum etiam aut flauos uel albos. Necesse est ergo ut ex his aliqua dicamus. Suadeo tamen non satis eos qui habent caput naturaliter frigidum frequenter ex his ungui. Stiptica sunt enim haec omnia talia et austera et densatiuam habentia uirtutem. Propter quod utilissimum est aliqua quae subtiliant et paulatim calefaciant in his quae tingere possunt admisceri quia descendunt in profundum, et magis ea quae innigrant capillos. Et ideo si addantur quae leniter calefaciant, minus laedere possunt. Conuenit autem per dies quattuor aut quinque adhiberi medicamen. Nam si per singulos dies adhibeatur, multo magis periculum incurrunt, ita ut maxime catarrizent, et peripneumonici aut epyleptici aut apoplectici fiant et exinde moriantur. Melius est ergo ut non in his causis incidant malis. Remouenda est enim frequens inunctio.

²² The first is λίαν; the second I cannot read from the photocopy of Mf.

²³ A conjecturable correction, perhaps, as Puschmann reports this also for C (a daughter of Zipser's π).

On a smaller scale again, the Latin Alexander at 1.11: ‘et tunc lauari iubebis’ appears to overtranslate the Greek at I, 455, 4 καὶ ἀπονίπτε, until, that is, one reads the Greek manuscript Mf at this point, which has καὶ τότε ἀπονίψασθαι κέλευε. And two lines later in 1.11 the Latin version agrees with Mf in omitting two commands present in the rest of the Greek tradition at I, 455, 6–7: κυπέρου φύλλα βρέξον χυλῶ στρουθίου καὶ χρω τῶ ἀποβρέγματι (having them instead a dozen lines later, just before 1.13 (= I, 455, 17ff.), the Latin being ‘cyperi folia infundes in suco strucii et uteris illa infusione’).

These findings naturally prompt even greater caution when it comes to characterizing independent work on the part of the maker(s) of the Latin Alexander in those books — the large majority — not transmitted by Mf, for it is only when the Greek tradition is unanimously against the Latin version that we can think in terms of interventions on the part of the Latin translator(s)/redactor(s) — and even then of course only provisionally. In passages for which we do not have Mf, such as the two examples below, chosen at random from Book 2 of the Latin Alexander, this is a standing and important caveat. The departures of the Latin version from the Greek in the form and detail of the instructions to the drinker of the remedy (at the start of the first example, from 2.67), and in the list of ingredients for the remedy διὰ βακάνου, are just like the sort of discrepancies we saw illustrated above between Mf and the rest of the Greek tradition. The divergences between the Latin and Greek introductions to simple remedies for diseases of the liver which follow in 2.67 are much more radical (apart from the difference in length, note the naming of Oribasius in the Latin, presumably for ὁ σοφὸς γέρων in the Greek), but, in the absence of a systematic comparison of Mf with Puschmann’s text, we must reserve judgement on the question whether they reflect recension of the Greek tradition, or of the Latin, or of both.

2.67 *med.* iaceat +qui biberit+ in latere dextro +manu dextra sub capite posita et extensus hora media+.

Item aliud diabacanam
Bacano ÷ i. costo ÷ i. folio .2 viii. Pipere +albo+ .2 vi. +spica nardi .2 vi.+ melle quod sufficit. Dabis autem cotidie lib() i. cum condito in balneo. Et hoc enim experimentatum est. Maxime autem haec potio facit ad eos quibus de spisso et pingui humore fit infraxis.

Item ponimus simplicia adiutoria **Uribasii** auctoris uel a diuersis nobilibus uiris probata adiutoria ad epar.

II,395,4–18 +κέλευε+ δὲ εἰς τὸ δεξιὸν ἀνακεῖσθαι πλευρόν.+—

Ἄλλο τὸ διὰ βακάνου
Κόστου οὐγ. α' βακάνου οὐγ.
α' φύλλου γρ. η' πεπέρεως γρ. ζ' μέλιτος τὸ ἄρκοῦν. δίδου κοχλ. μετὰ κράσεως κονδίτου ἐν λουτρῶ. καὶ τοῦτο διὰ πείρας μάλιστα πρὸς τὰς ὑπὸ γλίσχρων καὶ παχέων γενομένας ἐμφράξεις.

ὅπως δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ δυνατὸν συντιθέναι φάρμακον, οἷον βούλεται, ἀρμόζειν δυνάμενον πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην διάθεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κάμνοντος δύναμιν καὶ κράσιν καὶ ἡλικίαν καὶ πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν ἄλλων ἀποβλέπων, εἰς ὅσα καὶ ὁ σοφὸς γέρων ἐδίδαξεν ἀποβλέπειν, ἐξεθέμην ἀπλᾶ βοηθήματα, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν εὐπορεῖν συντόμως καὶ ἄλλα δὲ συντιθέναι ἐξ αὐτῶν, ὡς ἂν ἔλοιτό τις εὐχενρῶς δύνασθαι.

Ἅσα πρὸς ἦπαρ ἀπλᾶ βοηθήματα.

(Note that, in 2.67, while the Latin resumes agreement with the Greek for some lines after the end of the comparison above, the final 130 words of the chapter in the Latin version are not in Puschmann's text of the Greek; these additional words are quoted on p. 27 below.)

Equally, in the second example below, an extract from 2.217, while the relative fullness and clarity of the Latin version could plausibly be taken as the work of the translator (or his editor), unless and until we can identify Latin linguistic features characteristic of — ideally, peculiar to — such expansions, we must leave open the possibility that they are faithful translations of a lost Greek recension.

| | |
|---|--|
| 2.217 Haec enim omnia extenuant et digerunt omnem corporis superfluitatem et confortant totam habitudinem corporis ut ea quae molestantur iam non possint +laedere nec+ frigidum congregare humorem. Sed neque his qui ex alio fluit loco in eum qui laesus fuit supercurrit quia non recipitur ab eo qui fortior effectus est loco. | Π, 361, 14-17 ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα λεπτύνει καὶ διαφορεῖ καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀπέριττον διατίθησιν ἀναρρωννύοντα τὴν ὅλην ἕξιν, ὡς τοῦ λοιποῦ μηκέτι τὰ πεπονθότα δύνασθαι ψυχρὸν ἀθροίζειν χυμὸν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τὸν ἐξ ἑτέρου ἐπιρρέοντα ἐτοιμῶς ἐπιδέχεσθαι πρὸς ἑαυτά. |
|---|--|

2.4.2. LATIN MATERIAL NOT IN THE GREEK ORIGINAL

We saw in the last section some instances of apparently additional material in the Latin Alexander, whether a few words or whole chapters, sometimes matched by part of the Greek tradition and sometimes not. My main concern in this section is to highlight the fact that the Latin Alexander is to a significant degree a compilation: that is to say, the earliest version that we can reconstruct contains material demonstrably from other sources which has been deliberately worked into the Latin text at more or less appropriate places. This is seen on a small scale at the very beginning of Book 1 in the definition of *alopecia* and *ofiasis*, which is more elaborate than that offered at the opening of the Greek text, and is drawn from the start of the seventh chapter of the first book of Theodorus Priscianus,²⁴ as is clear from the comparison below:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1.1 <i>init.</i> (text of A) +—I, 441, 1–6—+ | Theod. Prisc., <i>Eup. faen.</i> 16, p. 16, 14ff. Rose | I, 441,1–6 +— Ἡ ἀλωπεκία πάθος ἐστὶ τριχῶν μάδισις, οὐκ ἐκ μιᾶς δὲ αἰτίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ διαφόρων καὶ ποικίλων ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν· —+ |
|---|---|--|

²⁴ Theodorus is named as the source of a remedy for epilepsy in both Greek and Latin versions, and may be the source of several others in the same chapter: 1.72: 'In LVIII titulo Theodorus. Epyleptico autem cadente, si de maioribus digitis pedum eius sanguinem tollas et linias labia eius et frontem, mox surgit' = I, 559, 18–561, 1: Περὶ θεραπείας ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου Θεοδώρου. Ἐπιληπτικοῦ δὲ καταπεσόντος ἀπὸ τῶν μεγάλων δακτύλων τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ αἷμα ἀποξύσας χρίσον αὐτοῦ τὰ χεῖλη καὶ τὸ μέτωπον καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ ἀναστήσεται; cf. Theod. Prisc., *Physica* 6, p. 254, 9–11 Rose: 'in ipsis uero commotionibus, si sanguinem de eius pedem digitis elicias quoquo pacto, et eius frontem ex eo tangas et labia, continuo exsurget', and see Rose's apparatus here for other places where Theodorus may have been used by Alexander.

+— Contingit haec duplex passio cadentibus capillis, ut aliquando defectu quodam cadant et nudando partes capitis turpent. (2) Fit uero ophysis, quae, uelut serpentinis squamulis superficiem cutis mentiatur. (3) Alia uero uulneribus horridis plerunque uisibus occurrit, cuius foeditas uulpinis uulneribus exhibet similitudinem, quam alopiciam uocant.—+

Contingit haec in capite duplex passio cadentium capillorum, ut aliquando defectu quodam cadant et nudando partes capitis turpent, (cf. 3) aliquotiens ut eorum uulnerum horridus plerumque uisus occurrat. ergo defectus, ut prius diximus, cum contigerit caluitium facit. foeditas illa uero uulpini uulneris exhibet similitudinem, (cf. 2) ut etiam serpentis aliquando squamosi superficiem mentiatur.

+—+

(4) Fit autem passio ...

γίνεται γὰρ ...

A much longer supplement to the Greek text is inserted by the makers of the Latin Alexander at 1.131–5, between the end of *parotides* and the start of *synanche*. These chapters are composed very largely of miscellaneous extracts from Books 3 and 5 of Galen, *Περὶ συνθέσεως φαρμάκων τῶν κατὰ τόπους*,²⁵ interspersed with some other recipes apparently from other sources,²⁶ and some editorial intervention, including perhaps the particle *quippe* (prec. n.) and a mildly ridiculous summing up at the end of 1.131.²⁷

The longest supplements by far are the extracts in the middle of Book 2 from Philumenus on the stomach and intestines (2.79–103 ≈ 6.5 per cent of the Latin Alexander) and Philagrius on the spleen (2.104–50 ≈ 6.5 per cent of the Latin Alexander). These hardly require illustration, as they have attracted interest as the sole or principal fragments of two otherwise lost Greek doctors: both excerpts have been edited together twice, by Puschmann (in his *Nachträge*) and Mihăileanu respectively, and Philagrius separately by Masullo. In the absence of the Greek originals of the texts from which these extracts were drawn, comparisons may be made at most with surviving fragments of other works. With regard to the making of the Latin Alexander, an important question — which applies also to the Galen excerpts mentioned above — is whether our translator(s) excerpted a ready-made Latin translation or turned Greek excerpts into Latin as they worked. I am as yet unable to give anything like a definitive answer to this

²⁵ 12.678–9, 688–95, 807, 812, 816, 848–9, 853–61, 869, 882, 880, 877, 883–6 Kühn. There are some divergences between the Latin Alexander and Kühn's text of Galen, e.g. between 1.134 and Gal. 12.849, 15–17. Note that Book 3 of Galen's *κατὰ τόπους* is referred to also by the Greek Alexander, at II, 81, 24 = 1.114 Latin (12.603–4 Kühn); cf. II, 163, 18 = 2.13 Latin (Book 7, 13.43 K.), II, 293, 18 = 2.44 Latin (Book 8, 13.118 K.).

²⁶ For example, the prescriptions eight lines into 1.131 beginning (text of A): 'ad roborandum igitur caput hoc modo uteris. deraso quippe capiti imponendum est emplastrum diaiteon aut barbara ...': compare the pseudo-Galenic *Εὐπόριστα* (14.336 Kühn), Theod. Prisc. 1.42 p. 43, 15–44, 4: '... post rasuram uero emplastrum diaiteon aut barbaram imponendo'; Cass. Fel. 31.1 Fraisse (pp. 62, 16–63, 2 Rose): 'medicamentis desiccatoriis capiti praeraro impositis curabis, ut est diaiteon emplastrum aut barbara'.

²⁷ 'Manifestum est autem in his passionibus ut considerata uniuscuiusque corporis natura si nihil impediatur sanguis detrahatur. Etiam et catarticum dandum est et diaeta obseruanda est et caput radendum est et medicamentis desiccandum est et apoflegmatismi sunt adhibendi' (text of A). Cf. the misleading summary of Gal. 12.853, 17–854, 13K at the end of 1.134: 'alia igitur medicamenta aut stiptica sunt adhibenda quae reprimant aut certe quae digerant'.

question. My general impression is that in terms of their Latinity these excerpts have enough in common with each other and with parts at least (the stylistically higher parts) of the Latin Alexander to make it likely that the several translations belong closely together. In Chapters 4 and 5 below, I offer some particular comparisons and contrasts, but regretfully postpone a systematic study of the Latin Philumenus, the Latin Galen, and the Latin Philagrius transmitted with the Latin Alexander.

Here and there in the Latin Alexander are sizeable chunks of Latin material apparently additional to the Greek text but of unidentified origin. By way of illustration, I reproduce below two examples (constituting complete, if small chapters) from that part of Book 1 devoted to diseases of the eyes.

1.92 (text of A; just before II, 29, 6 Puschmann) +- Signa infraxis in oculis factae
 Infraxin autem humorum in oculis factam hoc modo cognosces. Cum tumore enim eleuantur fortiter, et sine uenarum sanguine plenae sunt existentiae, sed et tensionem sentiunt in ipsis oculis. Haec ergo signa ostendunt satis pinguiissimos humores infraxin fecisse in oculis.-+

1.95 (text of A; just before II, 31, 17 Puschmann) +- Signa qui flebotomari opus habent uel qui catartico purgari
 Ex sanguinis autem abundantia si fiat flegmon, siquidem absque tensura est repletus qui inflammatus est locus cum tumore magno plus a natura rubro colore. Multa autem fit cognitio. Lacrimatur enim et lippes facit. Fit enim tensio intolerabilis in profundo oculorum, ut simul exprimi et rumpi uideantur. et cum pulsu interdum subleuantur palpebrae et euertuntur; et uix mouentur et album oculi altius nigro fit. Hos autem tales mox flebotomabis. Si autem flegmaticus aut colericus aut melancholicus fuerit, his catharticum dandum est. Quorum signa sunt haec. Si flegmaticus sanguini mixtus sunt haec. Album colorem et rubrum permixtum habent simul. et media natura flegmati mixtus est sanguis; et magis in uespera accessiones fiunt per singulos dies. Colericus autem humor si fuerit, calor sentitur multus. Mordens autem quam plurime est et lacrimae subrubro colore et subflauae; et tertia die fit accessio. Quodsi melancholicus fuerit sanguis, accessiones quarto die magis consurgunt. Quomodo autem debeant agnosci, in podagricis passionibus dixi.-+

In the absence of direct or indirect evidence of an independent source, we cannot exclude the possibility that these passages, and others like them, were in the translator's copy of the Greek Alexander; indeed, the last four words of 1.95 (underlined above) constitute a plausible reference to the chapters on gout at the end of Book 2. Naturally, as in the reference to Theodorus in both Greek and Latin traditions quoted in n. 24 above, an explicit reference to another book may have been taken over by the translator from his Greek original. Again, we cannot exclude this for cases such as the alternative version of a recipe, not in Puschmann's text, in the middle of 1.84, which begins: '+- In duobus autem libris nouiter scriptis, haec confectio ita habetur ...-+'. Our best hope in such cases is to identify either a source that Alexander cannot have known or features of the content or the language that set them apart from the rest of the Latin Alexander, or both. I conclude this paragraph by quoting in full two further examples, this time from Book 2, of substantial pieces of unidentified additional material in the Latin Alexander, in order to increase the probability of the source, if extant, being identified.

2. 67²⁸ *ad fin.* (a continuation of the Greek chapter ending II, 397, 4 Puschmann; text of A)
 +—Itemque purgant simam epatis popondion herba mercurialis cum mite lateride cum oximelle
 camelea cum absintio et ydromelle potata, brassicae sucus datus, nitrum cum mulsa potatum,
 cyclamidis radix, lupinorum apozima, oleum, mel, nitrum, lactis serum galliae tusti ius, ciceris ius.
 Adiuuant haec diuturnas flegmonas quae fiunt in sima epatis. Et quae purgant cirtam epatis: nardus
 Celtica potata, amonii apozima, squinoantum, acori radix, agaricum cum uino et melle potatum,
 gentiana cum aqua potata, picci albi folia cum mulsa, lauri radice cortice cum uino oboli tres potati,
 reoponticum, gliciricae sucus cum sapa, quinquefolii sucus de radicibus, agni sperma, daucus, apii
 semen, petroselinum, bacani folia, cardamomum centaurea glicidis quae et pionia semen, anisus
 pefrigmenus, absintium, costum, opobalsamum, smirmis, fu, asarum, meu. Haec diuturnas aegritudines
 epatis, siue cum tumore aliquo fuerint, siue distemperantia sit, et dolores ex epate sanant.—+

2. 187 *ad fin.*—188 (a continuation of the Greek chapter ending II, 485, 19 Puschmann; text of A)
 +— ne pus coaguletur intus ad flegmonem uesicae et renium: lini seminis puluere .L ii. amilo .L i. dabis
 in aqua coclearium unum bibendum. Trociscus ad renium et uesicae ulcera et antidotum ad ulcera et
 uulnera et dolores in ipsis locis consistentes, quod mox subuenit, recipiens haec: pipere albo .L xx.
 iusquiamo .L xx. opio .L i. croco .L iii. peretro .L i. euforbio .L i. Haec quidem confectio Philonii
 antidotum est, cui addantur in confectio: cucumeris domestici semine .L vi. apii semine .L vi. conii
 semine .L iii. lappatii semine .L iii. amigdalidis amaris .L iii. feniculi semine .L iii. melle quod sufficit.
 Dabis autem sicut Philonium antidotum.

2. 188 +— De trociscis et antidotis ad renium et uesicae ulcera

Item dia fisallidon trociscus, qui facit ad nefreticos et ad ulcera in renibus et uesica: cucumeris
 domestici semine .L xii. feniculi semine .L vi. lappatii semine .L iii. nucleis pineis pefrigmenis .L iii.
 croco .L vi. opio .L iii. iusquiami albi semine .L iii. amigdalidis amaris pefrigmenis .L iii. fisallidon
 (quam Latini uesicaginem uocant) grana numero uiginti quinque, conii (id est cicute) semine .L iiiii.
 Cum sapa autem facies trociscos dragmeos, et dabis cum uino dulci, qui non februnt aut sapa, qui
 autem februnt, cum aqua tepida. Facit ergo hic trociscus ad renium et uesicae passions, quibus pus
 cum urina redditur aut sanguis aut muccis simile aut sablonis cum urina iactant ex multo calore.
 Qui autem in uesica aut in uritra ulcera aut uulnus habent, inities per uritram (id est uirgam) cum lacte
 asinino aut muliebri aut cum sapa.—+

A second type of demonstrable Latin addition to the content of the Greek Alexander that merits a brief word here is the glossing, or more elaborate explication, of technical terms and concepts which are employed, usually without explanation,²⁹ in the Greek original. An extended example is seen in the explanation of the three types of blood-loss at 2.158 (for the Greek and Latin texts, see 4.10.5 below), but there are at least a dozen such instances in Book 2 alone. Usually, these involve either simply highlighting that the word is Greek, as e.g. at 2.181: ‘quod Graeci pentafileon uocant’ (cf. II, 465, 21: τῆς πενταφύλλου βοτάνης),³⁰ or providing a Latin gloss or terminological equivalent, as e.g. at 1.143 (text of A): ‘in epyzogoto membrano, id est in omento uel cingulo quo circumdantur latera’ (cf. II, 229, 4: τοῦ τᾶς πλευρᾶς

²⁸ Other divergences between the Latin and Greek versions of this chapter are set out on p. 23 above.

²⁹ Note, however, e.g. 2.258: ‘ad eos (*scil.* neruos) quos Graeci ankilas uocant’ (beside II, 539, 32: τὰς καλουμένας ἀγκυλώσεις); 2. 266: ‘cerota de opio confecta quae et ciliogrisa Graeci uocant’ (beside II, 561, 18: ἄς οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ χιλιόχρυσους καλεῖν ἄξιόνισιν).

³⁰ At 1.144, the Latin Alexander provides a second Greek synonym that is absent from Puschmann’s text at least: (text of A) ‘peganisa +—quam quidam diapegason appellat—+ ... potest ... digerere’ (cf. II, 233, 27: ἡ πηγαερὰ καλουμένη ... διαφορεῖν δύναται).

ὑπεζωκότος ὑμένος), again usually with an explicit reference to Greek terminology, as e.g. at 2.197: ‘Cognosces igitur uesicam scabram esse quod Graeci propriasin uocant ...’ (cf. II, 491, 12: Διαγίνωσκε τὴν ψωρίασιν τῆς κύστεως ...); 2.204: ‘multi eorum flegmaticum et quem Graeci yalodem, id est similem uitro, flegmatis secessum faciunt’ (cf. II, 337, 29–30: πλεῖστοι δ’ αὐτῶν τὸν φλεγματώδη καὶ τὸν ὑαλώδη μάλλον ἐκκρίνουσι χυμόν); 2.269: ‘potiones ad podagras quae sine dolore faciunt quas Graeci anodinas uocant’ (cf. II, 569, 2: πρὸς τὰς ποδαγρικός ἀνωδυνίας ποτά). A more elaborate case is seen in the treatment of Greek ὀρ(ρ)ώδης, which receives a rudimentary etymology at 2.42 (below), and occurs twice more at 2.249.³¹

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| II, 289, 29–30 +--+ | 2.42 +– Orus dicitur serus, id est ab humore pingui si tenuis decurrat; sic et liquidus humor a pingui defluens a Graecis orodis appellatur.–+ Quodsi orodis fuerit, id est tenuis a pingui fluens humore in uentrem non oportet remorari |
|------------------------|--|

In a third, straightforward but welcome and useful sort of case, the ‘extra’ material was not added to the Latin version but lost from the Greek. In fortunate circumstances, the Latin version makes it probable or certain that the translator’s Greek text contained words lost through a mechanical copying error in an ancestor of the surviving Greek manuscripts. A clear example of this is the absence of the Greek words corresponding to the end of 1.145 and the very start of 1.146 (see the comparison below) caused by a *saut du même au même* from σύμπτωμα (Latin *simptoma*) to σύμπτωμα (Latin *accidentia*).

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.145 <i>ad fin.</i> Sic ergo oportet pleureticis si non aliud aliquid adsit simptoma +– quod prohibeat praedicto ordine fieri adiutoria. | II, 239, 14–17 οὕτως οἷν διαιτῶν δεῖ τοὺς πλευριτικούς, εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο τι παρῆι σύμπτωμα +– |
| 1.146 De uentris fluxu pleuresis Quodsi ut saepius contingere solet e contrario agat accidentia,–+ tunc oportet et adhuc insistere, quale est si cum dolore flegmone laterum non secundum naturam uenter excernat sed inordinate | –+καὶ τότε δεῖ καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο ἐνίστασθαι, οἶον, εἰ συμβῆ μετὰ τοῦ ὀδύνην εἶναι καὶ φλεγμονὴν περὶ τὸ πλευρὸν, μὴ κατὰ φύσιν ἐκκρίνειν τὴν γαστέρα, ἀλλ’ ἀτάκτως, |

³¹ At 2.249, first it is glossed with Latin *aquosus*, then in the very next sentence it recurs in a *quod Graeci uocant* formula, where Puschmann’s text has not ὀρρώδης but λεπτός: 2.249: ‘dandum est catarticum quod possit educere pingue et spissum flegma et non orode id est aquosum et tenue urinae simile, quemadmodum multi faciunt dantes lacterides et opos titimali et cnidium coccum admiscentes et sic euacuant tenuiores humores quos Graeci orodes uocant’ (II, 521, 5–7: τὸ δυνάμενον ἐλκύσαι παχὺ φλέγμα καὶ ὀρρώδες, ὡσπερ ποιοῦσι πολλοὶ λαθυρίδας τε καὶ ὀπὸν τιθυμάλλου καὶ Κνίδιον κόκκον παρέχοντες αὐτοῖς, οἱ τὰ λεπτὰ κενοῦντες ῥέυματα).

2.4.3. MATERIAL IN THE GREEK ORIGINAL MISSING FROM THE LATIN VERSION

The converse of the glossing of Greek terms, touched on in the last paragraph, is seen in the translator's removal (sensible enough) of the Greek apology for the use of a Latin term. So, for example, 'barley-water' referred to by the Latin term at II, 191, 21: τῶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις καλουμένῳ φαριχύλῳ, appears in the Latin version simply as *sucus farris* (2.168: 'Non autem praesenti tisan<a> suco uteris farris'). Other minor omissions of Greek material we have already seen illustrated (e.g. on pp. 21–2 above). In this section, I wish to draw attention to three types of omission on a larger scale, and in particular the reduction of material devoted to theory and to magic, respectively.

Some substantial cuts amount to the omission of whole discussions of particular diseases. This is true of internal abscesses and hiccoughs (both originally in Book 7 of the Greek), of dysentery and paralysis (which constitute Book 10 in the Greek manuscripts), of tertian, quotidian, and quartan fever (about the last 40 per cent of the book on fevers), and, on a smaller scale, of ἄνθρακες of the eye (II, 59, 1–65, 28, between 1.104 and 1.105). These chapters were either absent from the translator's text, or omitted by editorial decision, whether because they were thought to be insufficiently important, or because other treatises on these subjects were available and preferred. The latter was probably the reason for the omission of Alexander on dysentery, as this disease is covered in the extracts from Philumenus on the stomach and intestines.

Other large omissions occur in lists of remedies in the Greek text which (presumably) seemed excessively long. In Puschmann's edition no fewer than fifteen pages are occupied by treatments for epilepsy, conventional (I, 545–57) and magical (I, 557–75), of which the Latin version lacks most of the second half of the latter (I, 567, 18–573, 14), resuming about a page from home and then translating to the end. A similar pattern is seen in remedies against coughing, which also claim fifteen pages of the Greek text (II, 157–85). Of these pages the Latin version translates the first five (II, 157, 1–167, 2), and then cuts almost ten pages of Greek, retaining only the very last two recipes in this very long chapter (II, 185, 26–34).

It is important to note that, while the remedies against epilepsy are mixed, conventional and magical, none of the treatments prescribed by Alexander for coughing are labelled as φυσικά, 'natural', medico-magical remedies: in this case at least, the abbreviation of the Greek text was not prompted by the desire to eliminate unconventional therapies from the Latin version. Thorndike observes correctly (*History*, I, 584) that the Latin Alexander omits 'many, although not all, of the chapters devoted to physical ligatures', but overstates her case in concluding that 'the early medieval translator and adapter, instead of retaining and emphasizing the superstition of the past, has largely purged his text of it'. It is true that the majority of the Greek medico-magical passages discussed by Thorndike (*History*, I, 579–84) do not appear in the Latin version,³² but enough magic survives in the Latin to throw serious doubt on the very

³² Note for example the substantial portions of Greek text absent from the Latin Alexander at 1.73 (I, 567, 18–573, 14) and 2.184 (II, 473, 28–475, 24).

idea of a deliberate purging. This is illustrated not only by the chapters on epilepsy outlined above (1.71–2) but also in the last three chapters on the treatment of colic (2.232–4), which open, also in the Latin version, with an acknowledgement of the need to say something about magical remedies. I reproduce both versions side by side below.

II, 375, 11 Puschmann

Cf. 1. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῶν περιοδομένων πολλοὶ καὶ μάλιστα τῶν πλουσίων οὔτε πίνειν ὄλως θέλουσι φάρμακον οὔτε κλύσματος θεραπεύειν τὴν γαστέρα, **διὰ δὲ περιάπτων φυσικῶν ἀναγκάζουσιν ἡμᾶς ἀποπαύειν αὐτῶν τὴν ὀδύνην**, ἐσπούδασα καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐκθέσθαι ὑμῖν, ὧν τε αὐτὸς ἔσχον πείραν καὶ ὅσα παρὰ φίλων ἀληθινῶν ἔγνων ὠφελεῖν δύνασθαι.

+—καὶ τοὺς ἀρίστους δὲ τῶν παλαιῶν εὕρομεν μαρτυρήσαντας, ὅπως μηδὲ ἡ τέχνη ἄπειρος εἶναι νομισθῆ καὶ ἀσυμπαθῆς μήτε οἱ περιοδεύοντες ἀφιλόκαλοί τε καὶ ἀσυμπαθεῖς εἶναι δόξωσιν, ὡς ἀγνοοῦντες τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἀσυμπαθῆ τε καὶ συμπαθῆ.—+

Cf. t. Περίαιπτα φυσικὰ πρὸς τοὺς κωλικὴν ἔχοντας διάθεσιν

+— Περίαιπτον ἀδιάπτωτον, οὗ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔσχομεν πείραν καὶ πάντες δὲ ὀλίγου δεῖν ἄριστοι τῶν ἰατρῶν εὐδοκίμησαν. —+

Cf. 2. λαβῶν ἀφόδευμα λύκου, εἰ δυνατὸν, ἔχον ὀστάρια κατάκλεισον εἰς σωληνάριον καὶ δὸς φορεῖν περὶ τὸν δεξιὸν βραχίονα ἢ μηρὸν ἢ ὀσφὺν ἐν τῷ παροξυσμῷ κατὰ τοῦ ἀλλοῦντος μέρους φυλαττόμενος, ὡς μήτε τῆς γῆς μήτε λουτροῦ θίγειν.

Cf. 4. Ἄλλο καὶ αὐτὸ διὰ πείρας. Κορυδαλὸς ἐσθιόμενος τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ καλῶς. οἱ δὲ Θρᾶκες ἔτι ζῶντος τοῦ κορυδαλοῦ ἐξαιροῦντες τὴν καρδίαν περίαιπτον ποιοῦσιν ἐν τῷ μηρῷ τῷ ἀριστερῷ περιθέντες αὐτό.

2.232 (text of A)

t. De fisis [et] ligaturis et potionibus et caracteribus ad colum

1. Quoniam multi qui colum patiuntur et maxime diuites neque ex toto aliquid bibere uolunt neque iniectionem sibi consentiunt fieri, propterea **nesesse est nobis de fisis ligaturis aut caracteribus aliqua dicere**. Quae si fiant mox relaxari solent uel amputari dolores et ideo ea quae ab antiquis uel postea a nobis probata sunt scribere non omittam et quae resistunt et patientibus colum praebent remedium.

+— II, 375, 16–22 —+

2. In primis ergo accipiens fimum lupi — et si possibile est ex eo qui ossa comedit — claudes in testeo uase et ligabis in dextro brachio aut in humero id est collo aut ad coxas suspendes in ipsa commotione doloris. Obseruabis autem ut neque terram tangat neque in balneum secum ferat.

3. Item aliud.³³

Et hoc experimentatum est. Corallium habens incendes et teres et quantum sunt coclearia duo aut tria ieiuno potum dabis per dies tres aut quattuor. Facit enim bene ad colicas passiones.

4. Item aliud.³⁴ Hoc ipsum corallium acceptum in cibo sanat. Item aliud. Qui autem scindunt eum et cor eius sublatur appendunt in coxa sinistra carent coli dolore

³³ The following is recipe 2/4 in 2.233.

³⁴ The following are recipes 3/4 and 4/4 in 2.233.

+Ἄλλο φυσικὸν δεδοκιμασμένον.
Χοίρου λαβὼν ἐκ τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐντέρου τὸ
μασθοειδές, σμυρνιασας και ἐνδύσας
δέρματι λυκίῳ ἢ κυνίῳ δίδου φορεῖν ἐν
ἀποκρούσει σελήνης και θαυμασίεις.—+

Cf. 5. Ἄλλο περίαπτον.
Εἰς λίθον Μηδικὸν γλύψον Ἡρακλέα
ὀρθὸν πνίγοντα λέοντα και ἐγκλείσας εἰς
δακτυλίδιον χρυσοῦν δίδου φορεῖν.

Cf. 3. Τὸ αὐτὸ πάλιν.
Κορυδαλὸς καιόμενος και λειούμενος και
διδόμενος, ὅσον κοχλιάρια β' ἢ γ',
προποτιζόμενος ἐφ' ἡμέρας γ' ἢ δ' ποιεῖ
πάνυ πρὸς κωλικὰς διαθέσεις.

Cf. 7. Ἄλλο λίαν δραστικόν.
Παιδίου ὀλίγον ἐκτιμηθέντος ὀμφαλοῦ εἰς
ἀργυροῦν ἢ χρυσοῦν ἐγκλειςον μεθ' ἄλλος
ὀλίγου. ὁ φορῶν τὸ περίαπτον τοῦτο ἄπνοος
ἔσται εἰς τὸ παντελές.

Cf. 8. Ἄλλο·
Αἴγειον ἤπαρ καύσας λείωσον και δὸς πειεῖν
μετ' οἴνου· πάνυ βοηθεῖ αὐτοῖς.

+Δακτύλιος πρὸς τὸ αὐτό.
Λαβὼν δακτύλιον σιδηροῦν ποιήσον
γενέσθαι τὸ κρικέλλιον αὐτοῦ ὀκτάγωνον
και οὕτως ἐπίγραφε εἰς τὸ ὀκτάγωνον ...
... γινέσθω δὲ ὁ προῦποτυπωθεῖς δακτύλιος
ιζ' τῆς σηλήνης ἢ κα'.—+

Cf. 6. Ἄλλο φυσικὸν ποιοῦν πρὸς κῶλον διὰ
πεύρας.
Λαβὼν λύκου ἀφόδευμα τρίσας χνοωδέ-
στατον πάνυ και σήσας δίδου τῷ κάμνοντι
εἰς ὕδωρ θερμὸν κοχλιαρίου τὸ s''.

+ Gk II, 377, 1–4 —+

(*ed.* 2.234 De lapide medicon)

5. Item aliud.
De lapide medicon sculpens in eo Heraclea[m]
rectum suffocantem leonem includes in anulo
aureo et dabis ad utendum in digito et sanus
erit

6. Item aliud.³⁵
Physicum faciens ad colum experimentatum
est ualde. Lupi fimum terens in subtilissimum
puluerem cernes et dabis patienti in aqua calida
coclearium in mesum.

(*ed.* 2.233 De characteribus)

7. Item aliud ualde bonum.³⁶
Accipiens nascente infante modicum de inciso
umbilico eius includes in argento aut aureo
metallo. Hoc enim secum portans sine dolore
erit semper.

8. Item aliud (Gk II, 377, 16).³⁷
Caprae epar ustulans teres et dabis bibendum
cum uino. Satis enim iuuat hoc +—et amputat
coli dolorem.³⁸ —+

+ Gk II, 377, 18–28 —+

This longish comparison not only illustrates the survival of magic in the Latin version, but also offers another extended example of how different the Latin may be from the Greek,³⁹ in terms both of arrangement and of content: notice especially the content of Section 1.⁴⁰

Another possible criterion for the shortening of the Greek original — whether by a Greek redactor or by the maker of the Latin Alexander — may have been a prejudice in

³⁵ The following is recipe 2/3 in 2.234.

³⁶ The first four words not in *ed.*; the following is recipe 1/4 in 2.233.

³⁷ The following is recipe 3/3 in 2.234.

³⁸ Here *ed.* repeats from end 2.232: 'Obseruabis autem ut neque terram tangat neque in balneum secum ferat'.

³⁹ To say nothing of divergences within the Latin tradition: see preceding nn.

⁴⁰ The numbering of sections here is to be regarded for the moment as purely ad hoc.

favour of purely factual and practical medicine matched by a consistent lack of concern for medical theory or debate. Such leanings are implied quite generally by the nature and form of those medical texts selected for translation and copying in the medieval West. Writing of the High Middle Ages, Danielle Jacquart observes⁴¹ that ‘[l]a principale carence des textes véhiculés au Haut Moyen Age réside dans la quasi-absence d’un propos théorique’. She cites Alexander as an example, and characterizes the Latin translations of his *Therapeutica* and of the *Euporista* and *Synopsis* of Oribasius as ‘compendia à usage pratique’. The observation gains in force when one notes that frequently even those limited passages on theory in the original do not appear in the Latin version. In view of the importance of the Latin Alexander as a witness for the Greek text, this is regrettable — regardless of one’s taste concerning what constitutes more and less interesting medical prose — as the missing material includes quotations from, allusions to, and discussions of doctrines of important medical predecessors of Alexander, as well as personal reflections on his approach to healing and anecdotes from his own practice. There is an important example in the chapters on coughing (edited in Chapter 5 below), where, while the Latin version contains the case of the man who coughed up a stone,⁴² it omits twenty lines of Greek containing Alexander’s famous criticism of Galen using Galen’s own words of criticism of Archigenes, and Alexander’s assertion, quoting Aristotle, of the overriding importance of truth over authority (II, 155, 2–22 Puschmann). At 1.58, on diet in the treatment of *phrenitis*, the Latin version has the opening sentence criticizing the ignorance of many doctors in this regard (‘Multi enim ignorantes cibos ministrant, et nesciunt utrum potius laedant aut sanent’), but then jumps directly to Alexander’s first prescription (‘Mox ergo a primordio ptisanæ sucus ministrandus est bene coctus’), omitting the fairly rhetorical tirade against contemporary doctors, which includes a reference to Galen and an appeal to personal experience (I, 521, 23–523, 7 Puschmann).

A particularly good example of severe compression of the Greek text at the expense of discursive, personal anecdotal material, so as to leave a bare minimum of functional statements, is the Preface to Cosmas at the start of Book 3 of the Latin Alexander (Book 12 of the Greek manuscripts). Much of what the Latin tradition presents as the Preface is in fact the first section on ephemeral fevers (I, 291 Puschmann). In fact, the interesting and colourful Greek preface, which contains important information about Alexander’s practice and the circumstances and intended style of composition of the promised work, is reduced to barely a quarter of its length in the Latin. See the comparison below.

| The Greek dedication to Cosmas | The Latin dedication to Cosmas |
|---|---|
| I, 289 Puschmann Αιτήσαντί σοι, Κοσμᾶ φίλτατε, τὰς ἐκ πείρας ἡμῶν πολλάκις ἀνυσθείσας — ἐπὶ διαφόρων νοσημάτων — | 3. pr. (text of <i>ed.</i>) Petisti a me, carissime Cosma, ut — de diuersis passionibus — membrorum et |

⁴¹ Jacquart, ‘Transmission’, 253.

⁴² Albeit with a disastrous mistranslation, 2.11.5 ‘ita defunctus est’ for II, 155, 1 ἂν ἀπόλετο.

ἐκθέσθαι θεραπείας ἐτοίμως ὑπήκουσα
 χάριτας ἀμφοτέρους εἰκότως ὁμολογῶν σοί
 +—τε καὶ τῷ σῷ πατρὶ τῆς εἰς ἐμὲ παρ'
 ὑμῶν φιλοφρόνως ἐκάστοτε γενομένης
 εὐνοίας· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐθὺς οὐ μόνον
 ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς τέχνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν
 κατὰ βίον πραγμάτων ἀπάντων δεξιὸς
 ὑπουργὸς ἐγένετο· σὺ δὲ μετὰ βαρβάρων τὴν
 ἀναστροφὴν μὲν ποιούμενος διὰ τὴν τῶν
 βιασαμένων ἡμᾶς πραγμάτων περιστάσιν
 παριδεῖν οὐκ ἐκαρτέρησας· διὸ καὶ γέρων
 λοιπὸν πειθαρχῶ καὶ κάμνειν οὐκέτι
 δυνάμενος τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον ἔγραψα
 συντάξας τὰς μετὰ πολλῆς τριβῆς ἐν ταῖς
 τῶν ἀνθρώπων νόσοις καταληφθεῖσας
 πείρας, τέρπει δὲ πολλοὺς εὖ οἶδα τῶν εἰς
 φθόνον μὴ θελόντων βλέπειν τό τε
 εὐμέθοδον τῶν θεωρημάτων καὶ τὸ σύντομον
 ἅμα καὶ σαφὲς τῆς λέξεως. ἐσπούδασα γὰρ,
 ὡς ἐνδέχεται, κοιναῖς καὶ μάλλον εὐδήλοις
 χρῆσασθαι λέξεσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσιν
 ἐκ τῆς φράσεως εὐλυτον εἴη τὸ σύνταγμα.

*februm generalibus tibi signa—+ et
 curationes breuiter exponerem. Obediens
 ergo petitioni tuae in utroque me parare
 confiteor +—et inceptum possibile est de
 februm diuersitatibus signa et curationes
 breui stilo scribam.*

This is not so much a translation as a bare-bones summary. It is interesting to note the addition of *signa* (twice, in the clumsily-repeated *signa et curationes*) and even more so the introduction of fevers (also repeated). The repeated mention of fevers here suggests that the maker of the Latin Preface was trying to make sense of the placement of the Greek Preface in his exemplar towards the end of the work and immediately before the book on fevers; the Greek Preface, on the other hand, makes no mention of fevers and implies that it is introducing a medical work of much broader scope (note especially I, 289, 1–2: +— τὰς ἐκ πείρας ἡμῖν πολλάκις ἀνυσθείσας —+ ἐπὶ διαφόρων νοσημάτων +— —+ ἐκθέσθαι θεραπείας, and 9–10: τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον ἔγραψα συντάξας τὰς μετὰ πολλῆς τριβῆς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων νόσοις καταληφθεῖσας πείρας); on the implications of this for the original arrangement of the work, see above (p. 17). With regard to the apparent elimination of original Greek material, we can be thankful that not every passage as engaging and personal as this appears so reduced in the Latin version!

If excisions of this sort make sense in a recension aimed at distilling the practical at the expense of the theoretical or discursive, on other occasions the Latin version lacks material which ought to have commended itself for out-and-out practical purposes, including differential diagnosis and lessons to be learned from case-histories. So, for example, at 1.54, the Latin version lacks the section on how to distinguish phrenitis from delirium (οἱ παραφρονοῦντες), on the one hand, and madness (οἱ μαινόμενοι), on the other. The Latin implies that there is a condition that resembles but is not phrenitis, but gives a (flawed) translation of only the last sentence of the Greek chapter headed Πῶς χρῆ διορίζειν τοὺς παραφρονοῦντας ἀπὸ τῶν φρενιτικῶν; (I, 511, 21), as in the comparison below.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>I, 513, 4 Puschmann +... ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ σημειᾶ τῶν κυρίως φρενιτικῶν, ἐφ' ὧν καὶ ξανθὴ χολῆ μόνη στηριχθεῖσα ἀνευ ἄλλης ὕλης τὴν διάθεσιν εἰργάσατο, → ὥσπερ εἰ μιχθεῖη τῇ ξανθῇ χολῇ φλέγμα, νόθη φρενίτις ἢ τοιαύτη καλεῖται καὶ τὸ καλούμενον ἐργάζεται ἀγρυπνον κῶμα.</p> | <p>1.54 <i>ad fin.</i> (text of A) +... → Quodsi mixta fuerint rubea colera flegmati, et haec uocatur frenesis, quia exinde insomnietas fit corporis, sed non est uera frenesis.</p> |
|---|---|

Again, at 1.83, on the treatment of melancholia, although we have in Latin the case of the woman who believed she had swallowed a snake, we lack the famous case⁴³ (preceding in the Greek, I, 605, 26–607, 5) attributed to the great Hellenistic doctor Phylotimus⁴⁴ of the curing of the man who thought he had been beheaded for being a tyrant.

Broadly-characterized recommendations or prescriptions for treatment couched in general terms, although of obvious practical value in the right hands, may have been perceived as quasi-theoretical, or at least insufficiently specific, and are on occasion omitted from the Latin version. So, for example, at 1.44 the Latin Alexander is innocent of the elegant last four lines, beginning καθ' ὄλου εἰπεῖν, on general principles to be observed in the treatment of chronic headache (I, 499, 1–4 Puschmann). Similarly, at 2.202 the Latin Alexander lacks the last twelve lines on the treatment of 'gonorrhoea' (II, 497, 24–499, 10 Puschmann), which also begin καθόλου (was this a signal to the translator to switch off?) and speak almost entirely of classes of foods and medicaments (those which cool, those which dry, etc.).

Surely of no less practical value from the point of view of the user/reader are programmatic statements about diseases to be discussed in coming chapters, such as the long list of eye-diseases at II, 31, 12–16. If these were in the original Greek text, they are absent from the end of 1.94 of the Latin version, on the treatment of constriction of the 'pores' of the eye (πύκνωσις).

Occasionally, one wonders whether the content of some missing material was the reason for its omission. At 1.139, for example, there is no trace of the twenty-eight lines of Greek (II, 137, 17–139, 14) on the preparation and use of human faeces as an ingredient in remedies for the treatment of angina. A few lines earlier, Alexander actually anticipates patients' (and perhaps doctors') refusal to use this ingredient: II, 137, 11–13: εἰ δέ τινες διὰ τὸ βδελυρὸν παραιτοῦνται χρῆσθαι τῇ ἀνθρωπιᾷ κόπρω, ἀρκοῦσι καὶ τὰ δύο μόνα, καὶ τὸ ἐλατήριον καὶ ἡ κυνεία κόπρος διαχριομένη. Alexander's assurance that the prepared juice of the squirting-cucumber and canine faeces suffice on their own might have suggested this excision to a squeamish redactor. Equally, at 2.203, the chapter on priapism, one wonders whether the sexual content of the missing lines (II, 499, 18–24, including references to pornography and to a case of a posthumous priapic erection) may account for their omission. The aversion to more theoretical statements may explain the absence of the last five lines of this chapter (II, 501, 2–6, from πάνυ γάρ), the redactor perhaps overlooking the specific physiotherapy recommended at the very end.

⁴³ It is reported also by Galen (19, 701) and Aëtius (6.9).

⁴⁴ More often written 'Philotimus', also by Puschmann. On the spelling, see von Staden, *Herophilus*, 48 n. 32.

Finally, we have to reckon in certain instances with purely accidental loss of original material, at whatever stage of the tradition. At 1.83, for example, the chapter on the treatment of melancholia (mentioned above for omission of another sort), the case-history of the second woman, rendered melancholic by her husband's long absence, is cut abruptly short: in the Latin Alexander, between the phrases 'Quam ego hac ratione curavi' and 'In primis scilicet catharticum dedi', we have lost the equivalent of about a page of Puschmann's text (I, 607, 12–609, 11), detailing the sudden cure of the woman thanks to the sudden reappearance of the husband,⁴⁵ and containing also the start of a new chapter, on chronic cases of melancholy. However the mistake was made in the first place, it was not apparent to superficial scrutiny — the reader was expecting some form of treatment for the melancholic woman — and hence the slip was allowed to stand until it was irrecoverable. A second example of apparently accidental loss is seen at 2.204 (on colic). A comparable amount of Greek text — just over a page of Puschmann — appears to have been lost. Latin manuscript A (closely matched by *ed.*) has:

Fit (*scil.* colica passio) et per alia multa, et non solum +- (Gk II, 335, 19–337, 25) +- flegmate imposito in intestino grauitas esse sentitur.

This time, the result — with the abrupt jump from causes to symptoms — is more obviously nonsensical in the Latin version, and so more probably the consequence of an accident within the Latin tradition.

It is probably fair to conclude that material was lost from the Greek Alexander in the processes of recension (in Greek and/or Latin) and translation (into Latin) sometimes by accident and sometimes as a result of deliberate excision. Some deliberate omissions were probably in some degree principled. Their main effects have been to shorten excessively long lists of remedies and to reduce the numbers of generalities, of theoretical and other discursive comments, and of magical remedies surviving in the Latin Alexander. If these were also deliberate policies, none has been carried through systematically. It bears to be stressed again that it is normally unclear — and in many cases probably unknowable — whether a given excision occurred among the ancestors of the Greek exemplar used by the maker(s) of the Latin Alexander, or in the preparation of that text for translation, or in subsequent editing of the first Latin version.

2.5. THE DATE AND PLACE OF ORIGIN OF THE LATIN VERSION

There is to my knowledge no external evidence as to where the Latin Alexander was made, or by whom. As to the question when, the only hard and fast *terminus ante quem* is the date of the earliest Latin manuscript copy, Par. lat. 9332 (my P1), around A.D. 800. Nevertheless, many scholars have pronounced more or less tentatively on these questions — presumably on the basis of probability and circumstantial evidence, for no arguments are produced — and a fairly firm consensus appears to have

⁴⁵ Note that the Greek Alexander, unlike the Latin (with 'ego curavi'), takes no credit for the cure.

emerged that the Latin Alexander was made soon after the Greek original (whenever that was!),⁴⁶ and in Ravenna or Rome.⁴⁷

This is certainly plausible enough a priori, given what we know of the production of medical literature in Latin in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. Hard evidence for the medical establishment in this period is slight in the extreme, but from the few hints that we do have ‘there can be no doubt that in the history of early mediaeval medicine Ravenna in the 6th century played a very important part’, as important as ‘a Western Roman Alexandria’.⁴⁸ One or two other known centres of medical learning and activity (such as Monte Cassino) may offer themselves as possible alternatives, but as MacKinney stresses,⁴⁹ it was ‘Ravenna and other *non-monastic* [emphasis implicit in the original] centres that took the lead in the translation of Greek medical texts and their transmission to the Latin West’. The connection of the Latin Oribasius with Ravenna was posited by Mørland (Oribasius, 191–2) on the strength of direct and indirect references to Ravenna in the text. This connection is now widely accepted, and more recently other late Latin medical texts have also been attributed to the putative output of the Ravenna redactors and translators, notably the Latin Galen.⁵⁰ If, as may be the case, we can establish close linguistic links between the Latin Alexander and the Latin Oribasius, we may perhaps suppose that they were made close together in time and space. However, in the absence of external evidence as to when and where the Latin Alexander at least was made, the best — really the only — way forward is through close linguistic study, and comparisons with other texts, on the basis of a sound text.

⁴⁶ Relative datings are offered by e.g. Rose, *Anecdota*, II, 108 (‘an alter dem griechischen original fast gleich’); Sigerist, *Rezeptliteratur*, 15 (‘schon zu Lebzeiten’); Ieraci Bio, ‘Interferenze’, 285 (‘quasi coeva all’autore’) — all three begging the question of Alexander’s own dates. Absolute datings range only from the sixth to the seventh century A.D.: cf. e.g. Wellmann, ‘Alex. Trall.’, 1461 (‘wohl noch im 6. Jhd.’); Ieraci Bio, ‘Trasmissione’, 195 (sixth century), eadem, ‘Interferenze’, 285, and ‘Centri’, 28 (sixth–seventh century); Sudhoff, ‘Unterricht’, 32 (after A.D. 600); Seidler, 45 (‘im 7. Jahrhundert’). To the best of my knowledge, the earliest dating is that implied by Rose’s comparison (*Anecdota*, II, 45) of the language of the Latin Alexander with that of the early sixth-century treatise on dietetics by the exiled Byzantine doctor Anthimus (the *De obseruatione ciborum*, prefaced with a letter to Theoderic, king of the Franks (r. A.D. 474–526); further references in Langslow, *Medical Latin*, 67).

⁴⁷ Mørland, ‘Nachträge’, 92, 93, (followed by Beccaria, ‘Sulle tracce’, II, 59) associates the excerpts from Philagrius and Philumenus with the ‘Ravenna-Kreis’, and this association is made for the Latin Alexander as a whole by MacKinney, *Medicine*, 218; Mazzini, ‘secoli V e VI’, 435 n. 10; Ieraci Bio, ‘Trasmissione’, 195, and ‘Interferenze’, 285 (in the latter article with the qualification ‘o comunque all’asse Roma-Ravenna’); and more cautiously by Cavallo, ‘Cultura Scritta’, 99 (‘non si può escludere che, come per quella di Oribasio (e di Dioscuride?), ne sia stata sede la stessa Ravenna’). Rome is favoured as the place of origin of the Latin Alexander by Sudhoff, ‘Unterricht’, 32; Riché, 185; and Vázquez-Buján, 670.

⁴⁸ Sigerist, ‘Latin med. lit.’, 135.

⁴⁹ MacKinney, *Medicine*, 52.

⁵⁰ See Mazzini and Palmieri, 286–7, 294–6.