

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, α (4.1), to the latest recension, that of ϕ , 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 ϕ (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. α : 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 un conjecturable 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 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\kappa\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \xi\zeta\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$, and at 2.236.5 the negative $\omicron\upsilon$. 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 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ (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 *Tereperica*,

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 χρω̄, ἔνδοθεν μὲν τοῖς ἀδήκτοις καὶ πραϋτάτοις ἔξωθεν δὲ τοῖς συμπέττειν δυναμένοις τὰς φλεγμονὰς.¹
- 2.236.5 The omission of the negative before *mediocris commotio* for Gk II, 503, 1 οὐ μετρίουσ ἐργάζεται τοὺς παροξυσμούς: 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.t. *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 <μᾶλλον 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 ἠδυνήθη τοῦ βήσσειν ἰσχυρῶς ἀπαλλαγῆναι: 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 ἰχθύων τοὺς πετραίους μάλιστα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, οἷς ἡ οὐσία λευκὴ καὶ ψαφάρὰ κατὰ φύσιν καὶ οὐδὲν ἔχουσα πιμελωδὲς)

¹ Nearly all the Latin manuscripts also ignore ἔξωθεν δέ, having just *intrinsicus qui digerere possint flegmones*; three, however, have ‘inside or outside’ (*intrinsicus uel extrinsicus* G1 Ma *interius uel exterius* Ge); and one, P3, has *extrinsicus* 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 λευκή) and *duras* in the mainstream tradition wrong (and *duras* is surely not for the second Greek adjective ψαφάρως ‘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*, respectively³) 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 II, 281, 6 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συγκοπῆναι κινδυνεύουσιν)

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 (ἀλμυρόν).

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 diuersarum causarum* (causarum *om.* P1): *diuersis causis* Ox P3
 φ po diuersis *cett.* (Gk II, 501, 8–9 ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων αἰτιῶν)

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 infert et magnos dolores: inferit*
 P1 v1 *inferet* M L2⁷ (Gk II, 501, 22–3 καὶ τῶ φλέγειν ἅμα καὶ διατείνειν ἐπιφέρειν οἶδε 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 infert 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 quaerant ex alio codice quae ad oculorum curationes sunt utilia: om.* P1 M (Gk II, 3, 8–9 ὥστε τὸν ἐντυγχάνοντα τῷδε τῷ βιβλίῳ θεραπευτικῶ ὄντι(?) μὴ ζητεῖν ἐξ ἑτέρων ἀναλέγεσθαι περὶ(?) τῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς 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 φλεγμονὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐκ πάντων τούτων ὑποπτεῦειν ἡμᾶς περὶ τὸν πνεῦμονα γεγενῆσθαι προσήκει)

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 . . . θερμῆς αἴσθησις αὐτῶ γίνοιτο πολλὴ περὶ τὸν θώρακα, ὥστε 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=propterea quod* in Diosc. (Svennung, *Palladius*, 396f.) — cf. the reading of M here: does *pro hoc* recur in M? in other manuscripts?).

⁶ See Hofmann and Szantyr, 267 and, on the dubious instance at Scrib. Larg. 21, p. 22, 4–5, Langslow, *Medical Latin*, 52.

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 cercnon patiuntur: sonum aliquem O Ma *fortasse recte*, sonum aliquid P1 sonum aliquod M aliquid P3' (Gk II, 153, 2–4 καὶ οὔτε ἀναπτύουσιν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ψόφον τινὰ οὐδὲ κέρχνον ὑπομένουσιν) γ substitutes *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 ἔστι δὲ τὸ παραρρέον ὅτε μὲν χολῶδες ἢ φλεγματοῶδες, ὅτε δὲ καὶ μελαγχολικόν) δ substitutes a third *aut* for *interdum etiam et* (cf. ὅτε 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. u. c. P3 L2 m. i. est u. c. (*capitis ed.*) φ (Gk II, 5, 27 τέμνειν χρῆ τὴν φλέβα τὴν ὠμιαῖαν)

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 compatiuntur: quamquam A Mu C P2 L2 B (for further detail, see 5.4 and the app. crit. ad loc.) (Gk II, 147, 11–12 καὶ ὅτι αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν κατὰ πρωτοπάθειαν, 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* (*quaedam?*) ‘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 P1 M hiis qui φ qui *cett.* (Gk II, 281, 3–5 καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐλμίνθων σημεῖα ζητεῖν: +–οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὰ θηρία ταῦτα θανάτους αἰφνιδίους ἐργάζονται καὶ συγκοπὰς οὐδὲν ἦττον τῶν ὀλεθρίων χυμῶν.→ (37.1) τοῖς οἶν ἔχουσι μοχθηροὺς καὶ δακνώδεις ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοὺς)

δ omits *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 οἶν). 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 iuuamen P1 M P3 u v1: nullum *cett.* (Gk II, 281, 21–2
οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὕτω συμβάλλεται)

It is probable that β (and hence γ' reflected in P3?) preserves the original reading (cf. Greek οὐδὲν), 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 μαλάττει καὶ τονοῖ)

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 τοῦτο τὸ βοήθημα κάλλιστόν ἐστιν)

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'): quae proueniunt in stomacho cum simptomate *cett.* (Gk II, 283, 7–8 τῶν συμβαινόντων ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς συμπτωμάτων)

δ errs (with *cum simptomate* for *simptomata*) 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 (aum-P1) P1 M u augmentatis *cett. etiam* v1 (cf. diuersorum augmentatione humorum θ'') (Gk II, 283, 9 διὰ ποσότητα πλεοναζόντων χυμῶν)

δ errs in corrupting *augmentantibus* to *augmentatis* (an easy corruption committed also by v1, although the converse — *augmentatis* > *augmentantis* > *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 ... occidere potest hominem sed quia ...: non enim P1 M nam ob D (Gk II, 187, 2–5 Οὐκ οἶδα πάθος, εἰ οὕτως ἄλλο χαλεπὸν ἐστὶν ...: οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ ... ἀναιρεῖν πέφυκεν, ἀλλὰ ...)

δ reflects an attempt to make sense of a nonsensical text preserved in β, where *non enim hoc solum* matches exactly Greek οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ, although neither of the Latin versions renders the Greek accurately. Note that, if we read *enim* instead of *ob*, *ipsa per se* seems to repeat *hoc solum*. One wonders whether one or the other entered the tradition as a gloss.

2.235.2 quia eius (i.e. *podagrae*) ignorantur natiuitates: ignoratur natiuitas M P3' v1 ignorantis natiuitatis P1 natiuitatis ignorantia plurimis est po

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 ποσότητα but (the non-existent) νοσότητα, 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 ποσότητα (although I am unable to find parallels for this).

although resembling a corruption of the plural, are easy slips given *-ti-* and *eius* just before.¹³ (Note the transposition and the additional words in po.)

2.271.10 *donec . . . soluantur omnes carnes eius: omnes om.* P1 M (Gk II, 575, 23–4 ἕως ἄν ἀναλυθῶσιν αἱ σάρκες αὐτῆς)

δ adds *omnes* absent from P1, M, and the Greek text.

2.271.12 *coques autem oleum sicut dictum est* (Gk II, 575, 27–8 ἔψε δὲ τὸ ἔλαιον, ὡς προγέγραπται)

δ omits *sicut dictum est* present in P1, M, and the Greek text.

4.2.4. β, γ AND u v1

On the evidence at present available, it is not possible to establish beyond doubt the relations among the descendants of β. On the face of it, in 2.235–6 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 β. In provisionally setting P1 and M against v1 and u, I have regard especially to the following shared errors.

2.36.3 *ita ut interdum etiam aliqui* mox derepente moriantur: iterum aut dementia aliquid M, iterum autem tumentia aliqui P1 (Gk II, 279, 22 ὅστε τινὰς παραυτικά ἀπόλλυνται)

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

2.37.2 *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 P1 and M.

2.37.4 *Ceterum autem oportet eis addere paulatim* cibos qui tarde digeruntur: et rarum eis adhiuere paulatim M ceterarum autem oportit eis adibere paulatim P1 (Gk II, 281, 15–16 λοιπὸν δὲ δεῖ προστιθέναι κατὰ μέρος αὐτοῖς ὅσα δυσμετάβλητά εἰσι)

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

4.3. DAUGHTERS OF δ

4.3.1. η ERRS

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

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, melancholicus: salsedo autem A O Mu C | acetosus autem] aut η P1 acetosus Ox si (si autem Ge) acetosus cett.* (Gk I, 463, 14–15 πικρότητος μὲν γὰρ αἰσθάνονται οἷς χολῶδές ἐστι τὸ αἷτιον· ἀλμυρᾶς δὲ ποιότητος, οἷς τὸ φλέγμα, ἰώδους δὲ, οἷς μελαγχολικός ἐστι χυμός)

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 ϵ , 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 rasuram (sit?) P2) (ab ...) qualitate assumptas ϕ qualitates assumptas (assumptas Ma) cett.* (Gk II, 147, 8–9 παντὸς τοῦ ἐπιρρέοντος χυμοῦ ἢ θερμῆν ἢ ψυχρὰν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ ποιότητα προσειληφότος)

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 inimicos: 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 *melanteria cum aceto acro inungues: om. O Mu* (Gk I, 461, 21 Μελαντηρίαν μετ' ὄξους κατάχριε)

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

1.19.3 *subtilior apparet et subcolerico colore: et subcolerico apparet colore O Mu* (Gk I, 463, 7–8 λεπτόν ἐστι τῆ συστάσει καὶ ὑπόχρον (ὑπόχολον Mf) τῆ χροιᾷ)

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 ἔξ ᾧν ἀπορρεῖ τὸ ὑγρὸν . . . ὡς μηδὲν ἔξ
αὐτῶν ἀπορρεῖν)

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, 4 ἔτι (ἔτι δὲ L) καὶ μεγάλως ἔβλαψαν)

In view of the common collocation *adhuc etiam* and the Greek at this point, *etiam magis* is probably right, and *magis etiam* a shared error.

1.86.2 *rubra enim sunt omnia et sanguineo colore, et ipsa facies rubra: et om.* O Mu
(Gk II, 5, 20–1 ἐρυθρὰ γὰρ ἅπαντα καὶ αἰματώδη καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον
ἐρυθρὸν)

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

1.86.2 *et uene apparent [apertius et] plene: quia* O quod Mu (Gk II, 5, 22 καὶ αἱ φλέβες
εὐρύτεραι)

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

2.1.4 *sine cognitione non possunt bene curari: om.* O Mu (Gk II, 147, 15 ἄνευ
διαγνώσεως οὐχ οἷόν τε θεραπεῦσαι καλῶς)

η' omits *bene*.

2.10.1 *Quando autem desubito qui laborant sentiunt coangustata praecordia se habere:*
coangustata A γ θ'' *coangusta* O Mu *per-/prae- cett.* (Gk II, 153, 8 Ὀπηνίκα δὲ
ἀθρόως ὁ κάμνων αἴσθηται 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, 20–1 δεῖ δὲ τούτοις . . .
συμβουλευεῖν)

η' omits *his*.

2.37.6 *Nihil enim est aliud maius iuuamen: iuuamen maius* O Mu (nothing exactly
corresponding in the Gk II, 281, 21–2 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 ἐπίρροϊαν ὕλης οἱ ῥευματισμοὶ τοῖς ἄρθροις
ἐπιγίνεσθαι πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψιλὴν ποιότητα μόνην)

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 θερμὴν καὶ ψυχρὰν ἔτι δὲ ξηρότης 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 δεῖ οὖν . . . ὑποπτεύειν ἥτις ἀκριβῶς ἐστὶν 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 expedientem apponere curationem: purgationem O Mu (Gk II, 503, 6–7 καὶ τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν ἐπιφέρειν βοήθειαν)

η' writes *purgationem* for *curationem*.

2.271.8 Mittens in caccabo olei communis sext. ii.: communis olei O Mu (Gk II, 575, 19 Βαλὼν εἰς κάκαβον ἐλαίου 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 ἐλκῦδρια πυκνὰ καὶ ἐρυθρὰ παραπλήσια θηλαῖς, ἀφ’ ὧν ἰχώρες 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 oportet non omnino existimare: non oportet omnino ε *praeter* P3 (Gk II, 281, 1–2 χρῆ μὴ πάντοτε νομίζειν)

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

2.37.2 et panis in aqua frigida aut in calida aqua: 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* D P3 (Gk II, 187, 6–7 καὶ οὕτω τὴν θεραπείαν ἐπιφέρειν καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι)

Given Greek καὶ οὕτω, 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 γ’).

2.235.3 Ego autem existimo ut quicumque eius bene potuerit natiuitates cognoscere uel diuersitates aut ipsas species quaecumque fiunt et qualiter contingunt bene et cito posse curare et facilius a medicis ab ipsis infirmitatibus liberari: fuerint G1 P2 L2 B D P3 *om.* Ox Ge (no direct correspondence in Gk II, 501, 12–14 ἐγὼ δέ φημι, ὡς, εἴγε διαγνωσθεῖεν καλῶς αἱ τε διαφοραὶ καὶ τὰ εἶδη αὐτῆς, ὅσα τε καὶ οἶα τυγχάνει, εὐθεράπευτος ἂν ῥαδίως ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν γενήσεται)

ε has *fuerint* for *fiunt*. κ’ 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 articularum 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 αἷμα συρρεῦσαν ἐν τῇ τῶν ἄρθρων κοιλότητι θερμὸν καὶ διατεῖνον αὐτὰ τε καὶ τοὺς συνδέσμους 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 existimare oportet P2 oportet existimare 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 ῥευματισμοὶ τοῖς ἄρθροις ἐπιγίνεσθαι πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψιλὴν 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 πεφύκασιν) but looked odd after *oportet ut*,¹⁴ 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 θ'' 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?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: distemperantiis O P2 B Ma D Ox Ge (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 503, 4–5 αἴτια γίνονται πολλάκις ῥευματισμῶν)

The distribution of *distemperantiis* 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 adhibeatur: Aliud quod ε Aliud. Aliud (sic) D Quod O Mu Ma Aliud cerotum quod C (Gk II, 575, 9 ἑτέρα κηρωτὴ ὁμοίως ἐν τῇ ἀκμῇ ἐπιτίθεσθαι δυναμένη)

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 mitigatium est: ipse γ, hoc ipsum ε (Gk II, 575, 12 Ἄλλη κηρωτὴ καὶ αὐτὴ παρηγορικὴ)

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.)

¹⁴ *oportet ut* is wrong but evidently old and may reflect either δεῖ in the translator's Greek text (for δέ or διά, neither of which is translated in β or δ), or a corruption of *propter* (for διά).

¹⁵ Note that κ' lost *mediocriter* a few words earlier.

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 γὰρ ποιῶν ἐπιτεύξει)

Again (as in 2.158.6 under ‘ θ' 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 cataplasmatibus dixisse: podagricis ϵ (but not C) (Gk II, 575, 29–30 τσσαῦτα περὶ τῶν ἀνωδύνων καὶ παρηγορικῶν ἐπιπλασμάτων μοι λέλεκται)

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 uisceribus autem oleo infundendum est magis et exeunte de balneo depones in frigidam piscinam non tantum aquam frigidam habentem sed lactaneam. Inuolutus ergo sabanis non satis remoretur in eis. Volens autem . . . Quod si sitem habet infirmus et in sabanis 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 θ' may include errors that occurred already in ϵ (see the introductory paragraphs to 4.3.3 above and 4.4.2 below).

1.19.1 *ex quibus fluit humor similis quod icor Graeci uocant: similis* γ A C Ox P3' *s. s.*

Ma *om.* ϵ η' (Gk I, 463, 3 ἐξ ὧν ἕξεισιν ὑγρὸν ἰχώρι παραπλήσιον)

θ' (and independently η') omits *similis*. Its presence in η (A C), γ (P1 M) and the Greek (παραπλήσιον) guarantee that it is original. Ox, P3' and the corrector of Ma will have inherited it from θ (and it could have been in γ').

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

διαγινώσκειν οὖν χρῆ)

θ' replaces *ergo* (οὖν) with *uero* (further altered to *autem* by D and C). Ox and P3' (one of them here followed by ϕ) will have inherited *ergo* from θ (and it could have been in γ').

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 εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ λυπῶν χυμὸς ἢ δύο συμπεπλεγμένοι)

θ' (including C but not L2), Ma and Ge substitute *mixti* for *commixti* which matches the Greek and obviously fits better. Ma and Ge follow θ' , while θ'' and κ (including D) follow θ .

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 χολώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς χυμοὶ σὺν τῷ αἵματι φαίνονται)

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

1.88.2 *Superinunctiones autem et inquitatismata +- sequenti sermone sunt ordinanda*

–+: *superunctiones* ϵ *praeter* Ox P3 (Gk II, 7, 19 ἐπιχρίσασι δὲ καὶ ἐγχυματισμοῖς τοῖσδε)

Admittedly a small discrepancy, but one that neatly characterizes the descendants of ϵ except, as often, Ox and P3, whose readings derive from θ (and could have been in γ').

2.1.1 *initium habet (scil. tussis) modo a calida distemperantia, est autem quando a*

frigida: est autem quando γ η θ'' , *quandoque* G1 C P2 L2 B, *modo* κ ϕ (Gk II, 147, 5–6 ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχεται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας, ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχρᾶς)

θ' (followed by C) replaces *est autem quando* (for Greek ἔσθ' ὅτε δέ) 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 agnoscenda* D Ma P3 (Gk II, 147, 24–5 οὕτω γὰρ ἔστι τὴν διὰ θερμὴν δυσκρασίαν βῆχα ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων σημείων διαγινώσκειν)

θ' (G1 P2 L2 B) and λ (followed by Ge) replace *cognoscenda* 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 ἦτρον καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προηγησαμένων ἐξ ἐγκαύσεως)

G1, P2, L2, B, Ma, D and Ge have additions in common (B apparently with a combination of G1 and P2). This is ϵ minus P3, Ox and ϕ , and the addition is probably best understood as an innovation of θ' , with the readings of P3 and Ox deriving from θ .

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 διαφέρουσι δὲ τοῦ μᾶλλον τὰς δραστικὰς ἔχειν ἐναργέστατα σημεῖα, τὰς δὲ ὑλικὰς ἀμυδρότερα καὶ οὐ χρὴ ταῦτὰ (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*.¹⁸ 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. θ'') (Gk II, 149, 16–17 ὅθεν δὲ καὶ ἐξ ὁποίων ἐπιπέμπονται μορίων, κἀνταῦθα διορίζεσθαι δεῖ καὶ προσέχειν)

G1, P2, L2, B and D omit *Vnde et* (θ'' 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 φ. (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 mox derepente 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 ἐὰν οὖν εὐρεθῶσι τινες ἔχοντες τῆς γαστρὸς αἰσθητικὸν τὸ στόμα, παραντικά ἀπόλλυνται)*

Whatever lies behind *nimis* (not in the Greek),¹⁹ *sensibilem* is to be preferred (for αἰσθητικὸν) 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 θ. Here again it looks as if the most likely model of φ is Ge.

2.37.5 *Oportet autem his cum requieverit +- aut lenimentum acceperit +- passio suadere semper ut citius cibos 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 quieverit P3) (Gk II, 281, 20–1 δεῖ δὲ τοῦτοις καὶ μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι τῆς ἐπιχειούσης διαθέσεως ἀεὶ ταχύτερον συμβουλεύειν ἐσθίειν)*

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 *requieverint*. 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 facilior ad curandum* Ma .i. *leuis* P3 m3(?) .i. *facilis ad cognoscendum* Ox φ.

¹⁹ Possibly *inuenti s(unt)*: cf. Greek εὐρεθῶσι?

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, caro desuper ipsam extenuatur: uene Ox Ge | carnis G1 P2 L2 B P3 Ma | extenuat γ fit extenuata 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 *caro* (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 and θ 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 sentiatur 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 εἰ δὲ καὶ δίψη σφοδρᾶ συνέχοιτο πρὸς τοῖς σημείοις τούτοις καὶ θερμῆς αἴσθησις ἀντὶ γίνοιτο πολλὴ περὶ τὸν θώρακα)

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*,²¹ and adds *expirent* (*respirent* ϕ ²²) after *frequenter*. The Latin appears to be a translation of διψῆ

²⁰ Or, less probably, κ followed γ' (*caro* γ), but I am trying to restrict knowledge of γ' to θ and P3.

²¹ P3 m3 adds *ad hec 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 συνεχῶς τε.²³ θ'' (Ma, P3 and hence φ) eliminates the hyperbaton (and the subjunctive) in *calor sentiatur multus*.

4.4.3. θ ERRS

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 O 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.)²⁴

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 inest humor: Si autem minus Ox P3 | *om.* Ox P3 φ (Gk I, 463, 17–18 ἦττον δὲ ψυχρὰ ἐφ' ὧν μελαγχολῶδες)

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 *inest 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 curationes: scriptis oculorum passiones et causas earum qualiter oportet cognoscere et earum curationes Ox P3 (Gk II, 3, 2–3 Ἦδη μὲν οὖν ἐν ἄλλοις τρισὶ βιβλίοις ἀναγέγραπταί 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 earum* 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 ἦτοι γὰρ αἷμα μάλλον ἢ χολή ἢ φλέγμα ἢ μελαγχολικὸς χυμὸς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπιρρεῦσαν)

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 εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ λυπῶν χυμὸς ἢ δύο συμπεπλεγμένοι)

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 εἰδέναι δὲ δεῖ καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς οὐ διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων αἰ 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.

θ omitted *sed quoniam*, perhaps deliberately in order to improve the Latin; *sed quoniam* was in γ and δ, and the corrector of Ma will have found it in θ'. The Greek text has just ἀλλὰ,²⁵ but ὅτι may have followed in the translator's Greek text. On the agreement of G1 with P3 and Ma', see 4.7.3. Note that θ'' and φ 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 acitonicum magis quam amaritudinem habere se sentiunt: se sentiunt habere P3 Ma Ox G2 (Gk II, 149, 4–6 καὶ βλάπτονται μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ψυχόντων, ὀνίανται δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν θερμαινόντων, καὶ ὀξίδος μᾶλλον ἢ πικρίας, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, αἰσθάνονται)
θ, here the common source of θ'' and Ox, transposes *habere* and *se sentiunt* (unless the transpositions were made independently).

2.3.3 Et praecessit eos magis frigidior quam calor, et balneo non in tempore competenti et potitionibus et cibis usi sunt frigidis: competenti tempore P3' Ma Ox φ (Gk II, 149, 6–8 καὶ προηγείται μᾶλλον τούτοις ψῦξις ἢ ἔγκαυσις καὶ λουτρῶν ἀκαίρων καὶ πομάτων καὶ ἐδεσμάτων ψυχρῶν χρήσις)

θ, here the common source of θ'' and Ox, transposes *tempore* and *competenti*.

2.7.4 Si autem et colericum sputant nec nimis grauiter angustiam sentiunt +– se habere praecordiae loca → *sed magis* calida esse: in praecordiae loca M P2 praecordiae loca P1A Mu C circa praecordiorum loca θ'' κ O in praecordiorum locis G1 L2 B Ge φ | *sed magis* | *magis* θ'' κ O φ (Gk II, 151, 10–11 εἰ δὲ χολῳδες ἀναπτύοιτο, μὴ πάνυ δὲ βάρους ἢ στενοχωρίας συναίσθησις γίνοιτο ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον θέρμης)

θ, followed by θ'', κ and O, inserts *circa*,²⁶ and omits *sed* (as does φ).

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 αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἀθρόαις μεταστροφαῖς καὶ ψοφοῦντος ἀκούειν πολλάκις)

The Latin text is uncertain here, but there is a clear division in the tradition between θ and γ (and O) without *ex* and with the accusative, and δ (seen in η and θ' – A Mu C G1 P2 L2 B – and λ followed by Ge) with *ex* + ablative.

2.8.3 manifeste confidendum est quia pus *est quod* in thorace *continetur*: est quod *om.* O P3' Ma D Ox | *non continetur* O P3' Ma (Gk II, 151, 22–3 δῆλον ὅτι ὁμολογούμενον πῦον ἐστὶ τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν τῷ θώρακι)

θ (whence θ'' and κ and O) omitted *est quod*; θ probably also added *non* before *continetur*, but this was corrected by κ and belatedly in P3 (with dots under *non*, and *est quod* added by m2 in the margin). Again, Ge follows λ.

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 Ἐἴπερ εἴη φῦμα [μῆ] μελετηθὲν ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι)

O agrees with both θ'' and κ (although Ge follows λ 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 φ, a possible hint (although a very slight one) that (a) a Greek text was consulted, or (b) φ 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 η, rather than introduced independently in M and P2: do we then have *in* + accusative of place where? Note that ε replaced *praecordiae* with *praecordiorum*. Again φ 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 (*editauerit 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 οὔτε γὰρ συμβῆναι δυνήσεται ἔτι ἀπέπτου καὶ μηδέπω 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 febribus molestari et siti multa: absque aliquibus febribus κ P3 (a quibus febribus P3') aliquibus febribus O Ma (Gk II, 153, 8–9 Ὀπνίκα δὲ ἀθρόως ὁ κάμνων αἴσθηται στενοχωρίας ἐκτὸς ὀχλήσεως πυρετοῦ καὶ δίψης 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 ἔχη δὲ τινα κέρχρον μετὰ βηχὸς)

θ adds *et acrorem* (or perhaps just *acrorem*, as in Ma) in the first instance probably as a gloss on *raucorem*.

2.10.1 qui ibidem fluunt de capite aut ex alio aliquo membro: altero aliquo O aliquo altero M P3 Ma D aliquo alio Ox L2 (Gk II, 153, 11–12 τὸ περιεχόμενον ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι καὶ συρρεῦσαν ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἢ ἐξ ἄλλου τινὸς μορίου)

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).

2.11.3 Iste uir per multum tempus molestiam sustinens de tusse: per multa tempora O per multo tempore M per multum tempore P1 multo tempore κ (Gk II, 153, 22–3 οὔτος ὁ ἀνὴρ πολὺν χρόνον ὀχληθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς βηχὸς)

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

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

θ (perhaps following γ' : cf. M) substitutes the singular for the plural, and is then followed by O and θ'' but corrected by κ . (*cura* M and *curas* P1 can of course reflect a single form, as word-final *-s* was not pronounced in some varieties of Latin. Equally, they may reflect a ‘vulgar’ accusative after *de*.)

2.36.3 lumbriци saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est ut faciant cardiacam passionem: stomachi θ'' κ stomacho ϕ (Gk II, 279, 23–5 πολλακίς δὲ καὶ ἔλμινθες ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδραμόντες ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστρὸς ἐργάζονται καρδιακὰς 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'' ERRS

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 ποτέ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχεται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας)

θ'' deletes *sed*. Given the evidence of the manuscripts, *sed* must have been in the Latin version,²⁷ 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 ποτέ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχεται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας, ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχρᾶς)

θ'' twice substitutes *ex* for *a* (ἀπό).

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' ὕλην ἐπίρρυτον ὡσαύτως συνίσταται)

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

2.3.1 Tussiunt etiam plurimi ex frigida distemperantia: Si autem tussis ex frigida distemperantia ... fit P3 Ma (Gk II, 149, 2 ὅσοι δὲ βήσσουσι διὰ ψυχρὰν δυσκρασίαν)

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 ὅθεν δὲ καὶ ἐξ ὁποίων ἐπιπέμπονται μορίων, κἀνταῦθα διορίζεσθαι 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 digne respirantes P3 Ma φ²⁸ (Gk II, 149, 5–6 εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄξιον ἀναπτύεται δυσπνοούντων αὐτῶν, φλεγμονὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐκ πάντων τούτων ὑποπτέειν ἡμᾶς περὶ τὸν πνεύμονα γεγενῆσθαι 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 ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπονοεῖν δεῖ ζέουσαν εἶναι τὴν φλεγμονὴν περὶ τὸν πνεύμονα)

θ'' omits *et adhuc magis*.

²⁷ Puschmann reports L ἄλλοτε in place of ποτέ, and I wonder whether the translator's Greek text might not have had ἀλλ' ὅτι, whence *sed quoniam*.

²⁸ φ 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 aliqua pro aliquid*) breuiter dicere non obmittamus <add. m2 in marg.: Ad hec enim facile inuenienda 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 ipsarum 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 ipsarum 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 εὐχερῶς εὐρίσκειν τὰς κατὰ μέρος ὕλας τῶν βηκικῶν βοηθημάτων καὶ ἀρμόζειν δύνασθαι +-πρὸς τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς διαγνώσεως ὑπαγορευομένην διάθεσιν—+, ἀκόλουθον ἐνόμισα +-μετὰ τὰς διαγνώσεις καὶ τὴν καθόλου ἀγωγὴν καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς —+ ὑμῖν ἐκθέσθαι τῶν βοηθημάτων μετὰ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς αὐτῶν συσταθμίας, ὥστε μὴ παρ' ἑτέρου δεῖσθαι μανθάνειν, +-ἀλλ' ἐντεῦθεν ἀναλέγεσθαι τὸ ζητούμενον—+)

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 P3' Ma stomachi add. in marg. P3 m4 (Gk II, 279, 19–21 συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο, εἰ μοχθηροὶ καὶ δακνώδεις καὶ ἰώδεις ἀθροισθῶσιν ἢ συρρέουσιν ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοί)

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 P3 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, ὅσα δυσμετάβλητά 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, ὅτι καὶ ἡ δι' ἀνακαρδίων πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖ καὶ ἡ πικρὰ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτως (?) 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 anacardi<n>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 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 (*uerba satis et oculorum om. Ox*) (Gk II, 7, 7 *πραῦνει καὶ συμπέττει τὰς πάνυ ζεούσας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν φλεγμονὰς*)

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, 10–11 *τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ποιούσι καὶ οἱ φοίνικες μετὰ τοῦ ἐπέχειν τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον ῥευματισμὸν μετὰ τῶν μελιλώτων (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 *Εἴπερ εἴη φῦμα [μῆ] μελετηθὲν ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι*)

(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 ἐπτά probably for ἐφθά, participle of ἔψω. 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: neruis D Ox Ge | solet Ox Ge P3 *ex corr.* (Gk II, 501, 20–1 καὶ διατεῖνον αὐτά τε καὶ τοὺς συνδέσμους ὀδύνην 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 Ταῦτα 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 θαλασσίας ζώσης)

The writing of *turpitude* 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 εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα, περὶ ὧν ὕστερον λεχθήσεται, ἔνθα 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 P3' (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 θ'' , 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 cognoscere uel ... species quaecumque fiunt ... bene et cito posse curare et facilius a medicis ... liberari (4) et sic postea curationes ipsas exponemus. (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 *solam 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* (*Sufficient* $\kappa \phi ?O$).

4.5. THE ϕ -RECENSION (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 conuerso quandoque utroque modo: *haec verba habent soli G2 ed. L1* (not in the Gk II, 5, 9)

ϕ inserts a long sentence of explanation not in the Greek original nor anywhere else in the Latin tradition.

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 τοῦτο, εἰ μοχθηροὶ καὶ δακνώδεις καὶ ἰώδεις ἀθροισθῶσιν ἢ συρρεύσωσιν ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς 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 ἔλμινθες ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδραμόντες ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστρὸς 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 γαστρὸς)

(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 cardiacae*] inprimis oportet eis cibos offerri: (Gk II, 281, 5–7 τοῖς οὖν ἔχουσι μοχθηροὺς καὶ δακνώδεις ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοὺς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συγκοπῆναι κινδυνεύουσιν ἀρμόζει πρῶτον αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων ἐκεῖνα 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 cathaplasmatibus 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 Anastomosin autem dicunt cum ora uenarum uirtute amissa apertiora effecta et laxiora sanguinem refundunt intrinsicus 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 *intrinsicus*; 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 vein*³⁵).

2.235.5 multos poterit liberare, et non solum eos quibus mox ab initio curationem adhibet curationem: exhibet ϕ (Gk II, 501, 16–17 ὀφελήσει πολλοὺς οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας εἰς τὸ πάθος)

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 Περὶ καρδιαλγίας; 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.

ϕ substitutes *exhibet* for *adhibet*.

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

ϕ 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: *om.* ϕ (Gk II, 503, 2–3 οὐ μόνον δὲ διὰ ἐπίρροϊαν ὕλης οἱ ρευματισμοὶ τοῖς ἄρθροις ἐπιγίνεσθαι πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψιλὴν ποιότητα μόνην)

ϕ omits *solam*.

4.6. THE SOURCES OF ϕ

ϕ appears to represent a recension which employed more than one exemplar of the text. One exemplar must have derived from κ, and must have been particularly close to Ox and Ge. Another source of ϕ must have been close to θ'', and especially to P3. (There are possibly one or two hints that B was a third source of ϕ: 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 ϕ has many γ-errors and many good γ-readings, it never agrees alone with γ, but nearly always with Ox and/or P3 as well.

4.6.1. ϕ AND κ (OR κ')

2.1.1 quoniam initium habet (scil. *tussis*) modo a calida distemperantia, est autem quando a frigida aut humida aut etiam sicca: modo a (modo de D) D Ox Ge ϕ (Gk II, 147, 5–6 ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχεται ἀπὸ θερμῆς δυσκρασίας, ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχρᾶς ἢ ξηρᾶς ἢ ὑγρᾶς)

κ and ϕ match the Latin form of the second alternative to that of the first (*modo a X, modo a Y*).

2.1.4 de qua re oportet nos accedere cum omni studio: nos oportet Ox ϕ | attendere Ox ϕ accendere D (Gk II, 147, 12–13 δεῖ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐλθεῖν μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς)

Ox and ϕ transpose *nos* and *oportet*, and substitute *attendere* for *accedere* (Greek ἐλθεῖν). *attendere* may be a correction (by Ox followed by ϕ?) of *accedere* (in D and perhaps in κ).

2.1.4 oportet nos accedere cum omni studio ad cognoscendam uniuscuiusque ueritatem: uarietatem Mu C ε *praeter* B, *tussis uarietatem* Ox ϕ (nothing corresponding in the Gk II, 147, 13–14³⁶)

Ox and ϕ insert *tussis* before *uarietatem*, the latter a corruption of *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 pura uel simplici generata fuerit *tussis*: sola Ox ϕ (Gk II, 147, 17 ψιλῆς τοίνυν οὔσης τῆς θερμῆς δυσκρασίας)

Ox and ϕ substitute *sola* for *pura*.

³⁶ However, Cloudy Fischer suggests that Latin *uniuscuiusque* may somehow reflect a part of Greek ὁποῖος for ποιούσης.

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 ὅσοι δὲ βήσσουσι διὰ ψυχρὰν 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 generata tussis: tussis generata cognoscitur Ox Ge tussis esse generata cognoscitur φ (Gk II, 149, 8–9 οὕτω μὲν αἰ διὰ ψυχρὰν αἰτίαν ἢ θερμὴν διαγινώσκονται βήχες)

κ' (Ox and Ge) transposes *cognoscitur generata tussis*, and φ takes this new word-order and inserts *esse*, thus making a nominative + infinitive construction.

2.4.2–5.1 materiales autem [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 τοῦ μάλλον τὰς δραστικὰς ἔχειν ἐναργέστατα σημεῖα, τὰς δὲ ὑλικὰς ἀμυδρότερα. καὶ οὐ χρὴ ταῦτά 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 fluit qui mouet tussem, siue ex altero membro: qui γ η P3' humor qui P3 (*add. m2*) Ge φ quod G1 P2 L2 B Ma D Ox (Gk II, 149, 17–18 καὶ προσέχειν εἴτε ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιρρεῖ τὸ κινοῦν τὴν βήχα εἴτε καὶ ἐξ ἐτέρων)

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 θ, Ma and D here follow λ, and (additional hypothesis 2) Ox had an accessory source. I am at present at a loss.

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 πνεύμων ἀδικεῖται πολλάκις: πρῶτος γὰρ ἐστίν, εἶτα 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 Φλεγμονῆς ἐν τῷ πνεύμονι 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. φ AND θ'', ESPECIALLY P3

2.1.4 Propter quod non una est causa tussis sed uaria: quoniam G1 P3 Ma φ (Gk II, 147, 12 ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐ μίαν αἰτίαν ἢ βήξ, ἀλλὰ ποικίλην κέκτηται)

θ'' (and in this case G1) and φ replace *propter quod* with *quoniam*.

2.5.1 et exinde nascentiam tussis habet: tussis nascitur P3 Ma φ (Gk II, 149, 16 αἰ βήχες ... τὴν γένεσιν ἔχουσιν)

θ'' and φ replace *nascentiam tussis habet* with the simpler *tussis nascitur*.

2.5.5 et omnino nihil praetermitti debet de tusse: praetermittendum est P3 Ma praetermittendum φ (Gk II, 149, 22 ὡς πανταχόθεν ἀπαράλειπτον εἶναι τὸν περὶ τῆς βηχὸς λόγον)

θ'' and φ replace *praetermitti debet* with *praetermittendum (est)*.

2.7.3 Si autem et sitis sit nimia, et frequenter ad haec signa et calor sentiatur multus in thorace: calor multus sentitur P3 Ma φ (Gk II, 151, 6 εἰ δὲ καὶ δίψη σφοδρῶ συνέχοιτο πρὸς τοῖς σημείοις τούτοις καὶ θερμῆς αἴσθησις αὐτῷ γίνοιτο πολλὴ περὶ τὸν θώρακα)

θ'' and φ 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 φ (Gk II, 281, 12–14 εἴπερ οἱ πάσχοντες ἦσαν τῇ κράσει θερμοὶ πάνυ καὶ οἱ περιεχόμενοι χυμοὶ δακνώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς ἄγαν)

P3 and φ 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 γ, feria quinta P3 φ (Gk II, 575, 27–8 ἔψε δὲ τὸ ἔλαιον, ὡς προέγραπται, ἐν οἰκίματι κατωγαίῳ μηνὶ μαρτίῳ πέμπτη)

P3 and φ 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 φ, at the very end of the manuscript tradition of the text) two of the daughters of η (O and C) and all but one (B) of the descendants of ε 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 ε-family, P2 appears to have known a copy close to δ, while at a lower level G1, a daughter of θ', shares errors on the one hand with C (daughter of η), and on the other hand with daughters of θ'', 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 γ (or β) in O on the one hand and in nearly all of the descendants of θ 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 γ, γ', 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 contamination. 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 ε, we find a number 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 αἴτια, ἢ τε κρᾶσις τοῦ πάσχοντος)

ε inserts *considerandae sunt* (altered to *attendere oportet* by κ' (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 ἀφῆς δὲ διαγινώσκειν ἐστὶ σοι δυνατόν)

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 B D *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 πλῆθος ὕλης ἐπιρρέον μόνον οἶδε ποιεῖν ὀδύνην καὶ ποιότης, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὸ συναμφότερον, καὶ ποιότης ἅμα καὶ 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'' κ (Gk II, 7, 6 Γάλα γυναικὸς μετὰ κρόκων ὀῶν καὶ ῥοδίνου διατιθέμενον +–θαυμαστῶς–+ πραῖνει)

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 πρὸς δὲ τὰς μεγίστας φλεγμονὰς καὶ ἐν ὄγκῳ 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 ἔχη δὲ τινα κέρχνον μετὰ βηχὸς, ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀναγωγὴν ὕγροῦ)*

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 (ἔσθ' 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 ἀρμόζει πρῶτον αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων ἐκεῖνα τῶν ἐδεσμάτων προσφέρειν, ὅσα μετὰ τοῦ ψύχειν ἔτι (ἔχει τι M) καὶ ῥωννύειν δύνανται)*

With *habeant aliquid* cf. the reading of Greek ms. M ἔχει τι,³⁹ although Latin *et ... et* nicely translates Greek μετὰ ... ἔτι καί. The substitution of *uirtutem* for *aliquid* makes the text clearer and no less idiomatic. Once introduced, *uirtutem* 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 ... νικᾶν 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 P2' citr(i)um cett. | mundaturam (mundati ad P1) β η mundatum ε mundati P2 (Gk II, 281, 24 ἢ μῆλον ἢ κίτρον ἐκτὸς τοῦ λέπους αὐτοῦ)*

The reinterpretation (thanks to the writing of *-tur-* as *ῥ*) 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 cardialgias sanat (scil. glicia remedium) ... sed et alia plurima: alia multa θ' praeter P2 Ox P3 (Gk II, 283, 2–3 οὐ μόνον γὰρ ἰάται καρδιαλγίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ... ἄλλα 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 $\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha$ 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* (*distemperantiam 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

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 diuersitates 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 χρῆ 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 *oportea(a)t adhibere*.

[1.85.4 *Incipiamus ergo [nunc] iam dicere: iam γ Ox P3, iam nunc G1 C L2 φ* (Gk II, 3, 8–9 ἀρξώμεθα 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 M D Ox P3 doloris nimio . . . -is P1* (Gk II, 3, 11–5, 1 εἰ οὖν ὀδύνας σφοδραὶ καὶ ἀκαρτέρητοι περιέχουσι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς)

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 πολλοὶ τοῖς ναρκωτικοῖς σκευαζομένοις θαρρήσης κολλουρίοις)

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

1.85.10 *Prouidentum est autem unde prorumpat quod supercurrit . . . et qualis utique superfluitas est: qualis γ Ox P3* (Gk II, 5, 9–11 θεωρεῖται δὲ καὶ πόθεν ὀρμάται τὸ ἐπιρρεῦσαν . . . καὶ οἶον ἄρα τὸ ἐπιρρέον ἐστίν)

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

1.86.1 *Si ergo sanguineus fuerit humor qui . . . : humor fuerit M D Ox P3 humor P3'* (Gk II, 5, 19 Εἰ μὲν οὖν αἱματικὸς εἴη χυμὸς)

M and γ', and hence θ, κ (D and Ox) and P3,⁴² transpose *fuerit* and *humor* (εἴη χυμὸς).

1.86.2 *Rubra enim sunt omnia et sanguineo colore et ipsa facies rubra et in tumore magno sunt posita: nimio M D Ox P3 L2 φ omnia C* (Gk II, 5, 20–1 ἐρυθρὰ γὰρ ἅπαντα καὶ αἱματώδη καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐρυθρὸν καὶ ἐν ὄγκῳ 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 accionis P1 omnes consuetas actiones M omni consueta accione D Ox omnibus consueta accione P3* (Gk II, 5, 22–3 καὶ ὄκνος περὶ τὰς συνήθεις ἐνεργείας)

κ (D and Ox) and P3 agree in error in substituting singular *consueta accione* for plural *consuetis actionibus*, 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 τούτοις μηδὲ τὸ δάκρυον δακνωδὲς καὶ δριμὺ φαίνοιτο)

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 ... uel*.

1.87.1 Si enim sanguineus esse tibi manifestus fuerit flegmon: *om.* M Ox P3' (not in Gk II, 5, 27 Εἰ μὲν οὖν αἱματικόν σοι φανείη τὸ τὴν φλεγμονὴν ἐργασάμενον αἴτιον)

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 uena (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 errs'.)

1.87.2 Si autem colericus et acer humor cum sanguine appareat mixtus: enim M D Ox P3 (Gk II, 5, 28–7, 1 εἰ δὲ καὶ χολώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς χυμοὶ)

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 Extrinsecus autem superponenda sunt adiutoria haec: igitur γ D Ox P3 ϕ (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 7, 5 Περὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν 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 ποιῶσι καὶ οἱ φοίνικες μετὰ τοῦ ἐπέχειν τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον ῥευματισμόν)

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 μετὰ + genitive as meaning 'after'.)

1.87.4 crocus et glaucion et ouorum uitella cocta et oleum roseum permixta superponantur: superimposita γ et superimposita (superposita Ox) mitigant dolores Ox P3 L2 ϕ mitigant D (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 7, 11–12 μετὰ ... κρόκου καὶ γλαυκίων καὶ πυρρῶν ὠν ἐπτὰ ἐκζεστῶν 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' .⁴³

2.37.2 si is qui patitur sit temperantia satis calida, et in eius stomacho contineantur humores mordicantes et acres nimis: distemperantia P3 D Ox Ge ϕ | acerrimi M acerrimi P3 ϕ (Gk II, 281, 12–14 εἶπερ οἱ πάσχοντες ἦσαν τῇ κράσει θερμοὶ πάνυ καὶ οἱ περιεχόμενοι χυμοὶ 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 nimis* 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 differri non oportet: dilatare γ P3 (Gk II, 187, 6–7 καὶ οὕτω τὴν θεραπείαν ἐπιφέρειν καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι)
P1, M and P3 alone have *dilatare* for *differri*, 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 aliquas 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 Ψιλῆς τοίνυν οὔσης τῆς θερμῆς δυσκρασίας αἰσθάνονται μὲν ἴσως διὰ τινος ποιότητος τοιαύτης, οἷον δυσκρασίας θερμῆς, βήσσοντες καὶ ἀναπνεῖν ἐπιθυμοῦσι 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 ἄρτος εἰς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν καὶ εὐκρατον)

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 defluit aut colericum . . . : qui defluit humor G1 P3 (Gk I, 463, 4 ἔστι δὲ τὸ παραρρέον ὅτε μὲν χολῶδες . . .)

1.19.3 et subcolerico colore: cum colerico M G1 P3 (Gk I, 463, 7–8 καὶ ὑπόχρον (ὑπόχολον Mf) τῆ χροῖᾱ)

2.37.t. on the (correct) placement by G1 and P3 (perhaps by θ'') of an additional title (Curatio cardiace G1 Curatio cardiacorum P3) misplaced elsewhere in the tradition, see under 4.5 above.

2.158.7 et sic aut uomitur aut per uentrem deducitur (scil. *sanguis*) in secessus: per uomitum G1 per uomitur P3 (not in the Gk II, 187, 11)

G1 and P3 alone 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 uentrem*, 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 ἔτι δὲ φλέγμα χωρήσαν εἰς τοὺς εἰρημένους τόπους ὀδύνης ἰσχυροτέρως αἴτιον 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 P3 L2 (not in Gk II, 575, 2)

G1 and P3 and L2 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 ÷ iiii.: cerotaria anodina que mox sine dolore faciant ordinamus. Quorum unum recipit opii croci G1 P3 L2 (Gk II, 575, 4–5 Κηρωτή ἐν τῇ ἀκμῇ τῶν παροξυσμῶν ἐπιτιθεμένη, ἀνωδύνους ποιοῦσα. +– + Κρόκου, ὀποῦ μήκωνος, ἀνά 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 ὀπὸν ἀπόβρεχε ἐν οἴνω, τὸν δὲ ἄρτον ὕδατι)

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 haec*. 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 θ' 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 θεραπείας ὀφθαλμῶν)

The ancestor of G1, here followed by C, transposes *oculorum* and *passionibus*.

1.85.4 Incipiamus ergo [nunc] iam dicere: iam nunc C G1 L2 φ, nunc iam *plerique* (Gk II, 3, 8–9 ἀρξώμεθα οὖν ἤδη τοῦ λόγου)

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 τῷ ἀναπτύεσθαι πλήθος)

C shares in the elaboration of *quod* to *ex eo quod*, an innovation probably of ε (note the further slight discrepancy between P2 and ε (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 ἔλμινθες ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδραμόντες)

The ancestor of G1, here followed by C, omits *saepius*.

2.236.2 Etenim sanguis calidus supercurrens in articularum cauitates: *om.* G1 C (Gk II, 501, 19 καὶ γὰρ αἷμα συρρεῦσαν ἐν τῇ τῶν ἄρθρων κοιλότητι θερμὸν)

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 ἔψε ξύλοις ἀμπελίνοις, ἕως οὗ βράση σφοδρῶς)

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 θ' . 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, oliuae folia cocta [trita?] cum melle cataplasmas: Item ... quae] Item C Iterum φ | in capite scabias sunt] ueteres autem scabies capitis illinies C ueteres scabies capitis sic curabis φ in capite scabies ueteres (ueteres s. s.) sunt P3 | Si autem recesserit a capite cutis] si autem cutis recesserit a capite cortice C P3 φ | oliuae folia cocta [trita?] cum melle] cortice oliuae et foliis coctis et (et s. s. P3) tritis cum melle C P3 φ (Gk I, 461, 7–10 Πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ψαρῶδη καὶ ἰχωρῶδη. Πήγανον καὶ στυπτηρίαν λεάνας μετὰ μέλιτος χρίε τὴν κεφαλὴν προξυρῶν· ἐὰν δ' ἀφιστῆται τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ δέρμα, ἐλαίας φύλλα ἐφθὰ 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 defluit: uelut quedam tabes* C ϕ (Gk I, 461, 12 ἄφ' ὧν ἰχώρες ἀποτήκονται)

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

1.19.2 *cognosci 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
διαγινώσκειν οὖν χρή τὸ κυρίως αἴτιον)

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 as 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 pereant* 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 ὥστε τινὰς παραυτίκα ὑφ' ἐλμίνθων δακνομένους 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 **statimalumbricorum*. Are we to reckon with some sort of dittography, perhaps caused by double reading/hearing of syllables in *scriptio continua*?⁴⁶ The converse — haplography of e.g. **staffī malulū bricorū* — is also conceivable, but raises further problems, including the question of the meaning of *in malo lumbricorum*.⁴⁷ We are not helped by the fact that the Latin Alexander appears not otherwise to use *perire*!

Secondly, while setting up γ 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 φημι ὡς . . . εὐθεράπευτος ἂν ῥαδίως ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν 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 citto 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 Mu C Ox Ge P2 L2 B, quoniam G1 Ma P3 ϕ (Gk II, 147, 12 ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐ μίαν αἰτίαν ἢ βῆξι, 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 A'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' .⁴⁸

2.36.4 oportet non omnino existimandum: existimandum M u *v1* existimandis P1 estimandum Ox 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.⁴⁹ 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 agnoscenda 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, 22–3 ἀλλὰ περὶ ὥραν τρίτην ἢ τετάρτην ἄρτον εἰς εὐκρατον λαμβάνειν ἢ εἰς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν)

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 ἀνιαρὰν ἐκτίσαστο, καὶ μηδὲ ὄλωσ ὑπὸ τέχνης ἰατρικῆς ἰαθῆναι ποτε δυνηθῆναι)

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 ὑπόληψιν as a part of ὑπολείπω. 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 uniuscuiusque] multos poterit liberare: attendantur po] attendendo α|ante multos *habent* quicumque (quisquis Ma quis P3 L2 *om.* η) uoluerit operari *omnes praeter* P1 M v1 po (Gk II, 501, 15–16 ἐλπίζέτω γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐάν τις ἀκριβῶς προσέχοι, ὠφελήσει 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* (*quicumque* 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*
 M v1 po mediocriter effecta P1 mediocriter *cett. om.* Ox Ge (Gk II, 503, 1–2
 ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ βάρους ἐπιτελεῖν αἴσθησιν οὐ μετρίου ἐργάζεται τοὺς
 παροξυσμούς)

(On the omission of the negative in all the Latin manuscripts, see under α above.) Here one can argue either:

(a) the translation is poor, and on a meaningless, word-for-word basis *facta* for ἐπιτελεῖν and *effecta* for ἐργάζεται in β is clearly closer to the Greek and therefore likely to be right: δ's deletion of *effecta* would then have been prompted by the thought that it merely repeated *facta*; or

(b) β and po understood *facta* to go with *grauitate*, felt the need for another participle with *sentitur commotio*, and added *effecta*.

A possible argument in favour of (b) is that ἐργάζομαι appears to be rendered rarely or never by *efficio*,⁵¹ but regularly and frequently by *facio*.⁵² If this is right, *effecta* is more likely to be secondary than the original equivalent of ἐργάζεται.

2.271.7 *Opium soluens cum lacte muliebri addes olei rosei ÷ vi. cera ÷ vi. et sic miscebis cerotum et uteris: addes om. P1 M | miscis P1 M misces P3* (Gk II, 575, 13–17 Ὀπίου δραχ. δ' ἐν ἄλλῳ ἢ κηρωτῆς ῥοδίνου λιτρ. α'. λείου γυναικείῳ γάλακτι τὸ ὄπιον καὶ οὕτω μίσγε τὴν κηρωτὴν ἐν τῇ θυΐᾳ καὶ χρῶ ὡς πάνυ καλλίστη.)

The Latin text is abbreviated and seems to be corrupt (e.g. there is no indication of the quantity of *opium* to be used). Either β lost *addes*, or, more probably, δ added it in an effort to make sense of the recipe. And, whichever the original form of the instruction to mix, there is a clear distinction between δ and β (with γ' reflected in P3).

4.8.3. O AND γ'?

Nearly all of the aberrant readings in O can be explained through contamination with θ; remarkably, eight of the innovations with which I characterize θ above are shared by O (see 4.4.3 above). Two innovations in O, however, seem to unite O alone in error with γ, and therefore to suggest that O had direct knowledge of γ'. I remain very tentative on this relation, which I do not represent on the stemma, as the evidence is as yet slight, but here for the record are the passages in question (note also 2.1.4 under 4.8.2 above).

⁵¹ Possibly at 1.35=I, 487, 11 (a mistranslation).

⁵² Note e.g. 2.184=II, 473, 5; 2.236.2=II, 501, 21; and especially 2.200, where in the space of two lines *factus*=II, 495, 2 ἐργάζομαι, but *effectus*=γινόμενος (as often: cf. e.g. 1.29, 1.34, 2.40, 2.41, 2.59).

2.2.3 Quod si haec fuerint passi et sola distemperantia fuerit: fuerint passi et recte δ (A Mu P2) fuerit passus et P1 M O passio ex ε C (Gk II, 147, 21 εἰ μὲν οὖν οὕτως εἴη μόνη ψιλῆ 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 βήσσουσι 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 σταφυλὴν 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 κ' 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:

- 1.85.11 the recovery of *enim* (under 4.4.3 above).
- 2.5.2 and 2.7.t.–2.7.1 the two additions of *humor* (under 4.6.1 above).
- 2.10.4 the recovery of *cogimur scribere* (under 4.4.6 above).
- 2.37.4 the elimination of the hyperbaton (under 4.7.1 above).
- 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:

- 2.1.1 B's *quandoque autem* appears to combine *quandoque* θ' with *est autem quando* γ η ϵ (under 4.4.1 above).
- 2.2.6 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.

- 1.87.4 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 II, 7, 8–9 $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\acute{\alpha}s\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}s\ \phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}s\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\gamma\kappa\omega\ \mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \acute{o}\ \kappa\rho\acute{o}\kappa\omicron>s$)

⁵³ Note especially 2.158.6 *fit extenuata* in, of all places, η and κ (discussed under 4.4.1 above).

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

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 εἰδέναι δὲ δεῖ καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς οὐ διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων αἰ βῆχες κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν μόνην, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους)

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

2.3.t. De tusse quae ex frigida distemperantia fit: si ... oritur B ϕ (Gk II, 149, 1 Περὶ βηχὸς διὰ ψυχρὰν δυσκρασίαν γινομένης)

B and ϕ 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 γλῶττα τραχεῖα καὶ μῆλα ἐρυθρά)

B and ϕ alone gloss the erroneous *mala* with *maxilla*.

2.236.3 colericus humor saepius supercurrens super neruos aut inter ipsos residens: *om.* B ϕ (Gk II, 501, 21 χολὴ πολλάκις ἐπιρρυεῖσα μεταξὺ τῶν νεύρων)

B and ϕ 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.* grauiter (Gk II, 151, 10 πάνυ)

2.10.t. *-que* for *et*

2.37.6 *adiumentum*: iuuamentum *ed.*, iuuamen *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*

- 1.85.5 *om. nimio* (Gk II, 3, 11 σφοδρά)
 2.37.7 *accipiant: sumant M P3 accipiant Ox*⁵⁴ *assumant cett.* (Gk II, 281, 23 λαμβάνειν)

C

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 melancholicus est for est aut melancholicus* of η
 1.19.8 *si autem frigidior melancholicus* (points under) *flegmaticus est [h(umor)]*
 2.7.3 *extrinsecus: intrinsecus cett. recte* (not in Gk II, 151, 8–9)
 2.36.3 *mouentes: appetentes β, petentes cett.* (Gk II, 279, 24 ἀναδραμόντες)
 2.271.9 *om. secundam aut tertiam* (Gk II, 575, 21–2 δεύτερον ἢ τρίτον)

D

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

ed.

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. *scrissa for scissa*
 1.19.5 *melancholicum 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 ὀμιαῖαν (φλέβα))
 2.81 *om. cum insomnietate* to end of chapter
 2.235.6 *agendo: attendendo cett.* (Gk II, 501, 16 προσέχοι)
 2.236.2 *add. in articulis [seu articulorum] concauitates: non habent cett.* (Gk II, 501, 19 ἐν τῇ τῶν ἄρθρων κοιλότητι)
 2.271.11 *mollificatiuum: mollissimum cett.* (Gk II, 575, 27 ἀπαλωτάτην)

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 efficit et qualitates doloris* for *feri dolorem et qualitates*
- 1.85.11 *aut ex uentositate* <*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 *susplicari 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 μεταστροφαίς)
- 2.11.3 *om. non poterat fortiter extussire* (Gk II, 153, 23–4 οὐκ ἠδυνήθη τοῦ βήσσειν ἰσχυρῶς ἀπαλλαγήναι)
- 2.11.7 *adiutoria ad tussem: ad tussem adiutoria cett.* (Gk II, 155, 23 τῶν βηχικῶν 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 dittography 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 ζητεῖν)
- 1.85.8 *antecedentes: attenden(te)s cett.* (Gk II, 5, 5 ἀποβλέποντα)
- 1.85.10 dittography 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> passionis: habent cett.* (Gk II, 501, 8 τὸ τῆς ποδάγρας πάθος)
- 2.235.5 *om. uerum etiam diuturnas iam existentes> podagras: habent cett.* (Gk II, 501, 17–18)
- 2.236.6 *frequenter: sepius 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*: *cognosci potest* θ' MaDGe *cognoscere poteris cett.* (Gk I, 463, 16 διαγινώσκειν ἐστὶ σοι δυνατόν)
 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 *uiole 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 κόνταῦθα)

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.t. *ex quibus si talis quidem defluit humor* for *ex quibus tabes quedam defluit*
 1.19.4 *non fuerit [fuerit] subtilis 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*: *constricteque 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 χυμῶν)
 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*: *uenenosis cett.* (Gk II, 281, 2 μοχθηρῶν)

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 μῆλον ἦ)
 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 [diuersis] oculorum passionibus*
 1.85.9 *fieri dolores et sepius ex qualitate, sepius autem* for *fieri dolorem et qualitates, sepius 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 [fueri]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:quod* for *postquam*
- 2.158.7 *relatiores: relaxatoris M, laxiora cett.* (this section not in Gk)
- 2.235.4 *cognita enim: cognitiones cett.* (Gk II, 501, 15 διαγνώσεις)
- 2.235.5 *habet: adhibet plerique recte* (nothing corresponding in Gk II, 501, 17)⁵⁷
- 2.235.5 *inexistentis: 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 acetosus, 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 νικῶν)⁵⁸
- 2.37.5 *om. ut <citius> cibos accipiant: 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*) *supereminens 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 τοὺς ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας εἰς τὸ πάθος — but it is unlikely that *habet* in P1 is related to Greek ἔχοντας.

⁵⁸ P2 inserts *in stomacho 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.t. *humore sanguineo* for *sanguineo humore*
 2.6.t. *de capite ... humores: ex capite ... humor cett.* (Gk sg. II, 149, 24 ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιρρεῖ)
 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 οὐπερ ἡ σκευασία ἔχει οὕτως)
 2.271.2 *debilitatem: imbecillitatem cett.* (Gk II, 573, 26 τὸ ... πεπονθέναι)

u

- 2.36.4 *lumborum: lumbricorum cett.* (Gk II, 281, 1 ἐλμίνθων)
 2.37.7 *om. in calida ... frigida infusum* (Gk II, 281, 23 ἄρτον εἰς εὐκρατον λαμβάνειν ἢ εἰς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν)
 2.37.9 *aloe epantite ... feniculi radices cortices ... mel: feniculi radicum cortice ... aloe epatite ... melle attico* (Gk II, 281, 28–30 μαράθρου ... ἀλόης ... μέλιτος Ἀττικοῦ)
 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 τοσαῦτα περὶ τῆς καρδιακῆς διαθέσεως εἰρήσθω τῆς γινομένης ἐπὶ δῆξει τῶν δακνόντων καὶ μοχθηρῶν χυμῶν)
 2.37.14 *om. last word humoribus* (Gk II, 283, 9 χυμῶν)

v1

- 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 μῆλον)
 2.37.12 *dianacardion: anacardion/-ium/-ia cett.* (cf. Gk II, 283, 4 ἢ δι᾽ ἀνακαρδίων)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 ἔφαμεν, ὑποπτεῦειν, ἥτις ἀκριβῶς ἐστὶν ἡ ποιητικὴ τοῦ πάθους αἰτία, καὶ τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν ἐπιφέρειν 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 A 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 Πήγανον; presence of καὶ στυπτηρίαν; absence of τὰς 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) Πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ψωρώδη καὶ ἰχωρώδη. Πήγανον (-ος *cum mensura* Mf) καὶ στυπτηρίαν (καὶ στ. *om.* Mf) λεάνας μετὰ μέλιτος χρίε τὴν

κεφαλὴν προξυρῶν (προξυρίσας τὰς τρίχας Mf)· ἐὰν δ' ἀφιστῆται τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ δέρμα, ἐλαίας φύλλα ἐφθὰ μετὰ μέλιτος κατάπλαττε (μέλιτι καταπλάσσει Mf).

[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 [trita?] cum melle cataplasmas.

Item aliud ad P1M A P3] Item aliud OMu Item ad G1P2L2B Ma DOxGe (Item C Iterum G2 L1) | **eas quae** G1P2L2B Ma DOxGe] 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 ε 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 DOxGe 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 ψωρώδη καὶ ἰχωρώδη). Latin *scab-* presumably reflects Greek ψωρ-. 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 *uteris* in the previous sentence ('Uteris autem illo magis ad humiditas et impetiginosas'): C, P3, G2 and L1 all have *uteris* correctly at this point, but it is striking that *ueteris* for *uteris* is here attested both in the *Liber passionalis* (s, p. 309, where it is corrected from *Uteris*!) and in the oldest manuscript of the *Tereoperica* (Par. lat. 11219, f. 49ra *ueteris*).

unges scripsi] unguis M OMu unges C φ inunguis P1 P3 inlines A illinies *cett. NB* illinies . . . unges] Item ueteres autem scabies capitis illinies ut sunt ruta et stipt(er)ea teres cum mell(e) et unges caput C

I would defend a form of *ung(u)o* on the grounds that it is attested on both sides of the stemma (in descendants of γ and of η), while *illino* 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 O \bar{x}) must surely reflect the corruption of *cutis* in γ' (*cotis* \rightarrow *cortis* \rightarrow *cortix/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 .

oliuae fol. coct. [trit.?] cum mel. P1M AOMu] oliue fol. coct. cum mel. trit. G1P2B Ma D (coct. et corticibus cum . . . D) cortice oliue et fol. coct. cum mel. trit. Ge cort. oliue et fol. coct. et trit. cum mel. C P3 ϕ (oliue cortice et fol. coct. trit. cum mel. O \bar{x}' : et corticibus *add. supra post* fol. [cf. D!])

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 scabeas 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 ad eas que in capite 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 foliis coctis cum melle tritis cathaplastmabis.

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

D 4vb Item ad eas que in capite sunt scabies. rutam stipteream teres cum melle et illinies capud antea tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit oliue foliis coctis et corticibus cum melle tritis cataplastmabis.

ed. om.

Ge 148v Item ad eas que in capite sunt scabies. rutam et stipteream teres cum melle et illinies capud. ante tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit cortice oliue et foliis coctis cum melle tritis cathaplastmabis.

G1 5r *et* **L2** 6vb Item ad eas que in capite sunt scabies rutam et stipt(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 foliis coctis cum melle tritis (tritis *s. s.* G1) cataplastmabis (catha- L2).

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

Ma 6v Item ad eas que in capite sunt scabias (sic *uel* fit). rutam et stipteream teres cum melle et illinies caput. Antea tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit oliue foliis coctis cum melle tritis cataplastmabis.

M 288b Item aliud ad ea que in capite scabia sunt. Ruta et stiptiria teris cum mel et unguis caput antea tamen radis. Si autem recesserit a capite cortex oliue folia cocta trita cum mel catapl(asm)as.

Mu 2vb et **O** 5ab Item aliud quibus in capite scabies sunt. rutam et stipt(er)iam t(er)is cum melle (cum m. t. O) et unguis caput ante tamen radis. Si autem recesserit a capite cutis oliue foliis coctis tritis cum melle cataplastmabis.

Ox 4r (tit.) Ad eas que in capite sunt scabies. Accipe rutam et stipt(er)eam teres cum melle et illinies capud ante tamen rades. Si autem recesserit a capite cutis oliue cortice et foliis (et corticibus s.s.) coctis tritis cum melle cataplastmabis.

P1 144vb Item aliud ad eaque in capite scauias sunt. ruta et stiptiria teris cum mel et inunguis caput | (145ra) antea tamen radis si autem recesserit a capitis cutis oliue folia admiscis sucum et inunguis (in- s. s.) et permittis ut siccet . . .

(145ra) XVII. (*spatium uacuum pro tit.*) Ad psydracia et ad ea que in capite scauias sunt. Ruta et stiptiria teris cum mel et inunguis capud antea tamen radis. Si autem recesserit a capite cutis oliue folia cocta trite cum mel catapl().

P2 9v Item ad eas que in capite sunt scabies (*corr. ex -eas*) rutam et stipteream teres cum melle et illinies caput. Antea tamen rades. Si autem cutis a capite recesserit oliue foliis coctis cum melle tritis cataplastmabis.

P3 4r Item aliud ad eos quibus in capite scabies ueteres (ueteres s. s.) sunt. rutam et stipteream t(er)is cum melle et inunguis caput. antea tamen radis. si autem cutis recesserit a capite cortice oliue et foliis coctis et (et s. s.) tritis cum melle cataplastmas.

(*Lib. pass.*) s p. 309 Item alia ad ea que in caput scabia sunt ruta et stiptiria teris cum mel et inlinebis et de folia oliuarum cum mel cataplab'

(*Ter.*) Par. lat. 11219, 49ra Item alia ad ea que in capite scabeas sunt. rute stipteria. teris cum melle et inunges caput anteponis rades. Si autem necesse est a capite cutis oliuae folia cocta trita cum melle cataplastmabis.

4.10.2. BOOK I.18–19

(**A** 4vb; **B** 145r; **C** 8r; **D** 4vb; *ed.* 3r; **G1** 5r; **G2** 15r; **Ge** 148v; **L1** 13v; **L2** 7ra; **M** 289a; **Ma** 6v; **Mu** 2vb; **O** 5b; **Ox** 4r; **P1** 145ra; **P2** 9v; **P3** 4r; Greek text I, 461,11 Puschmann)

1.18.t. Ad ulcera in capite spissa et rubra modica⁶¹ assimilantia titinulas ex quibus tabes quaedam defluit

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

+- *another recipe* -+⁶²

2. Item aliud. Melanteria cum aceto +- acro -+ inunges.

⁶¹ *modice* M. This is surely *modica ulcera*=ἐλκύδρια rather than *modice assimilantia* all for παραπλήσια.

⁶² Although he is reporting Greek ms. Mf at this point, Puschmann fails to say that this recipe is not in it.

(I, 461, 11–21) t. Πρὸς (ἄλλο πρὸς Mf) τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐλκύδρια πυκνὰ καὶ ἐρυθρὰ παραπλήσια θηλαίς, ἀφ' ὧν ἰχώρες ἀποτίκτονται (ἀποτίκτονται Mf M L 2203)

1. Προξυρήσας τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ὕδατι καὶ νίτρῳ προαποσμήξας θεῖον ἄπυρον (θ. ἀπ. *abbr.* Mf) μετ' οὔρου ἀνθρωπείου (μετὰ οὔρου παιδὸς ἀφθόρου Mf) λείων χρῶ.⁶³

+– Ἄλλο πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ. Λιθαργύρου δραχ. ἰβ' ψιμμιθίου δραχ. ἰβ' θείου ἀπύρου οὔγγ. η'. κηρωτῆ μυρσίνῃ ἀναλάμβανε καὶ χρῶ.–+

2. Ἄλλο· Μελαντηρίαν μετ' ὄξους +– (δριμέως Mf) –+ κατάχριε.

1.19.t. De acorae⁶⁴ signis

1. Acora passio est in ipsa⁶⁵ cute capitis facta, parua foramina habens ex quibus fluit humor similis quod icor⁶⁶ Graeci uocant, unde et ipsa passio acora appellatur,⁶⁷ quod nos tabem dicimus.

2. Est autem quod defluit aut⁶⁸ colericum aut flegmaticum interdum etiam et melancolicum.⁶⁹ Cognosci⁷⁰ ergo oportet passionis ipsius proprietatem, et ex hoc maxime curatio est adhibenda.

3. Colericus igitur abundans humor subtilior apparet⁷¹ et subcolerico⁷² colore.

4. Si autem non fuerit subtilis sed pinguis et glutinosus, flegmaticus humor salsus⁷³ augmentatus facit acoras.

5. Si autem nihil horum fuerit, sed appareant loca ex quibus fluit humor duriora magis +– et scirodia –+⁷⁴ et superinentia cuti et constricta,⁷⁵ ut nihil ex his defluat aut uix⁷⁶ modicum, scias melancolicum esse humorem qui facit acoras.

(I, 463, 1–18) t. Περὶ ἀχώρων

1. Καὶ ὁ ἄχωρ πάθος ἐστὶ περὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς κεφαλῆς γινόμενον, μικρὰς διατρήσεις ἔχον, ἐξ ὧν ἔξεισιν ὑγρὸν ἰχώρι παραπλήσιον· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἄχωρ τὸ πάθος καλεῖται. 2. ἔστι δὲ τὸ παραρρέον ὅτε μὲν χολῶδες ἢ φλεγματώδες, ὅτε δὲ καὶ μελαγχολικόν. διαγινώσκειν οὖν χρὴ τὸ κυρίως αἴτιον· οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πάντων θεραπεία. 3. χολώδους μὲν γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ πλεονάζοντος περιττώματος,

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 ἄχωρ, -ος (m).

⁶⁵ *ipsae* A

⁶⁶ *icor* η] *ycor* (-g- P1, -ch- G1) γ GIL2 Ox *ycora* (-ch- D) *cett*.

⁶⁷ *appellant* η', prompted probably by the surrounding actives, *uocant* and *dicimus*.

⁶⁸ *ut* M A

⁶⁹ *aut*₂ ... *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 συστάσει.

⁷² cf. ὑπόχολον, 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. ἀλμυρόν 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 ὀλίγον.

λεπτόν ἐστι τῆ συστάσει καὶ ὑπόχρον (ὑπόχολον Mf) τῆ χροιά. **4.** εἰ δὲ μὴ λεπτόν τῆ συστάσει, ἀλλὰ παχὺ καὶ γλίσχρον, φλέγμα (φλεγματοῶδες νόει καὶ ἀλμυρὸν Mf) τὸ πλεονάζον καὶ ποιοῦν τὸν ἄχωρα. **5.** εἰ δὲ μηδὲν τούτων εἶη, φαίνονται δὲ οἱ τόποι, ἐξ ὧν ἀπορρεῖ τὸ ὑγρὸν, σκληροὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ὑπερέχοντες τῆς ἐπιφανείας καὶ στεγνότεροι, ὡς μηδὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπορρεῖν ἢ μόλις ὀλίγον, γίνωσκε μελαγχολικὸν εἶναι τὸ ποιοῦν αἴτιον τὸν ἄχωρα.

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

7. Gustus igitur si amarus fuerit, colericus est humor; salsus⁷⁸ autem si fuerit,⁷⁹ flegmaticus est; *acetosus autem*⁸⁰ melancholicus.⁸¹

8. Sed et tactu cognoscere poteris +— qualis sit⁸² humor—+. Calidior enim si tibi locus appareat, colericus inest⁸³ humor. Si autem frigidior, flegmaticus est. Minus autem frigidus, melancholicus inest humor. +— —+

6. λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ τὰ προηγησάμενα αἴτια, ἢ τε κρᾶσις τοῦ πάσχοντος καὶ ἡ ἡλικία καὶ ἡ γεῦσις. **7.** πικρότητος μὲν γὰρ αἰσθάνονται οἷς χολῶδές ἐστι τὸ αἴτιον· ἀλμυρᾶς δὲ ποιότητος, οἷς τὸ φλέγμα (φλεγματοῶδες?⁸⁴), ἰώδους δὲ, οἷς μελαγχολικός ἐστι χυμός. **8.** ἀπὸ τῆς ἀφῆς δὲ διαγινώσκειν ἐστὶ σοι δυνατόν· θερμότερα γὰρ σοι φαίνεται ἐφ’ ὧν ἐστι χολῶδες, ψυχρότερα δὲ ἐφ’ ὧν φλεγματοῶδες, ἦττον δὲ ψυχρὰ ἐφ’ ὧν μελαγχολῶδες. +—οὕτω μὲν διαγινώσκεις τοὺς τίκτοντας τὸν ἄχωρα χυμούς.—+

4.10.3. BOOK I.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.t. De oculorum passionibus⁸⁵

1. Iam enim in aliis tribus libris a me scriptum est⁸⁶ de oculorum passionibus qualiter oporteat cognosci in eis consistentes passiones, et causas eorum et curationes et

⁷⁷ *uerba* considerande sunt (sunt considerande Ma) *add.* ε (*etiam* C) attendere oportet *add.* Ox Ge. γ and η have the same verbless sentence as the Greek. For the personal use of *considerandus*, cf. 1.124 *-anda qualitas et quantitas* (II, 105, 20 ἐπισκεπτέον).

⁷⁸ salsedo η

⁷⁹ si fuerit P1 Ma *om. cett.*

⁸⁰ These two words are omitted by γ and η, who after *flegmaticus est* have just *aut melancholicus*. The earlier presence of *acetosus* may account for *salsedo* in η. All the descendants of ε (but not C) have *acetosus* (ἰώδης, LSJ, s.v. II.). On the medieval Latin terminology for the flavours, see Burnett, ‘Flavours’.

⁸¹ That M omits *salsus* . . . *melancholicus* perhaps indicates that *est humor* originally stood after *melancholicus*, as in the Greek, which would make M’s fault a *saut du même au même*.

⁸² This subjunctive is even in γ.

⁸³ Does *inest* reflect a misunderstanding of ἐφ’ ὧν ἐστι?

⁸⁴ We expect a derivative, rather than just the base φλέγμα. -τῶδες could easily have been lost by haplography before ἰώδους.

⁸⁵ For *similia*, cf. Paul. Aeg. 3.22.3, p. 172, and Adams, *Paul. Aeg.*, I, 409ff., 423ff.

⁸⁶ scriptis Ox P3 scripta sunt *cett.*

diuersitates colliriorum,⁸⁷ et modus⁸⁸ qualiter oporteat adhiberi et qualiter conficiantur +- demonstratus est -+.⁸⁹

2. Vnde nunc⁹⁰ bene hoc⁹¹ mihi uisum est ut breuiter constrictaque debeat de his dicere, ut legentes hunc librum +- -+ non quaerant ex alio codice quae ad oculorum curationem sunt⁹² utilia. +- -+

3. +- Oportet ergo prius singularum in oculis passionum signa cognosci et sic adhiberi curationem.-+

4. Incipiamus ergo [nunc⁹³] iam dicere de his⁹⁴ quibus in oculis contingere +- solent -+ dolores.

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

(II, 3, 1-11) t. Περὶ θεραπείας ὀφθαλμῶν

1. Ἦδη μὲν οὖν ἐν ἄλλοις τρισὶ βιβλίοις ἀναγέγραπταί μοι περὶ τῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παθῶν καὶ πῶς διαγιγνώσκῃν χρὴ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς συνιστάμενα πάθη καὶ τὰς αἰτίας τούτων καὶ τὰς θεραπείας καὶ περὶ διαφόρων κολλουρίων καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς σκευασίας. +--+ 2. ἀλλ' οὖν ὅμως καὶ ἐνταῦθα καλὸν ἔδοξέ μοι κεφαλαιωδῶς καὶ συντόμως εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, ὥστε τὸν ἐντυγχάνοντα τῷδε τῷ βιβλίῳ +- θεραπευτικῶ ὄντι -+⁹⁵ μὴ ζητεῖν ἐξ ἑτέρων ἀναλέγεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς χρησίμων. +- ἀλλ' εἰ δύναίτο τις ὡσπερ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν παθῶν οὕτω καὶ περὶ τούτου πῶς δεῖ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἅπαντα διαγιγνώσκῃν τε καὶ θεραπεύειν πάθη. -+⁹⁶ +- (3.) -+ 4. ἀρξώμεθα οὖν ἦδη τοῦ λόγου ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς συμβαινούσης ὀδύνης: 5. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἀνιαρὸν καὶ +- -+ κατεπεῖγον τὴν τέχνην⁹⁷ εἰς θεραπείαν, ὡς ὀδύνη σφοδρὰ συμβαίνουσα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.

6. Quando ergo dolores nimii et intolerabiles occupauerint oculos, +- -+⁹⁸ non, sicut multi faciunt, narcoticis confectis praesumendum est uti colliriis;

7. multi etiam et ipsum opium praesumpserunt inquimatizare, unde nullo modo paragorizauerunt dolorem sed adhuc etiam magis laeserunt.

⁸⁷ The accusatives *causas*, *curationes* and *diuersitates* are not appropriately governed by *cognosci*, and hang rather in the air.

⁸⁸ Probably originally *modos*.

⁸⁹ Added in the Latin along with the change of *modos* to *modus*.

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

⁹¹ *hic* in φ matches Greek ἐνταῦθα, but probably by chance. Could *hoc* be impersonal 'it'?

⁹² sint P2 Ge φ

⁹³ Greek ἦδη: *nunc* is absent in γ, and probably entered the tradition as a gloss.

⁹⁴ eis A. The Greek refers to the pain, the Latin (with the addition of *solent*) to the patients.

⁹⁵ θεραπεύοντα?

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 εἰ δύναίτο τις. 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?'

⁹⁷ Latin *artifex* here is preferable to τὴν τέχνην, which should probably be corrected to τὸν τεχνίτην; cf. 1.85.13 below.

⁹⁸ But the Greek phrase at this point looks very much like a gloss on ἀκαρτέρητοι.

8. Contemplari ergo oportet qualitatem causae, et unamquamque causam attendens curationis praeuideas⁹⁹ species. Non enim est una qualitas causae, sed multae et uariae sunt.

9. Fit enim¹⁰⁰ plenitudo materiae supercurrens, ut solum ex hoc uideas fieri dolorem et qualitates.¹⁰¹ Saepius autem ex utrisque fit, ex qualitate scilicet¹⁰² et ex quantitate.

10. Prouidendum¹⁰³ 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 qualis utique¹⁰⁴ superfluitas est.¹⁰⁵

11. Aut enim ex sanguine nigro¹⁰⁶ aut coleribus aut flegmate aut melancholia est quod fluit aut <ex?> uentositate [est?] spiritus,¹⁰⁷ et si¹⁰⁸ unus ex ipsis est qui molestat humor aut duo commixti.

12. Contingit enim et unum solum fluentem facere flegmonem et dolorem nimium, et duo simul permixti faciunt +– dolorem uel –+¹⁰⁹ tumorem, ex quibus etiam differentia est causae.¹¹⁰

13. Ad unumquemque¹¹¹ igitur¹¹² eorum quae necessaria sunt artificem adhibere expedit existimantem¹¹³ cognitionem singularum passionum.

(II, 3, 11–5, 17) 6. εἰ (ὅταν 2203 M Mf) οὖν ὀδύναι σφοδραὶ καὶ ἀκαρτέρητοι περιέχουσι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, +–ὡς μὴ δύνασθαι καρτερεῖν τὸν πάσχοντα–+, μὴ ὡς πολλοὶ τοῖς ναρκωτικοῖς +– εὐθὺς Mf –+ σκευαζομένοις θαρρήσης κολλουρίοις· 7. πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ τολμήσαντες ἐγγέειν τὸ ὄπιον, πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν ὅλως παρηγορῆσαι τὴν ὀδύνην ἔτι (ἔτι δὲ L) καὶ μεγάλως (μᾶλλον Mf) ἔβλαψαν. 8. ἐπισκέπτεσθαι οὖν δεῖ τὴν ποιούσαν +– τὴν ὀδύνην Mf –+ αἰτίαν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀποβλέποντα οὕτω καὶ τὸ τῆς θεραπείας ὀρίζειν εἶδος· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἓν τὸ ποιῶν

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 ποιότητος. That this was not corrected in the light of the next phrase suggests that the translator was working in haste at this point.

¹⁰² scilicet *om.* γ Ox P3

¹⁰³ Prouidendum A

¹⁰⁴ Here, as elsewhere in the Latin Alexander and the Latin Oribasius, *utique*=Greek ἄρα; cf. Langslow, 'utique'.

¹⁰⁵ sit B

¹⁰⁶ 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.

¹⁰⁷ For the plain ablative, cf. 1.37 'manifestum est uentositate tumentis spiritus fieri' (Gk I, 487, 21 φυσώδους ἐγκειμένου πνεύματος 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* (with prothetic *e-*) less likely as the starting-point. For this translation, cf. Orib., *Syn.* 8. 41.1 La *ex uentositate[m] spiritus*=πνευμάτων φυσωδών.

¹⁰⁸ et si unus M. I take it that *si* is the original, automatic, and nonsensical translation of Greek πότερον, variously corrected in the tradition.

¹⁰⁹ This may well originally have stood in the Greek.

¹¹⁰ 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?

¹¹¹ Did the translator mistake the Greek neuter for masculine? Only D and P2 have *unumquodque*.

¹¹² igitur] *om.* γ ergo D Ox P3

¹¹³ Only γ has the participle, necessary for the sense; the rest have *existimare*.

αἷτιον,¹¹⁴ ἀλλὰ πολλὰ καὶ ποικίλα. **9.** καὶ πλήθος ὕλης ἐπιρρέον μόνον οἶδε ποιεῖν ὀδύνην καὶ ποιότης, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὸ συναμφότερον, καὶ ποιότης ἅμα καὶ ποσότης. **10.** θεωρεῖται δὲ καὶ πόθεν ὀρμᾶται τὸ ἐπιρρεῦσαν, ἅρα γε ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος ἢ ἐκ μόνης τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ πότερον διὰ τῶν ἀρτηριῶν ἐκχεόμενον ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν φλεβῶν +—+ καὶ οἶον ἅρα τὸ ἐπιρρέον ἐστίν· **11.** ἦτοι γὰρ αἷμα μᾶλλον ἢ χολὴ ἢ φλέγμα ἢ μελαγχολικὸς χυμὸς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπιρρεῦσαν ἢ πνεῦμα φυσῶδες· καὶ πότερον εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ λυπῶν χυμὸς ἢ δύο συμπεπλεγμένοι· **12.** ἐνδέχεται γὰρ καὶ ἓνα μόνον ἐπιρρεῦσαντα ποιῆσαι φλεγμονὴν καὶ ὀδύνην σφοδρὰν καὶ δύο ἅμα καὶ σύνθετον ἐργάσασθαι +—+ τὸν ὄγκον. ἐπεὶ οὖν διάφορά ἐστὶ τὰ αἷτια, **13.** πρὸς ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἀνάγκη τὸν τεχνίτην ἐφαρμόζεσθαι. ἡγείσθω δὲ ἡ διάγνωσις ὀδηγοῦσα εἰς τὴν ὀρθὴν θεραπείαν.

1.86.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.

2. Rubra enim sunt omnia et sanguineo colore, et ipsa facies rubra, et in tumore magno sunt posita, et uenae apparent [apertius et] plenae,¹¹⁵ et grauitas sentitur, et pigritia in omnibus consuetis actionibus accidit.¹¹⁶

3. Et si in his neque mordicans lacrima uel¹¹⁷ acris uideatur, adhuc magis sanguineum humorem esse existima qui fluit et facit flegmonem.¹¹⁸

(II, 5, 18–25) **t.** Περὶ διαγνώσεως τοῦ εἶναι τὸν ποιήσαντα τὴν φλεγμονὴν αἱματικὸν χυμὸν

1. Εἰ μὲν οὖν αἱματικὸς εἴη χυμὸς ἐπιρρεῦσας καὶ τὴν φλεγμονὴν ἐργασάμενος, ἔσται δῆλόν σοι ἐκ τοῦ εἶδους αὐτῆς τῆς φλεγμονῆς. **2.** ἐρυθρὰ γὰρ ἅπαντα καὶ αἱματώδη καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐρυθρὸν καὶ ἐν ὄγκῳ μείζονι καὶ αἰ φλέβες εὐρύτεραι καὶ βάρους συναίσθησις καὶ ὄκνος περὶ τὰς συνήθεις ἐνεργείας. **3.** εἰ δὲ πρὸς τούτοις μηδὲ τὸ δάκρυον δακνῶδες καὶ δριμὺ φαίνοιτο, ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον αἱματικὸν εἶναι νόμιζε τὸ ἐπιρρεῦσαν αἷτιον καὶ ποιῆσαν τὴν φλεγμονὴν.

1.87.t. Curatio +—flegmonis de sanguine facti—+

1. Si enim sanguineus esse tibi manifestus fuerit flegmon, incidenda¹¹⁹ 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* (?).

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 θ . 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 appareat mixtus, et catharticum postquam flebotomaueris dabis et colliriis¹²¹ uteris intrinsecus +– →¹²² qui digerere possint flegmonis, quorum etiam confectiones uobis tradere non omittam.

3. Extrinsecus autem¹²³ superponenda sunt adiutoria haec. Lac mulieris cum oui uitello et oleo roseo superpositum +– → mitigat et digerit satis igneos oculorum flegmones. Similiter quoque et uiolae herbae folia praestant.¹²⁴

4. Ad autem <eum>¹²⁵ cui cum nimio flegmone uel tumore ingenti +– dolor fuerit ortus → bene facit crocus cum micis panis et uitellis ouorum +– →. Similiter autem et dactili faciunt – postquam¹²⁶ autem repressum fuerit reuma – cum meliloto crocus et glaucion et ouorum uitella cocta et oleum roseum +– permixta superponantur. –+

5. Ad dolores autem et plenas epiforas oculorum: rosis siccis. L iiii, croco L i +– opio L i. → Cum sapa¹²⁷ ubi melilotum fuerit coctum colliges +– et uteris. –+

(II, 5, 6–7, 16) t. Περὶ θεραπείας +– →

1. Εἰ μὲν οὖν αἱματικόν σοι φανείη τὸ τὴν φλεγμονὴν ἐργασάμενον αἴτιον, τέμνειν χρῆ τὴν φλέβα τὴν ὠμιαῖαν. 2. εἰ δὲ καὶ χολώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς χυμοὶ σὺν τῷ αἵματι φαίνονται, καὶ κάθαρσιν μετ’ ὀλίγον τῆς φλεβοτομίας παραλάμβανε καὶ βοηθήμασι χρῶ, ἔνδοθεν +– μὲν τοῖς ἀδήκτοις καὶ πραῦτάτοις, → ἔξωθεν δὲ τοῖς συμπέττειν δυναμένοις τὰς φλεγμονὰς, ὧν καὶ τὰς σκευασίας ὑμῖν ἐκθησόμεθα.

3. Περὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἐπιτιθεμένων βοηθημάτων. Γάλα γυναικὸς μετὰ κρόκων ὠῶν καὶ ῥοδίνου διατιθέμενον +–θαυμαστώσ+– πραῦνει καὶ συμπέττει τὰς πάνυ ζεούσας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν φλεγμονὰς, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἴου τὰ φύλλα. 4. πρὸς δὲ τὰς μεγίστας φλεγμονὰς καὶ ἐν ὄγκῳ μείζονι ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ κρόκος μετὰ ψιχῶν καὶ τῶν κρόκων τῶν ὠῶν +–καὶ ῥοδίνου.–+ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ποιοῦσι καὶ οἱ φοίνικες¹²⁸ μετὰ τοῦ ἐπέχειν τὸν ἐπιφερόμενον ῥευματισμὸν μετὰ τῶν μελιλώτων καὶ κρόκου καὶ γλαυκίων καὶ πυρρῶν¹²⁹ ὠῶν ἐφθῶν [ἐκζεστῶν]¹³⁰ καὶ ῥοδίνου.–+ →

¹²¹ More specific than the Greek βοηθήματα.

¹²² *Saut du même au même*, whether in the translation or in the translator’s Greek text. θ^{ll} added *uel extrinsecus* (cf. *interius uel exterius* Ge).

¹²³ igitur γ 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 scripsi*] At η P2, Greek πρὸς; *addidi sensus causa*. Cf. 1.15 *At autem* (A: *Ad ed.*)=I, 459, 9 πρὸς δέ. (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 τῶν δὲ ὀσπρίων προσφερέσθωσαν.) 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 τὰς μὴ πάνυ ... I cannot parallel *Ad autem eum* ...; *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 ἔψημα, 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 γλυκὺ at 1.127=Gk II, 113, 22. Cf. Orib. *Eup.* 4.15.4 ἀναλάμβανε μελιλώτων ἀφεψήματι ἢ γλυκεῖ (Aa *cum sapa*, La *aut sapa*). Cf. also Cass. Fel. 29.14 Fraisse ‘melilotum ... in passo coctum.’

¹²⁸ This phrase goes better after ῥευματισμὸν.

¹²⁹ This variation in the word for ‘yolk’ so soon after two occurrences of κρόκου may be a hint that μετὰ ... ῥοδίνου 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 ἐπτὰ.

5. Πρὸς περιωδυνίας καὶ μεγίστας ἐπιφοράς.

ῥόδων νεαρῶν δραχ. δ'
κρόκου δραχ. α'

+— —+

ἀναλάμβανε μελιλώτων ἀφεψημάτι +—ἐν γλυκεῖ ἀφεψηθέντων.¹³¹—+

1.88.t. De colliriis +—mitigatiuis in doloribus oculorum ex sanguineo humore factis—+

1. Cataplasmata enim¹³² extrinsecus ad flegmonem *talia quae*¹³³ *diximus* sunt utenda.

2. Superinunctiones autem et iniquimatismata +—sequenti sermone sunt ordinanda.—+

(II, 7, 17–19) **t.** Περὶ κολλουρίων +—+

1. Ἐπιπλάσμασι μὲν οὖν ἔξωθεν ἐπὶ φλεγμονηθέντων¹³⁴ κεχρηῆσθαι, 2. ἐπιχρίσμασι δὲ καὶ ἐγγχυματισμοῖς τοῖσδε.

4.10.4. BOOK 2.36–7

(A 62ra; B 182v; C 39v; D 59ra; *ed.* 38r; G1 52r; G2 178r; Ge 63r; L1 136v; L2 50ra; M 359a; Ma 66v; Mu 27rb; O 39a; Ox 50r; P1 186ra; P2 54r; P3 43v; u 320; v1 59r; Greek text II, 279,18 Puschmann)

2.36.t. De cardiaca passione¹³⁵

1. Cardiaca passio stomachi¹³⁶ causa est.

2. Contingit autem his quibus pessimi et uenenosi cum mordicatione stomachi ibidem colliguntur¹³⁷ humores et dominantur,¹³⁸ maxime his¹³⁹ qui nimis sensibilem¹⁴⁰ habent stomachum, ita ut interdum etiam aliqui mox derepente moriantur, non ferentes insustentabilem mordicationem uenenosis humoribus.¹⁴¹

3. Scire autem oportet quia et¹⁴² lumbrici saepius superiora petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est ut faciant cardiacam passionem et cum angustia +—

¹³¹ ἐν γλυκεῖ ἀφεψηθέντων looks very much like an addition (possibly from another version of the same recipe).

¹³² igitur γ γ' autem Mu Ox

¹³³ quae γ γ' P3] qualia *cett.*

¹³⁴ M inserts δεῖ. As it stands, the infinitive κεχρηῆσθαι would have to be taken as imperatival: for a parallel, cf. I, 335, 7, but in the overwhelming majority of its more than 200 occurrences in the Greek Alexander κεχρηῆσθαι is dependent and not absolute.

¹³⁵ For *similia*, cf. Adams, *Paul. Aeg.*, I, 511–13 (add Oribasius, *Syn.* 9.10), and, on worms, Adams, *Paul. Aeg.*, II, 145–50, and Krieger-Königsberg.

¹³⁶ Here *stomachus*=στόμαχος, but in 2.36.2, 4; 37.14 *stomachus* translates τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστρούς.

¹³⁷ generantur φ

¹³⁸ *dominantur* corresponds to συρρέουσιν, but must reflect something like κυριεύουσιν (kappa and sigma differing by only a single stroke).

¹³⁹ his *om.* A

¹⁴⁰ debilem γ P3 φ. Cf. 1.113 *sensibilitas*=II, 79, 9 αἰσθητικόν.

¹⁴¹ We are clearly here reading the work of a superior translator! Might he have ventured the bare instrumental ablative after *mordicatio*? Or should we reckon with loss of *e(x)* before *uenenosis*?

¹⁴² et *om.* A

→ sincopos¹⁴³ ingerant, ita ut aliqui statim¹⁴⁴ a lumbricorum mordicatione pereant.¹⁴⁵
 4. Propterquod¹⁴⁶ oportet non omnino¹⁴⁷ existimare a pessimis ← et uenenosis → humoribus fieri subitaneas sincopas stomachi, in¹⁴⁸ qua re etiam lumbricorum signa sunt requirenda. ← →¹⁴⁹

(II, 279, 19–281, 5) t. Περί καρδιακῆς διαθέσεως

1. Καὶ ἡ καρδιακὴ διάθεσις τοῦ στομάχου πάθος ἐστί. 2. συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο, εἰ μοχθηροὶ καὶ δακνώδεις καὶ ἰώδεις ἀθροισθῶσιν ἢ συρρεύσωσιν ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοί. ἐὰν οὖν εὐρεθῶσί τινες ἔχοντες τῆς γαστρὸς αἰσθητικὸν τὸ στόμα, παραντικά ἀπόλλυνται μὴ δυνηθέντες ὑπενεγκεῖν τὴν ἄμετρον δῆξι τῶν χυμῶν. 3. πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἔλμινθες ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν ἀναδραμόντες ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τῆς γαστρὸς ἐργάζονται καρδιακὰς διαθέσεις καὶ λειποθυμίας ← → ἀμέτρους καὶ συγκοπὰς, ὥστε τινὰς (II, 281) παραντικά ὑφ' ἐλμίνθων δακνομένους ἀπόλλυσθαι. 4. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν χρὴ μὴ πάντοτε νομίζειν ὑπὸ μοχθηρῶν ← → χυμῶν γίνεσθαι αἰφνιδίους συγκοπὰς τοῦ στόματος τῆς γαστρὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐλμίνθων σημεῖα ζητεῖν· ← οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὰ θηρία ταῦτα θανάτους αἰφνιδίους ἐργάζονται καὶ συγκοπὰς οὐδὲν ἦττον τῶν ὀλεθρίων χυμῶν.—→

2.37.t. [Curatio cardiace]¹⁵⁰

1. Nam¹⁵¹ qui habent in stomacho mordicationem de malignis humoribus et propterea sincopos patiuntur, inprimis oportet eis cibos offerri qui et refrigerandi habeant aliquid,¹⁵² et confortare possint locum qui solutus est.
 2. Infrigidant igitur bene et corroborant¹⁵³ malogranati grana assumpta, siue sucus eorum acceptus, sed et mela¹⁵⁴ non satis dulcia sed mediocriter stiptica, et pira et persica¹⁵⁵

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

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 *mox*.

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).

¹⁴⁶ Unanimously attested here, although elsewhere often with the variant *propterea*. In Book 1, A attests *propterquod* twenty-four times, *propterea* eight times and *propter hoc* three times.

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

¹⁴⁸ *in qua re* is unparalleled in Books 1 and 2 in A, although *de qua re* and *pro qua re* are quite common.

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

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 *Infrigidant igitur*. Like G1, P3 has a title at this point, a much longer one: *Curatio cardiacorum qui habent . . . patiuntur*.

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

¹⁵² With *habeant aliquid* cf. the reading of Greek ms. M ἔχει τι, although Latin *et . . . et* nicely translates Greek μετὰ . . . ἔτι καὶ.

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.

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).

¹⁵⁵ persice η: another example of a divergent *a*-stem noun in η.

et¹⁵⁶ duracina¹⁵⁷ et uuae quae austerum aliquid et stipticum habent, et panis in aqua frigida aut in calida aqua,¹⁵⁸ si¹⁵⁹ is qui patitur sit temperantia satis calida, et in eius stomacho contineantur humores mordicantes et acres nimis.

3. His¹⁶⁰ ergo ab initio *hunc*¹⁶¹ oportet uti qui cardialgiam¹⁶² patitur.

(II, 281, 5–15) 1. τοῖς οὖν ἔχουσι μοχθηροὺς καὶ δακνώδεις ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς χυμοὺς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συγκοπήναι κινδυνεύουσιν ἀρμόζει πρῶτον αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων ἐκεῖνα τῶν ἐδεσμάτων προσφέρειν, ὅσα μετὰ τοῦ ψύχειν ἔτι, καὶ ῥωννύειν δύναται τὸ μόριον ἐκλυόμενον. 2. ἐμψύχουσι τοίνυν καλῶς καὶ ῥωννύουσιν οἱ τε τῆς ροιᾶς κόκκοι ἐσθιόμενοι καὶ ὁ χυλὸς αὐτῶν καὶ μῆλα δὲ τὰ μὴ πάνυ γλυκέα, ἀλλὰ μετρίως στύφοντα καὶ οἱ ἄπιοι καὶ περσικὰ καὶ ῥοδάκινα καὶ ἡ αὐστηρὸν καὶ στύφον ἔχουσα σταφυλὴ καὶ ἄρτος εἰς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν καὶ εὐκρατον, εἴπερ οἱ πάσχοντες ἦσαν τῆ κράσει θερμοὶ πάνυ καὶ οἱ περιεχόμενοι χυμοὶ δακνώδεις καὶ δριμεῖς ἄγαν. 3. τούτοις μὲν οὖν κατ' ἀρχὰς δεῖ κεκρῆσθαι πρὸς τὴν καρδιαλίαν.

4. Ceterum autem oportet eis¹⁶³ addere paulatim cibos qui tarde digeruntur +– +, quale est [+–de piscibus–+] bulba¹⁶⁴ et pectines et astaci et isicia *et*¹⁶⁵ pectines et ciciria¹⁶⁶ et uentres anserini et pedes porcini et quaecumque non facile corrumpuntur sed repugnando uincere possunt malos qui continentur¹⁶⁷ humores.

5. Oportet autem his, cum requieverit +– aut lenimentum acceperit –+¹⁶⁸ passio, suadere semper ut citius cibos accipiant.

6. Nullum enim est aliud maius iuamen¹⁶⁹ quam cibi qui tarde digeruntur et difficile corrumpuntur accepti.¹⁷⁰

¹⁵⁶ et M: *om. cett.*

¹⁵⁷ duracine η

¹⁵⁸ Note the repetition of *in aqua* and the chiasmus, further features of this translator's style(?).

¹⁵⁹ I run on at this point, partly because the Greek does also, and partly because of the absence of a particle in the Latin (cf. note 151 above).

¹⁶⁰ Huic η P2 (and therefore δ?), prompted by singular *qui patitur*.

¹⁶¹ *hunc* Fischer: hoc β η *om. cett.*

¹⁶² v1 along with δ has *cardialgiam* (which in view of the Greek καρδιαλίαν is probably right), although γ, u and O have *cardiacam*: while this is an easy error, given that *cardiaca passio* is the subject of the chapter, and could have occurred several times independently, its distribution suggests that it was in β, and may be another hint that O knew a descendant of γ (cf. 4.8.3 above); v1 found *cardialgiam* either in a source higher than β or in a descendant of δ. (Cf. 2.37.8 below.)

¹⁶³ ei AMu G1P2L2B Ge

¹⁶⁴ *bulba plerique*] uulua M (ἡ τε βούλβα καλουμένη): is *uulua* (edible sow's womb) intended? Two parallel passages, in which the Greek has the diminutive βούλβιον, are unilluminating: II, 247, 27 οἶον στέρνιον καὶ βούλβιον καὶ δαμαλῶν πόδες=2.19 (A) 'qualia bubula sunt et sternion et de iunice pedes'; II, 495, 7 καὶ τῶν κρεῶν βούλβιον καὶ στέρνιον καὶ πόδες μάλιστα τῶν βοῶν=2.200 (A) 'et carnes steriles et pedes porcinos et maxime bouinos'.

¹⁶⁵ ad P1 adde M de *cett.*

¹⁶⁶ ciciria A

¹⁶⁷ Greek κρατούσαν would lead us to expect *dominantur/dominentur*, and *continentur* may reflect a misreading of a script in which *t* resembles *m*.

¹⁶⁸ Notice again the fullness of the translation. If this phrase was originally a gloss, it was incorporated very early.

¹⁶⁹ adiuumentum A D

¹⁷⁰ Yet another double translation, but here the translator seems to have misunderstood βραδυσιτεῖν 'to eat late in the day' (LSJ) and the logic of ἀλλά, and consequently to have started a new sentence in the Latin.

7. His ergo hora tertia suadendum panem infusum in calida aqua ut assumant aut in aqua frigida infusum¹⁷¹ aut mela aut citri¹⁷² deforis¹⁷³ mundaturam.

8. Diaeta enim haec expedit eis¹⁷⁴ qui cardialgiam¹⁷⁵ patiuntur.

(II, 281, 15–25) 4. λοιπὸν δὲ δεῖ προστιθέναι κατὰ μέρος αὐτοῖς, ὅσα δυσμετάβλητά εἰσι +– καὶ δύνανται πρὸς τὰ δακνώδη ἀντέχειν καὶ δριμέα τῶν λυπόωντων χυμῶν,+ οἷόν ἐστιν +– + ἢ τε βοῦλβα καλουμένη καὶ τὸ στέρνιον καὶ ἀστακοὶ καὶ ἰσικοὶ καὶ κτένια καὶ κηρύκια καὶ κοιλῖαι χηνῶν καὶ πόδες συῶν καὶ ἀπλῶς, ὅσα δύνανται μὴ διαφθεῖρεσθαι ταχέως, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάχεσθαι καὶ νικᾶν τὴν κρατοῦσαν κακοχυμῖαν. 5. δεῖ δὲ τούτοις καὶ μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι τῆς ἐπιχειούσης διαθέσεως αἰεὶ ταχύτερον συμβουλεύειν ἐσθίειν. 6. οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὕτω συμβάλλεται, ὡς τὸ μὴ βραδυσυτεῖν, 7. ἀλλὰ περὶ ὥραν τρίτην ἢ τετάρτην ἄρτον εἰς εὔκρατον λαμβάνειν ἢ εἰς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν ἢ μῆλον ἢ κίτρον ἐκτὸς τοῦ λέπους αὐτοῦ. 8. ταῦτα μὲν ἀρμόζει τοῖς τὴν καρδιαλγίαν ὑπομείνασι.

9. Adiutorium autem magnum¹⁷⁶ est glicia,¹⁷⁷ cuius confectio recipit haec:¹⁷⁸ Aceti sext. unum semis, feniculi +–radicis corticis+– ÷ vi,¹⁷⁹ aloë +–epatite+– ÷ iii, melle attico lib. iS.

10. Conficies¹⁸⁰ ut mos est, et dabis ex eo coclearia duo aut tria. Malaxat autem¹⁸¹ et confortat uentrem.

11. Hoc enim medicamen +–ad haec+–¹⁸² optimum est, et non solum cardialgias¹⁸³ sanat sed et inchoantem epilepsiam et ypocondriacas passiones +– uel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est,+– sed et alia plurima de quibus nunc non est tempus¹⁸⁴ ad commemorandum.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷¹ Note again the chiasmic repetition (cf. 2.37.2 above).

¹⁷² citri β: citrie η P2' citrium *plerique*: another *a*-stem in η.

¹⁷³ Mørland, *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 καὶ τῶν πεπόνων ἢ σῶρξ ἐκτὸς τοῦ σπέρματος. If we take *deforis mundaturam* as ‘without its rind’, we have the problem of the case of *citrium* (or *citria* f.?), clearly genitive in β and η. 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 α, is to take *deforis* almost as adjectival, ‘of a citron the outside skin’.

¹⁷⁴ eis δ] his β γ γ'

¹⁷⁵ cardialgiam] cardiacam γ O P3 Ma C cardia u. Again (cf. 2.37.3 above), v1 alone of the descendants of β has the correct reading.

¹⁷⁶ Did the translator's original have μέγα, perfectly idiomatic in Greek (attested in Pseudo-Democritus, Oribasius, Rufus)?

¹⁷⁷ Here and at 2.37.12 below, the tradition points fairly clearly to a *glicial-ea* for Greek γλυκῶ. The transfer to the 1st declension is striking.

¹⁷⁸ In this recipe, the Latin gives more detail than the Greek.

¹⁷⁹ 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.

¹⁸⁰ conficies β

¹⁸¹ autem om. β: was it lost because abbreviated to *at* immediately after *-at* of *malaxat*? Or was it originally not there, as in the particle-less Greek?

¹⁸² *ad haec* is not in the Greek. The Latin tradition is divided between *hec* and *hoc*, both branches being split, and some mss. having just an abbreviation (*h* with a dot, or a stroke through the tail).

¹⁸³ cardiacam M DOx P3 Ma: this time P1 and u (u has *cardian 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.

¹⁸⁴ tempus non est A

¹⁸⁵ This construction may be another tell-tale of this translator.

12. Scio autem quia et anacardion¹⁸⁶ +—antidotum—+¹⁸⁷ ad tales passiones bene facit et pigra data¹⁸⁸ iuuat sed nullum sic sicut glicia adiuuat.¹⁸⁹

13. Sufficiant haec de cardiacis dicta quae fiunt¹⁹⁰ de acredine +— + humorum cum mordicatione.

14. Ceterum uero de his dicendum quae proueniunt in stomacho simptomata aut ex qualitate¹⁹¹ [accidentium]¹⁹² aut ex aegritudinibus diuersis augmentantibus¹⁹³ humoribus.

(II, 281, 25–283, 9) 9. τῶν δὲ βοηθημάτων ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἐπιτήδειον τὸ γλυκὺ λεγόμενον φάρμακον, οἷπερ ἡ σκευασία ἔχει οὕτως· ὄξους ξεστ. α' s'' μαράθρου οὐγ. α' ἀλόης ουγγ. γ' μέλιτος Ἀττικοῦ λιτρ. α' s''. 10. ἡ δόσις κοχλ. β' ἢ γ'. μαλάττει καὶ τοιοῦτὴν γαστέρα. 11. τοῦτο τὸ βοήθημα κάλλιστόν ἐστιν· οὐ μόνον γὰρ ἰάται καρδιαλίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχομένας ἐπιληψίας καὶ ὑποχονδριακὰς διαθέσεις +— + καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖστα, ὧν οὐκ ἔστι καιρὸς μνημονεύειν νῦν. 12. οἶδα δὲ, ὅτι καὶ ἡ δι' ἀνακαρδίων πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖ καὶ ἡ πικρὰ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτως ὡς τὸ βοήθημα τοῦτο. 13. τοσαῦτα περὶ τῆς καρδιακῆς διαθέσεως εἰρήσθω τῆς γινομένης ἐπὶ δῆξει τῶν δακνόντων +— καὶ μοχθηρῶν +— χυμῶν. 14. λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἶπωμεν τῶν συμβαινόντων ἐν τῷ στόματι τῆς γαστρὸς συμπτωμάτων ἢ διὰ ποιότητα ἢ διὰ 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 emoptoicos

1. Non scio si est alia peior passio ista,¹⁹⁴ id est qui sanguinem expuunt, non ob¹⁹⁵ hoc solum quia ipsa per se euacuando occidere potest hominem, sed quia pessima et diuturna +— cum terribili mentis turbatione¹⁹⁶ +— passio generatur.

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

¹⁸⁷ antidotus P1 v1: there is no ἀντίδοτος in the Greek. Can we trust P1's -us? Probably not! Equally, v1's *dianacardion antidotus* looks freakishly learned and should probably be ignored.

¹⁸⁸ data β P2 Ox] datum *cett*. Neither is satisfactory. We may have lost *antidotum* after *pigra*.

¹⁸⁹ Another instance of *uariatio sermonis* (*adiuuat* ~ *iuuat*) in this translator?

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 *cardiaca* and *fiunt* to *fit*.

¹⁹¹ qualitate u θ'] -ibus *cett*. Cf. the singular in the Greek.

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 ποιότητα, ποσότητα and πλεοναζόντων. The appearance of Latin *aegritudines* out of the blue makes one suspect that the translator's Greek text had νοσότητα. What does *diuersis* translate? Might there have been dittography of the first part of Greek πλεοναζόντων?

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, πλεοναζόντων.

¹⁹⁴ ista] ab ista (abstam P1) γ P3

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.

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*¹⁹⁷ ergo festinare oportet inprimis¹⁹⁸ mox cognoscere passionem unde contingit¹⁹⁹ causa aut in quo loco querela facta est.
3. +—Quibus agnitis— sic curatio competens est adhibenda et differri²⁰⁰ non oportet, quia omnium aegritudinum²⁰¹ est pessima +— —+.²⁰²
4. Ante omnia scire oportet quia tribus causis sputum uel uomitum sanguinis cognoscendum²⁰³ est fieri, id est per rixin et diabrosin et anastomosin quae Graeci uocant.
- +— 5. Rixin dicunt²⁰⁴ cum uena crepuerit.
- +— 6. Diabrosin dicunt quando uena,²⁰⁵ amisso nutrimento,²⁰⁶ caro desuper ipsam extenuatur,²⁰⁷ et uena nudata subtiliorque²⁰⁸ effecta, eius tunica a se ipsa comesta, multum desudat sanguinem, et sic effusus intrinsecus per os²⁰⁹ redditur.
- +— 7. Anastomosin autem dicunt cum ora uenarum, uirtute 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.

(II, 187, 2–12) t. Περί αἵματος ἀναγωγῆς

1. Οὐκ οἶδα πάθος εἰ οὕτως ἄλλο χαλεπὸν ἐστὶν ὡς ἡ τοῦ αἵματος πτύσις· οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ τὴν κένωσιν ἄμετρον ἐπιφέρειν ἀναιρεῖν πέφυκεν, ἀλλὰ κακίστων καὶ χρονίων αἷτιον +— —+ γίνεται νοσημάτων 2. ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ· σπουδάζειν οὖν δεῖ διὰ ταῦτα διαγιγνώσκειν τὸ πάθος τοῦτο πρότερον, πόθεν ἔσχε τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ἐν ποίῳ τόπῳ συμβέβηκε, 3. +— —+ καὶ οὕτω τὴν θεραπείαν ἐπιφέρειν καὶ μὴ ἀναβάλλεσθαι· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ πάντων τῶν νοσημάτων ἐστὶν ἡ ἀναβολὴ κακὸν πάνυ, +— πολὺ δὲ πλεόν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ αἵματος ἐξαγωγῆς.—+ 4. εἰδέναι τοίνυν χρὴ τοῦτο πρὸ πάντων, ὡς διὰ τρεῖς αἰτίας ἡ τοῦ αἵματος ἀνάπτυσις ἐγνώσθη γινομένη, διὰ τε ῥῆξιν ἀγγείων, δι' ἀνάβρωσιν καὶ δι' ἀναστόμωσιν.
- +— 5. —+
- +— 6. —+
- +— 7. —+
8. γνωρίσεις δὲ ἕκαστον τῶν πόνων²¹⁰ οὕτως.

¹⁹⁷ Note the divergent sentence-breaks in the Greek and Latin versions. For *quam plurime* 'in general' (= ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ), cf. e.g. 2.2=II, 147, 24.

¹⁹⁸ For *inprimis* 'first of all' in late medical Latin, see Mørland, *Oribasius*, 162–3 (including an example of *mox inprimis*). Here presumably for Greek πρότερον (or τοῦτο πρότερον, if this is an adverbial phrase).

¹⁹⁹ contigerit B (Ma?) φ — but *facta est*, a few words on, is indicative in all mss.

²⁰⁰ dilatare γ P3

²⁰¹ aegr. om. A

²⁰² At best an obscure compression of 'of all diseases this is the worst to delay in'. A lost *dilatatio* (cf. ἀναβολή) would explain the variant *dilatare* (for *differri*) in γ, γ' and P3.

²⁰³ Does the gerundive reflect a misreading of Greek ἐγνώσθη (e.g. as an infinitive in –σθαι, an imperative in –θι, or a jussive subjunctive in –θη), or a sort of preservation of the notion of obligation in *oportet*?

²⁰⁴ dicent γ (also in 6 and 7, immediately below).

²⁰⁵ The nominative is best left (cf. 5 *cum uena*, 7 *cum ora uenarum*), notwithstanding the anacoluthon.

²⁰⁶ Apparently a correctly used ablative absolute. Cf. immediately below *eius tunica a se ipsa comesta*, and *uirtute amissa*.

²⁰⁷ extenuat γ fit extenuata η κ (!)

²⁰⁸ et subtilior P3 (!)

²⁰⁹ ore γ ora G1 P3'. *ora* (pl.) in the sense 'small holes in the vein' would not be absurd.

²¹⁰ πόνος seems odd here. It is otherwise attested in Alex. Trall. twice in the plural (II, 81, 7; 481, 8) and nine times in the singular (e.g. II, 75, 1; 579, 25), always meaning 'pain' (cf. ἄπνοος 'without pain' II, 377, 14; 573, 23), never 'disease, affliction' (*passio*), as apparently here.

4.10.6. BOOK 2.235–6

(A 116va; B 194v; C 69r; D 110rb; G1 99v; G2 332v; Ge 119r; ed. 74r; L1 254r; L2 92va; M 424b; Ma 128v; Mu 48vb; O 69^{bis}a; Ox 97; P1 224vb; P2 99r; P3 90v; v1 75va; *Pod.*: po 60v; Greek text II, 501,7 Puschmann)

2.235.t. De podagra²¹¹

1. Podagrae passionem²¹² sciri oportet ante omnia quia ex multis et ex diuersis causis²¹³ habet consistentiam, unde existimo quia propter uarietatem natiuitatis eius neque cognoscitur omnino neque curari potest²¹⁴ perfectius.

2. Relinquitur²¹⁵ enim eius²¹⁶ aliquid in ipsis locis, et ideo²¹⁷ nullo modo²¹⁸ ab artificibus²¹⁹ medicinae sanari potest +– quia eius ignoratur natiuitas. +²²⁰

3. Ego autem existimo ut quicumque eius bene potuerit natiuitatem²²¹ cognoscere uel diuersitates aut ipsas species quaecumque fiunt et qualiter contingunt, bene et cito²²² possit²²³ curari et facilius a medicis +– ab ipsis infirmitatibus liberari. +²²⁴

4. Dicamus igitur primo cognitiones ipsarum et sic postea curationes ipsas exponemus.²²⁵

²¹¹ For *similia*, cf. Paul. Aeg. 3.78 and Adams, *Paul. Aeg.*, I, 657ff., 666ff.

²¹² –es *trad.* We really do not want the plural, which may easily have arisen from –em before s-, especially as the disease is referred back to with singular *eius*, *cognoscitur*, *potest*. The form with –ica- (*podagricam?*), which must have been in β and *Pod.*, deserves serious consideration. The type –i(a)ca *passio* is paralleled e.g. at 2.36 *cardiaca 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 τὸ τῆς ποδάγρας πάθος.

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 (*multa et diuersa*)? The genitive *diuersarum causarum* is worth considering as a literal translation of διαφόρων αἰτιῶν 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 δύναμαι (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, ὑπόλειψιν for ὑπόληψιν?). 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 μηδὲ ὅλως ‘not at all’.

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

²²⁰ ignoratur natiuitas M v1 P3] ignorantis natiuitatis P1 (making genitive forms to agree with *eius*) ignorantur natiuitates *cett.* This is a rather otiose repetition of the second part of 2.235.1. It looks as if β had *ignoratur natiuitas*, 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] citto P1 credo M v1 *om. Pod.* Three possibilities: (a) *credo* is right, and was inserted to give the sentence structure when *existimo ut* eighteen words earlier was in danger of being forgotten; then P1 and the rest agree in error against M 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 ἄν, 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 + ἄν, see Schwyzler 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 repetitiousness, *uariatio sermonis* and fullness of expression characteristic of the superior translator.

²²⁵ Note the chiasmic word-order, another feature of the superior translator.

5. Credo²²⁶ enim quia si ea quae scripta tradimus diligentius attendantur²²⁷ [naturam uniuscuiusque²²⁸] [uoluerit operari],²²⁹ multos poterit liberare,²³⁰ et non solum eos quibus mox ab initio curationem adhibet²³¹ uerum etiam diuturnas iam existentes podagras²³² iuuare poterit.²³³

(II, 501, 8–19) t. Περὶ ποδάγρας

1. Τὸ τῆς ποδάγρας πάθος εἰδέναι χρὴ πρό γε πάντων ὡς ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων αἰτιῶν ἔχει τὴν σύστασιν, ὅθεν, οἶμαι, διὰ τὸ ποικίλον τῆς γενέσεως οὔτε διαγνωσθῆναι καλῶς οὔτε θεραπείας τελείας ἠδυνήθη ἐπιτυχεῖν. 2. ὑπόληψιν δὲ ἐκ τούτου τὸ πάθος ἀνιαρὰν ἐκτίησατο, καὶ μηδὲ ὅλως ὑπὸ τέχνης ἰατρικῆς ἰαθῆναι ποτε δυνήθηται. — — 3. ἐγὼ δὲ φημι, ὡς, εἴγε διαγνωσθεῖεν καλῶς αἱ τε διαφοραὶ καὶ τὰ εἶδη αὐτῆς, ὅσα τε καὶ οἶα τυγχάνει, εὐθεράπευτος ἂν ῥαδίως ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν γενήσεται — —. 4. εἶπωμεν οὖν ἤδη τὰς διαγνώσεις αὐτῶν, εἴθ' οὕτω καὶ τὰς θεραπείας. 5. ἐλπίζετω (ἐλπίζω?) γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐάν τις ἀκριβῶς προσέχοι, ὠφελήσει πολλοὺς οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας εἰς τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἤδη κεχρονικότας ἐν αὐτῷ.

2.236.t.²³⁴

1. Multa igitur sunt uitia²³⁵ in his qui insanabiles possident podagras.²³⁶
2. Etenim sanguis calidus supercurrens²³⁷ in articularum cavitates, extenduntur, et nerui²³⁸ quos sindismos uocant dolores facere in pedibus solent²³⁹ nimios.

²²⁶ Sg. 1 indicative for sg 3 imperative ἐλπίζετω — or did the translator's text have ἐλπίζω? This is the only occurrence of sg. 1 *credo* in Books 1 and 2. ἐλπίζω 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 τῆς is the subject of the sg. 3 imperative, τῆς precedes. It would probably be better to read ἐλπίζω in the Greek text!

²²⁷ *attendantur scripsi ut Pod.*] -endo α. 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*=προσέχω, cf. 1.137=II, 127, 20; 2.5.2=II, 149, 17; for προσέχω of attending to a prescription, cf. II, 309, 13 (unfortunately not translated at 2.47).

²²⁸ For this phrase, cf. 1.35 *fin.*=I, 487, 11ff.; 1.131, 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, uoluerit, 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 P1, which could be impersonal, 'there is'). The Greek phrase τοὺς ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας εἰς τὸ πάθος 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 2.236.1 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 . . . iuuare poterit*).

²³⁴ New chapter and title, *De causis podagrae*, only in φ.

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

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

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

²³⁸ neruis κ

²³⁹ The subject of *solent* must surely be *nerui*. 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 supercurrens super neruos aut inter ipsos residens,²⁴⁰ et +— maxime —+ in his quos sindismos diximus uocari +— qui et ossibus uicini sunt —+, ardorem simul et tensionem²⁴¹ locis qui dolent infert et magnos dolores.

(II, 501, 19–24) 1. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν εἰσιν αἴτια τὰ τὴν ἀνιαρὰν τίκτοντα ποδάγραν· 2. καὶ γὰρ αἷμα συρρεῦσαν ἐν τῇ τῶν ἄρθρων κοιλότητι θερμὸν καὶ διατείνον αὐτὰ τε καὶ τοὺς συνδέσμους ὀδύνην ἐργάζεσθαι πέφυκε σφοδρὰν. 3. ὁμοίως καὶ χολὴ πολλάκις ἐπιρρνεῖσα μεταξὺ τῶν νεύρων καὶ +— —+ συνδέσμων +— —+ καὶ τῷ φλέγειν ἅμα καὶ διατείνειν ἐπιφέρειν οἶδε μεγάλας ὀδύνας.

4. Sed et flegma eodem modo²⁴² laedens dolores fortissimos facit simul et frigidorem,²⁴³ et angustata loca extendit.²⁴⁴

5. Facit etiam sic et melancolicus humor: et non solum infrigdat et opprimit sed et grauitate sua facta sentitur <non> mediocris²⁴⁵ commotio.

6. Non enim solum oportet²⁴⁶ ut supercurrente²⁴⁷ materia reumatismi +— —+ solent²⁴⁸ fieri sed et per simplicem solam qualitatem +— efficitur, id est per distemperantias ipsarum²⁴⁹ 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 —+,²⁵⁰ ex quibus distemperantibus²⁵¹ fiunt saepius reumatismi.

7. Oportet ergo diligenter, ut dictum est, omnia contemplari²⁵² quales sunt causarum singularum qualitates uel quantitates,²⁵³ et sic singularum causarum²⁵⁴ expedientem apponere curationem.

²⁴⁰ Another nice chiasmus, *supercurrens* . . . *residens*.

²⁴¹ tensionem] intensionem η P2' B Ma(?)

²⁴² This suggests that the translator read Greek τρῶπ- instead of τόπ-.

²⁴³ There is no support in the manuscripts for the tempting change to instrumental ablative *frigidore*, so I presume that the translator read Greek ἅμα τε τῇ ψύξει with what precedes.

²⁴⁴ angustata γ] coangustata *Pod.* angusta *cett.* Alternatively, perhaps: et angustat loca *et* tendit, allowing a main verb for each Greek infinitive. Greek διατείνω (to judge from ms. A at least) is sometimes *extendo* (with 2.236.2 above, cf. e.g. 2.195=II, 491, 1) and sometimes just *tendo* (with 2.236.3 *tensio* 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 μέτριος, *-ίως* and occurs (as adjective and adverb) nearly 100 times. The occurrence of *non mediocris*=οὐ μέτριος 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 *Pod.*) as original.

²⁴⁶ Presumably, somehow for Greek δεῖ, whether from δέ or διά.

²⁴⁷ supercurrente] supra- η

²⁴⁸ Apparently, *oportet ut* + indicative (corrected to *soleant* by D and Ge).

²⁴⁹ Understand *qualitatum*, I suppose.

²⁵⁰ The tradition makes a real hash 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 distemperantibus] -antiis O P2 B Ma D Ge Ox. The commoner word must have been restored more than once (probably by O, θ' 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 *uariatio sermonis*.

²⁵² The tradition is unanimous on *contemplo(r)*. Of five other occurrences of Greek ὑποπτεύειν in the *Therapeutica*, four are translated, one with *existimare* (1.76=I, 593, 13), two with *susplicari* (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 ἀκριβῶς — 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 ποιητική?

²⁵⁴ A final chiasmus (*causarum singularum* . . . *singularum causarum*) followed by a formulaic ending with hyperbaton (*expedientem apponere curationem*).

(II, 501, 24–503, 7) 4. ἔτι δὲ φλέγμα χωρῆσαν εἰς τοὺς εἰρημένους τόπους ὀδύνης ἰσχυροτέρας αἴτιον γίνεται ἅμα τε τῇ ψύξει καὶ τῷ στενοχωρεῖν καὶ διατείνειν αὐτούς. 5. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ μελαγχολικὸς χυμὸς οὐ μόνον τῷ ψύχειν καὶ θλίβειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ βάρους ἐπιτελεῖν αἴσθησιν, οὐ μετρίους ἐργάζεται τοὺς παροξυσμούς. 6. οὐ μόνον δὲ διὰ ἐπίρροιαν ὕλης οἱ ῥευματισμοὶ +– τοῖς ἄρθροις +– ἐπιγίνεσθαι πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ ψιλὴν ποιότητα μόνην +– + καὶ θερμὴν καὶ ψυχρὰν (ψῦξιν M)· ἔτι δὲ ξηρότης τε καὶ ὑγρότης αἴτια γίνονται πολλάκις ῥευματισμῶν. +– + 7. δεῖ οὖν ἀκριβῶς, ὡς ἔφαμεν, ὑποπτεῦειν, ἥτις ἀκριβῶς ἐστὶν ἡ ποιητικὴ τοῦ πάθους αἰτία, καὶ τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν ἐπιφέρειν βοήθειαν.

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.t. De localibus adiutoriis mitigatiuis et anodinis²⁵⁵

1. Haec 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 uomitum concitantur, seu pro²⁶² timore aliquo siue per²⁶³ suspicionem aliquam medicaminum²⁶⁴ +– – et hi in accessione dolores ferre non possunt – +²⁶⁵ aliqua²⁶⁶ debemus²⁶⁷ uobis 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 (η?: titulum om. O Mu C Ma L2) G1 θ' φ

²⁵⁶ os] ore γ

²⁵⁷ The gerundive is rather stronger than the statement οἶδε in the Greek.

²⁵⁸ possunt] -int γ. The subjunctive in γ is striking; usually, δ has the subjunctive and γ, the indicative!

²⁵⁹ imbecillitatem] debilitatem P3 L2

²⁶⁰ ut accipiant] quod accipiunt 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 per] 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 requirunt 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 ἄλλης.

²⁶⁷ Rather different from Greek ἐσποῦδασα, 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 haec:²⁶⁹ croco²⁷⁰ opio ana ÷ iiiii,²⁷¹ panis L i, cera L i, oleo sext.

5. Crocum²⁷² et opium infundes in uino; panem uero²⁷³ in aqua infundes et exprimens manibus admiscebis ubi crocus et opium trita sunt, et iterum teres²⁷⁴ donec omnia misceantur, sic postea ceram +— +²⁷⁵ solutam supermittens teres²⁷⁶ et uteris.

(II, 573, 24–575, 8) t. Περί τοπικῶν βοηθημάτων παρηγορεῖν δυναμένων

1. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παρηγορεῖν οἶδε διδόμενα διὰ στόματος. 2. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς μὴ ἀντέχοντας, εἴτε διὰ τὸ τὸν στόμαχον πεπονθέναι καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι κρατεῖν τι τῶν προσφερομένων, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς εἰς ἔμετον ὀρμᾶν, εἴτε διὰ φόβον καὶ ὑποψίαν τινὰ φαρμακείας ἄλλης, ἐσπούδασα μὲν ἐκθέσθαι ὑμῖν, ἅ καὶ τῷ λογῶ καὶ τῇ πείρᾳ χρήσιμα ἡμῖν ἀπεδείχθη ὄντα, ἔχουσι δὲ οὕτω. 3. Κηρωτὴ ἐν τῇ ἀκμῇ τῶν παροξυσμῶν ἐπιτιθεμένη, ἀνωδύνους ποιοῦσα. 4. Κρόκου, ὁποῦ μήκωνος, ἀνὰ οὐγγ. δ', ἄρτου, κηροῦ, ἀνὰ λιτρ. α', ἐλαίου ζεστ. α'. 5. τὸν κρόκον καὶ τὸν ὀπὸν ἀπόβρεχε ἐν οἴνῳ, τὸν δὲ ἄρτον ὕδατι. καὶ ἐκπιέσας ἐπιμελῶς μίσγε τῷ ὀπῶ καὶ τῷ κρόκῳ προλελειωμένοις. εἶτα τὸν κηρὸν +—μετὰ τοῦ ἐλαίου —+τήξας μίσγε τοῖς λοιποῖς.

6. Item aliud cerotum simile quod in statu passionis adhibeatur.²⁷⁷ Cera ÷ iiiii, litargiro ÷ ii, psimithio ÷ ii, strigni succo L i, oleo rosaceo L i. Supermittes²⁷⁸ succum donec totum²⁷⁹ colligatur, et sic uteris.

7. Item aliud cerotum.²⁸⁰ Et ipsum mitigatium²⁸¹ est: facit enim²⁸² ad omnem inflammationem²⁸³ ignitam. Opium soluens²⁸⁴ cum lacte muliebri, addes²⁸⁵ olei rosei ÷ vi, cera ÷ vi, et sic miscebis²⁸⁶ cerotum et uteris. +— +

(II, 575, 9–17) 6. Ἐτέρα κηρωτὴ ὁμοίως ἐν τῇ ἀκμῇ ἐπιτίθεσθαι δυναμένη. Κηροῦ οὐγγ. α' (δ' M), λιθαργύρου, ψιμιθίου, ἀνὰ οὐγγ. β', ῥοδίνου, στρύχνου χυλοῦ, ἀνὰ

²⁶⁹ *Recipit autem haec* must be for Greek ἔχουσι 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 Oribasius (*Eup.* 4.116.14) also prescribes four ounces, although in Paul of Aegina (3.78.8) only one ounce is called for.

²⁷² Crocum enim η (A OMu Ch C) κ' (Ox Ge) — presumably, the particle was added twice, independently?

²⁷³ uero γ G1P3

²⁷⁴ terens η 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 Orib., *Eup.* 4.118.)

²⁷⁶ terens A

²⁷⁷ adhibeatur] -etur γ *ed.*

²⁷⁸ -ens η

²⁷⁹ Did the translator see πᾶν in his Greek version? (Cf. 2.271.10 *omnes carnes* and note ad loc.). Greek ἀναλωθῆ would account both for ἀν λυθῆ printed by Puschmann and for the variant ἀν λειωθῆ 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 Oribasius (Mørland, *Oribasius*, 64).

²⁸² enim *om.* γ

²⁸³ cf. the chapters on coughing, where φλεγμονή is not translated but borrowed (e.g. 2.7, including in the phrase 2.7.3 *ignitus flegmo*=ζέουσα φλεγμονή). Is there a difference of sense, e.g. internal (*flegmo*) vs external (*inflammatio*)?

²⁸⁴ soluens η P2 θ' D Ge (*om.* Ox)] solues *cett.* Compare Greek λείου, which (*pace* Puschmann) cannot mean 'dissolve'.

²⁸⁵ addes *om.* γ

²⁸⁶ miscebis] misces (-is γ) γ P3 — *misces* could be a 3rd-conj. future; cf. Väänänen, *Lat. vulg.*, 145.

λιτρ. α'. ἀναλάμβανε τῷ χυλῶ, ἕως ἂν λυθῆ. 7. Ἄλλη κηρωτὴ καὶ αὐτὴ παρηγορικὴ καὶ ποιουσα πρὸς πᾶσαν φλεγμονὴν ζέουσαν. Ὅπιου δραχ. δ' ἐν ἄλλῳ ἢ κηρωτῆς ῥοδίνου λιτρ. α'. λείου γυναικείῳ γάλακτι τὸ ὄπιον καὶ οὕτω μίσγε τὴν κηρωτὴν ἐν τῇ θυίᾳ καὶ χρῶ +- ὡς πᾶνυ καλλίστη.-+

8. Item aliud cerotum ad podagram²⁸⁷ mirabile experimentatum +- +. Mittens²⁸⁸ in caccabo oleum commune sext. ii, coques lignis de uitibus, id est de sarmentis, donec bulliat +- +.

9. Et +- ubi iam desierit²⁸⁹ bullire,+ torpedinem²⁹⁰ [piscem] maritimum uiuum²⁹¹ pensantem²⁹² L i mittes in ipso oleo et coques donec iterum²⁹³ bullitionem faciat²⁹⁴ secundam aut tertiam.

10. Et post hoc supermittes asphalaci²⁹⁵ (animalis quem aliqui *madamus*²⁹⁶ uocant) sanguinem ÷ iiiii, et simul coques cum torpedine donec discoquatur et soluantur²⁹⁷ omnes carnes²⁹⁸ eius.

11. Et sublatum ab igne cum refrigerauerit colabis²⁹⁹ et mittes in alio³⁰⁰ uase,³⁰¹ et cum opus fuerit accipies ex³⁰² ipso oleo quantum sufficiat ad³⁰³ utendum, et miscebis ceram et resolues in trulla et facies³⁰⁴ cerotum mollissimum et linteo inductum superpones.

12. Coques autem oleum sicut dictum est³⁰⁵ in hospitio pede plano³⁰⁶ mense Martio quinta feria.³⁰⁷ Sic enim facta coctio multum ualere³⁰⁸ potest.

²⁸⁷ ad podagram γ η (not C) G1

²⁸⁸ Mittens η P2 P3] mittes *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] desinet M -it P1

²⁹⁰ torpedinem φ] turpid- *plerique* turpitudinem de D Ox Ge B (!) torpedinis .i. φ. On the use of the stingray in medicine, see Gössen.

²⁹¹ uiuum γ] *om. cett.* Cf. Greek ζώσης.

²⁹² pensans A (A repeats the pattern present participle + future indicative).

²⁹³ Strictly otiose in the Latin, given *secundam aut tertiam*. Could *iterum* have anything to do with Greek τὸ μέτρον? τὸ μέτρον is itself strange: might it have been added as a noun phrase to agree with δεῦτερον ἢ τρίτον, when the latter were no longer understood as adverbs?

²⁹⁴ Again, the tradition is unusually unanimous over *donec* + subjunctive.

²⁹⁵ asphalaci] asfalacus (-icus P1) γ (Greek genitive singular).

²⁹⁶ *madamus scripsi* (μαδαμούσαν Paul. Aegin. 7.17.77)] *adamus* γ *manda(m)um* η *marida(n)um cett.*

²⁹⁷ dissoluantur A

²⁹⁸ omnes *om. γ* (cf. Greek). It is tempting simply to regard *omnes* as an addition of δ, but this passage bears comparison with 2.271.6, where again a word for 'whole, all' in the Latin (*totum colligatur*) stands opposite not πᾶν but ἅν in the Greek (ἅν λυθῆ). So, too, here: *soluantur omnes carnes*:: ἅν ἀναλυθῶσιν αἱ σάρκες.

²⁹⁹ colabis *trad. et* P3'] colas γ P3

³⁰⁰ Reflecting Greek ὑέλινον?

³⁰¹ uaso M uasculo P1

³⁰² ex γ η] de *cett.*

³⁰³ ad *om. A* (by haplography after *sufficiat*).

³⁰⁴ et facies] faciens A G1 P2

³⁰⁵ sicut dictum est γ] *om. cett.* Cf. Greek ὡς προέγραπται.

³⁰⁶ plano] plane (plene A) η P2 D φ. The *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 *hospitio 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 *plano pede* attested already in Varro and Vitruvius).

³⁰⁷ die Iouis γ: the Latin, in either version, must mean 'Thursday' (on this use of *feria*, cf. *ThLL*, s.v., 505, 18ff.); both Puschmann and Thorndike, *History*, I, 582 take Greek πέμπτη to mean 'the 5th of the month' (i.e. the recipe may be made on only one day each year!).

³⁰⁸ ualere] iuuare ε Ch(!). While *multum iuuare* is a frequent collocation in the Latin Alexander, *ualere* occurs apparently only here. The Greek and Latin are again some way apart.

(II, 575, 18–29) **8.** Κηρωτὴ θαυμαστὴ καὶ διὰ πείρας, +- ἦ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ προσεμαρτύρησαν. -+ Βαλὼν εἰς κάκαβον ἐλαίου κοινοῦ ξε. β' ἔψε ξύλοις ἀμπελίνοις, ἕως οὗ βράση +- σφοδρῶς -+, **9.** καὶ +- -+ ἐπίβαλε τουρπαίνης θαλασσίας ζώσης λιτρ. α' καὶ ἔψε, ἕως οὗ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ προειρημένου ἐλαίου βράση δεύτερον ἢ τρίτον. **10.** εἶτα ἐπίβαλε ἀσφάλακος (τοῦ ζώου ὃ τινες παλαμίδα καλοῦσι) τοῦ αἵματος οὐγγ. δ' καὶ συνέψει τῇ τουρπαίνῃ, ἕως ἂν ἀναλυθῶσιν αἱ σάρκες αὐτῆς. **11.** καὶ ἐπάρας μετὰ ταῦτα ψῦξον καὶ διήθησον καὶ ἀνατίθει εἰς ὑέλινον ἀγγεῖον. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς χρήσεως λαβὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἐλαίου ὅσον ἐξαρκεῖ πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν, μίσγε κηρὸν καὶ λύσας ποίει κηρωτὴν ἀπαλωτάτην καὶ εἰς ὀθόνιον ἐπιπλάσας ἐπίθεσ. **12.** ἔψε δὲ τὸ ἔλαιον, ὡς προγέγραπται, ἐν οἰκίματι κατωγαίῳ, μὴνὶ μαρτίῳ πέμπτῃ μηδαμῶς ὑπερτιθέμενος τὴν ἡμέραν· οὕτω γὰρ ποιῶν ἐπιτεύξει.

13. Sufficiat haec de anodinis et paragoricis cataplasmatibus³⁰⁹ dixisse.

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

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

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