

Articoli/Articles

THREE XENON TEXTS

DAVID BENNETT

Royal Holloway College, University of London, GB

SUMMARY

The few Byzantine medical texts whose titles or contents associate them with the xenon repay close study for what they reveal about that institution as well as about the transmission of medical knowledge in the late Byzantine period. This paper examines common passages in three xenon texts, codd.Vat. gr. 292 and 299 and Laur 75.19. It argues from the evidence of these and other texts that the xenon and its medical staff contributed not only to the preservation and transmission of the medical corpus, but also to that of the craft medical texts of the late Byzantine period.

The Byzantine xenon is often seen as the ancestor of today's hospitals, not only because professional medical care was supposedly available within it, but also because it functioned as a centre of medical learning and education¹. The manuscript evidence on which any such assessment should rely has, however, never been systematically examined. The texts bearing xenon ascriptions are few in number and share with the far larger corpus of surviving Byzantine medical texts their fluidity and sometimes spurious attributions². Among these few are at least eighteen comparable texts, ten of which bear the title θεραπευτικά ἰατρῆαι συντεθεῖσαι παρὰ διαφόρων ἀνδρῶν ἰατρῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐκτεθεῖσαν ἀκολουθίαν τοῦ ξενῶνος, several treatises compiled by xenon medical staff, and a number of miscellaneous texts including the three which are the subject of this paper, a contribution to the larger project of surveying the whole³.

In her paper on one of the texts, *Sur une 'Αποθεραπευτική' attribuée à Théophile*, Ieraci-Bio draws attention to two very similar incipits⁴. One is at f.82 verso in the *Apotheapeutike* itself

Key words: Texts – Hospitals – Transmission

(Cod. Laur. gr. 75.19) and reads ἐὰν πυρέσση ὁ ἄρρωστος καὶ πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίης. The other, prefaced by a descriptive title beginning ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος περὶ πυρετῶν κτλ is at f.276 in Cod.Vat.gr.299; it reads Ὅταν πυρέσση ὁ ἄρρωστος πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίης (see Table 1b).

Ieraci-Bio observes that the Vatican manuscript also contains a number of therapy texts that are ascribed to the Mangana hospital, and cautiously remarks

Le fait que certains textes du recueil du Vaticanus soient liés à l'hôpital de Mangana (ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος τῶν Μαγγάνων) peut être un indice pour une possible localisation de notre texte et pour une identification de notre auteur en tant que ἰατρῶν παῖς ...

adding properly *mais on est seulement dans le domaine des hypothèses, bien que suggestifs*⁵. To the two *incipits* on which Ieraci-Bio remarks, can be added a comparable third in Cod.Vat.gr.292 at f.200 recto that reads ἐὰν πυρέσση ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίησι κτλ. That *incipit* has a *chapter* title markedly similar to the *chapter* title in cod.Vat.gr.299 quoted above. These titles and *incipits* are set out in Tables 1a and 1b. The similarities are patent, although, on comparison, the full texts of this passage on fevers disclose numerous divergencies, chiefly in content and order of words. They also differ markedly in length⁶. Other *chapters* in this third text were then found which, in some respects, were similar to passages in cod.Vat.gr.299 and cod.Laur.75.19. They are listed in Table 2⁷. Reference is also made to the fifteenth-century cod.Laur.App.2 in which, amid a considerable miscellany of symptomatology and therapy, Manuel Atrapes copied selected parts of the Vat.gr.299 text, including five of the Mangana hospital therapies to which Ieraci-Bio refers⁸.

Each of these three texts exemplifies one of the several forms that the Byzantine craft medical text takes. The *Apothepautike* in Laur.75.19 comprises selected passages, many attributed to writers of the Greek medical corpus, but assembled without a wholly clear pattern or order. Its title alone marks it as a *xenon* text:

⁵ Ἀρχὴ σὺν θεῷ ἀγίῳ τῆς ἀποθεραπευτικῆς Θεοφίλου συλλέξαντος ταύτην ἐκ διάφορων ξενωνικῶν βιβλίων¹¹

Table 1a
Comparison of titles or headings in Laur.75.19, Vat.gr.299 & Vat.gr.292 preceding the *incipit* ἐὰν πυρέσση ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίησι & its variations⁹

Laur.75.19	Vat.gr.299	Vat.gr.292
saec.XIV f.89v.	saec.XIV ex f.276 ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος περὶ πυρετῶν, ὅσα ἐκ πείρας ἰατρῶν	saec.XIV f.200 προσταγαὶ καὶ τύποι τῶν μεγάλων ξενόνων
	παῖδες τοῖς	ὅσα ἐκ πείρας
θεραπεία εἰς πυρέττοντας	πυρέσσουσιν ἰατρείας χάριν προσάγουσι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλως πῶς πάσχουσι μάλιστα δὲ ἐν τοῖς ξενῶσιν	ἰατρῶν παῖδες θεραπείας χάριν προσάγουσι. καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πῶς πάσχουσιν ἐν τοῖς ξενῶσιν ¹⁰

The medical collection in Vat.gr.299, which contains the Mangana Xenon chapters referred to by Ieraci-Bio, is better ordered; under the headings of generic pathologies are set out numerous excerpts of diagnostic and therapy from both named and unnamed writers. The short treatise in Vat.gr.292 is the last of sixteen diverse texts in that codex which are described by their catalogue as a single collection¹². It makes no reference to earlier writers, except by citation of eponymous therapies; for example, Galen's ἱερά (f.208 verso, ll.11 - 12).

In speaking of the *Apothepautike* as a *xenon* text, we must distinguish it from Vat.gr.292 and Vat.gr.299 where ascription to

Table 1b
Incipits following titles in Codd.Laur.75.19, Vat.gr.299 & Vat.gr.292 (see Table 1a above)

Laur.75.19 Vat.gr.299 Vat.gr.292	ἐὰν πυρέσση ὁ ἄρρωστος καὶ πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίης Ὅταν πυρέσση ὁ ἄρρωστος πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίης ἐὰν πυρέσση ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρῶτὸ καὶ δειλίησι .
Laur.75.19 Vat.gr.299 Vat.gr.292	τουτέστιν ἐὰν συνεχῆ πυρετὸν ἔχη. τουτέστιν ἐὰν συνεχῆ πυρετὸν ἔχη. τουτέστιν συνεχῆ πυρετὸν.

the xenon derives from the προσταγαὶ καὶ τύποι τῶν μεγάλων ξενόνων title in Vat.gr.292 or the ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος chapter headings in Vat.gr.299, with or without their qualifying τῶν μαγγάνων. The *Apothepautike* title merely describes the sources from which the compiler derives his material, that is the ξενωνικῶν βίβλων. Whereas some scholars have taken this to mean that Byzantine hospitals had libraries, it may only mean that the material comes from the corpus of medical writers to which doctors had recourse in their practice at hospitals¹³. The Vat.gr.292 title προσταγαὶ καὶ τύποι κτλ and Vat.gr.299 references ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος (τῶν Μαγγάνων) on the other hand, purport to describe a hospital provenance, with the inference that their contents were devised, ἐκ πείρας, for use by doctors in their hospital practice.

Vat.gr.292 as a xenon text

Although space does not allow a detailed comparison of the common passages in the three texts, some description of Vat.gr.292's text is called for by the explicit nature of the title that precedes it (see Table 1a), the significance of which lies as much in its attribution of the text to the great *xenones*, as in the anonymity of these *xenones*. Without its title, the treatise might well have remained unnoticed as merely another commonplace craft medical text. It is important to be clear whether the title is genuinely descriptive and has its origin in the unknown archetype, or is formulaic. The extension of the factual προσταγαὶ καὶ τύποι τῶν μεγάλων ξενόνων by the specific qualifier ὅσα ἐκ πείρας ἰατρῶν παῖδες κτλ seems to validate a *xenon* origin¹⁴. Why otherwise should the qualifier be included? Correspondingly, why should not these *great hospitals* be named? Is there a reference here to the Mangana Xenon? The resolution of these questions may lie in the conjecture that the treatise is a synthesis of *excerpts* from several texts of *xenon* origin, one of which derived from the Mangana Xenon. The presence of four modified passages (or chapters) in Vat.gr.292, which in Vat.gr.299 are attributed to the Mangana Xenon, is suggestive of that. Table 2 sets out all the instances where chapters in Vat.gr.292 are to be found in one or other, or both, of its companion texts. If the title of

Vat.gr.292 is to be taken at its face value, then the earlier existence of other *xenon* source texts, no longer extant, is also a reasonable conjecture. This is not to say that Vat.gr.292 is the source used by the copyists of Vat.gr.299 and Laur.75.19, and it is certainly not to suggest that it is the archetype. Its location among the sixteen medical treatises that form the first and largest part of the codex makes it clear that it, too, is copied from another source. Miller, in his monograph *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire* (see footnote 1) describes the treatise as emerging from *xenon* practice, the physicians developing the remedies contained in it in the course of their daily practice¹⁵.

The title is followed by the opening, and longest, chapter on fevers, amounting to nearly a third of the treatise (see Table 1b). Alone in the treatise, it lacks any descriptive heading; the other fifteen have headings (see Table 2, col.2). The omission is perhaps attributable to error by the copyist (or by a later hand inserting the titles), and is repeated in Vat.gr.299 and a late Ambrosian copy of Vat.gr.292¹⁶. The comparable passage in Laur.75.19 has the title θεραπεία εἰς πυρέττοντας (see Table 1b), and a fragment of the fevers *chapter* in cod.Vindob.med.gr.37 separates title from text by the words περὶ συνεχῶν πυρετῶν. The text in the fragment is, however, only half the length of the fevers text in Vat.gr.292, although the two texts match almost entirely word for word. The same cannot be said for the comparable passages in Vat.gr.299 or Laur.75.19, in both of which a word by word comparison demonstrates both common and divergent readings of every kind, including orthography, order of words and syntax, and omissions from, or additions to, the content. The omissions and additions reveal no consistent pattern that would allow a relationship in the form of a stemma to be demonstrated. The precepts of Maas have no place here¹⁷. There are, however, a few indicators of the quality of each of the three texts that lie not so much in these divergencies, as in the superiority of the comparable readings in Laur.75.19 and Vat.gr.299¹⁸. The second longest chapter of Vat.gr.292 is the fourth, περὶ κοιλιακῶν. In this chapter, Vat.gr.292 alone incorporates within the text what appears to be a marginal gloss from an earlier copy of the text explaining the ingredient οἶνανθις¹⁹. This feature, together with a

number of other problematical readings, suggests that the copyist had insufficient understanding of his subject matter to enable him to preserve a faithful copy, or was working from a text that itself contained these infelicities²⁰.

If Vat.gr.292 had not survived, the comparable passages in Vat.gr.299 and Laur.75.19 might have gone unnoticed. The recognition of these passages places a special emphasis on Vat.gr.292, particularly in its relationship to Vat.gr.299 and Laur.75.19 and, in the case of the putative Mangana Xenon passages, to the archetype. Vat.gr.292 appears, *prima facie*, to be a systematic *xenon* text, but on closer examination we see no more than a recipe list, at its most detailed in the chapters on fevers and bowels, but otherwise curiously selective in the sixteen pathologies that make up the treatise. Other common ailments, or generic pathologies, that would presumably be encountered in *xenon* medical practice, might have been expected in a work of this kind. Nor are the subjects in the familiar *e capite ad calcem* order (v.Table 2). It is neither a structured text, nor is there more than slight evidence of *xenon* practice in it. ὁ ἀνακλιθεὶς ἄρρωστος (f.206 verso, l.5) is not necessarily indicative of the *xenon* ward. The recording of some of the therapies may be. Many of the therapies are listed with their ingredients, but a proportion are identified by short title alone. For example, in the *chapter* περὶ κοιλιακῶν (ff.204 recto - 206 verso) we find τὴν ἀντίδοτον τοῦ φίλωνος, ἢ τοῦ ἔσδρα, τὸν τροχίσκον τοῦ ῥόδωνος, ἢ τοῦ φιλίππου, and τὴν ἀντίδοτον τοῦ ἐβράου (f.205 recto, ll.7 - 16). Although short titles of this kind are not uncommon in Byzantine medical texts, their consecutive listing here and elsewhere in Vat.gr.292 (e.g. f.210 recto, ll.1 - 4) typifies an accustomed nomenclature of an institutional text. There was no need to describe the ingredients in detail in the archetype because the names of the recipes were familiar, and in that guise they were transmitted. By the same token, formulaic phraseology and alternative nomenclature are used in Vat.gr.292, and diagnostic content is lacking. In only seven of the chapters are presenting symptoms briefly recorded as guidance on the therapies to be used. These are the elements of an institutional craft manual and *aide-mémoire*.

Table 2

Common passages in Codd. Vat. gr. 292, ff. 200 recto - 210 verso, Cod. Vat. gr. 292 & Laur. 75.19

No.	Folios	Vat. gr. 292	Vat. gr. 299	Laur. 75.19
1	200v- 203v	(Untitled : fevers)	276 recto	89 verso
2	203v - 204	περὶ κεφαλικῶν	-	92 verso
3	204	περὶ ἀγρυπνίσεως	278 recto	-
4	204 - 206v	περὶ κοιλιακῶν	-	93 recto
5	206v	περὶ ἥπατικῶν	*374 recto	-
6	207	περὶ σπληνικῶν	*377 verso	88 recto
7	207 - 207v	περὶ στομαχικῶν	*368 recto	-
8	207v - 208	περὶ ὑδερικῶν	*381 verso	125 recto
9	208 - 208v	περὶ ῥιγιῶν	-	112 recto
10	208v	περὶ σκοτωματικῶν	-	97 recto
11	208v - 209v	περὶ ἰσχιδιακῶν	-	97 verso
12	209v - 210	περὶ βηχικῶν	-	102 recto
13	210	περὶ πλευριτικῶν	-	101 r / vo
14	210v	περὶ ἰκτερικῶν	-	107 recto
15	210v	περὶ ἀθρίτιδος ²¹	-	-
16	210v	περὶ νεφρῶν	-	98 verso

* indicates chapters ascribed to the Mangana Xenon

The centrality of the Mangana Xenon therapies

The lengthy medical collection in Vat.gr.299 is made up of excerpts, many of which are attributed to earlier medical writers from the corpus, set down in numbered chapters of varying lengths. These *chapters* are divided into sections by subject matter. Within the long section dedicated almost entirely to ailments of stomach, spleen, kidneys and liver are seven *chapters* ascribed to the Mangana Xenon (see Table 3), four of which, in modified form, are to be found in Vat.gr.292 and two in Laur.75.19 (q.v.Table 2,col.4). Elsewhere in Vat.gr.299 there are similar attributions, but confined to ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος alone or, as in the case of the fevers *chapter*, commencing προσταγαὶ καὶ τύποι τῶν μεγάλων ξενῶνων, κτλ.

The naming of a *xenon*, here the Mangana, as the source of therapies appears to be unique in surviving texts and, for that reason alone, the authenticity of their ascription needs to be examined. Did a later copyist add the ascription to the passages on his own authority? They are disseminated over fourteen folios

Table 3
The Mangana Xenon Therapies in Cod.Vat.gr.299 - Headings

	[1] f.368 recto, line 19 (Laur.App.2: f.342 verso) ἄλλο δοθὲν παρὰ θεοδώρου ἰατροῦ τῶν μαγγάνων
*	[2] f. 368 recto, line 25 (Laur.App.2: f.343 recto) πρόσταξις στομαχικῆ τοῦ ξενῶνος τῶν μαγγάνων
	[3] f.368 verso, line 7 (Laur.App.2: f.343 recto) Ἐπιστολὴ ἀπὸ θεσσαλονίκης παρὰ στεφάνου ἀρχιατροῦ τῶν μαγγάνων πρὸς ἰω- άννην ἐξάκτορα ἰατρὸν τὸν χαλὲ περὶ στομαχικῶν σπληνικῶν καὶ ἥπατικῶν
*	[4] f.374 recto, line 11 (Laur.App.2: f.353 verso) περὶ ἥπατικῶν πρόσταξον ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος τῶν μαγγάνων
	[5] f. 374 recto, line 22 (Laur.App.2: f.353 verso) τοῦ σαρακηνοῦ τοῦ ἀβραμ καὶ ἀκτουαρίου τῶν μαγγάνων καὶ βασιλικῶ ἀρχιατροῦ
*	[6] f. 377 verso, line 5 (see also Cod.Laur.75.19, f.88) πρόσταξις περὶ σπληνὸς τοῦ ξενῶνος τῶν μαγγάνων
*	[7] f.381 verso, line 19 (see also Cod.Laur.75.19, f.125) ἀπὸ τοῦ ξενῶνος τῶν μαγγάνων

* indicates text to be found in modified form in Cod.Vat.gr.292 as indicated in Table 2

(368 recto - 381 verso) containing 79 chapters²². This spread appears random and there seems no reason why the copyist of Vat.gr.299 should have chosen to add ascriptions to the Mangana Xenon to these seven therapies and not to others (for example, those chapters headed ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος) unless they were authentic. There is also the circumstantial evidence in the headings of the names and offices of three members of the Xenon's medical staff, particularly that of Abram (v.Table 3, §5) whose therapy is written as a transcription, from Arabic to Greek characters, of an Arabic recipe, accompanied by a Greek translation of the same Arabic. That, and the superscription of Stephanos' letter (Table 3, § 3) give a sense of authenticity even though the names are otherwise unknown. Stephanos (Table 3, §3) writes to a fellow doctor, Chale, whom he addresses as *exaktor*, a post not recorded in the sources after 1204²³. A later chapter in Vat.gr.299 (f.393 verso) refers to the theme of Bulgaria which was in existence from ca.1018 - 1188. The archetypes of these two passages

may therefore be located in the eleventh - to twelfth - centuries. The Mangana Xenon was founded ca.1050 and occupied by the Knights of St.John in 1204, a working life of some 150 years; it is unclear whether it resumed its function in 1261. The latest writer whose work is copied in the *conlectanea* of Vat.gr.299 is probably Theophanes (Nonnus) Chrysobalantes whose *floruit* is held to be mid tenth-century. There is, therefore, some evidence for an archetype, compiled within the 150 year span, from which the late fourteenth-century Vat.gr.299 was copied, either directly or at a remove, and for a *terminus post quem* of the twelfth - century.

If the Mangana ascriptions can reasonably be assumed to be authentic, and if they, in turn, were copied into Vat.gr.299 from an unknown source, it follows that that source was also available in some form to the compilers of Vat.gr.292 and Laur.75.19. It is unlikely that either of those two texts was copied directly from Vat.gr.299 although Vat.gr.292 appears to be more or less contemporaneous with Vat.gr.299, Theophanes (Nonnus) Chrysobalantes also being the latest writer to be included in Vat.gr.292's compilation. The *Apothérapeutike* is of disputed date. If the compiler were Theophilos Protospatharios, then a number of excerpts by late writers in it must be accretions as convention assigns him to the seventh- century, and some recent opinion to the ninth- or tenth- centuries. Space, however, does not allow rehearsal of the arguments for its date and the person of the compiler²⁴. Because it is avowedly a compilation from *xenon* books, the date of the archetype of the *Apothérapeutike* (Laur.75.19) is germane to the discussion of the Mangana Xenon texts only in so far as two of their number are to be found in it. It is the presence of the Mangana Xenon texts in Vat.gr.292 and Laur.75.19 without ascription to that Xenon, that raises issues, the resolution of which await further detailed study of Vat.gr.299. Not the least of these issues is the nature of the text which recorded Mangana Xenon therapies, and the extent to which it was available to the compilers of the archetypes of Vat.gr.292 and Vat.gr.299 (and possibly Laur.75.19). Why were not the ascriptions to the Mangana Xenon retained in Vat.gr.292 at least; and might we not expect there to have survived more

medical craft texts ascribed to named *xenones* in place of the extant few bearing their anonymous references to the great hospitals, various hospitals or the hospital? This is a fundamental issue for those who argue that the *xenon* was a centre of medical learning and education and, by extension, the agent for the preservation and transmission of contemporary medical texts as well as the Greek medical corpus.

Preservation, transmission and the xenon text

A distinction can be made between preservation and transmission. Laur.App.2 preserves five of the Mangana Xenon passages which are copied word for word using Vat.gr.299 as its source. That is evident from a close comparison of the manuscripts. Similarly cod.Ambros.633 contains almost certainly a direct copy of Vat.gr.292's *προσταγαὶ καὶ τύποι* text in its entirety. The transmitted text that is modified *ἐκ πείρας* by its copyist becomes a new text and in the process loses the reason for its ascription, in this instance the *xenon*. Vat.gr.292 and Laur.75.19 have reached that point²⁵. Vat.gr.299 retains its ascriptions to the Mangana Xenon, either by intention or because it is a faithful preservation of those passages from their source. In the opening paragraph of this paper, reference was made to the texts bearing the title *θεραπευτικὰ ἰατρῆαι συντεθεῖσαι κτλ.* Among their number are examples of both preserved and modified texts. Their existence, side by side, leads me to propose that a proportion of texts in compilations, if not the compilations themselves, could have originated in *xenones*. Evidence for the *xenon* as a source becomes lost in the passage of time because *xenon* ascriptions and titles were more likely to have been omitted than generated. In one fifteenth - century manuscript, cod.Paris.gr.2194, we have evidence of later ascription of a text to a *xenon* origin where a hand, differing from that of the copyist, has added at the head of one treatise (f.441 recto) *δυναμερὸν ξενωνικὸν διὰ πείρας*, and elsewhere (f.448 recto) *ξενωνικά*, twice. Preservation from copy to copy is necessarily mechanistic; transmission, mediated by selection and modification of the material transferred, creates a re-invigorated text. Manuscript has the advantage over the printed book by sometimes allowing a glimpse of other means of trans-

mission, both informal and didactic. Two examples suffice to show how word of mouth and teaching become incorporated in the written word: *ἄλλο διὰ πείρας τοῦ διαλόγου* in Vat.gr.299 (f.370 verso, l.10) precedes a liver therapy, and *εἰς φλεγμονὴν χειρὸς φλεβοτομηθείσης ἐκ τοῦ ξενῶνος, καθὼς ἐδιδάχθημεν* is the heading of another therapy in Laur.App.2 (f.362 verso)²⁶.

The *xenon* offered a meeting place for doctors to learn and practise their skills, both formally and informally. In it, teaching and evaluation of therapies and diagnostic, *ἐκ πείρας*, were a foundation for the production of craft texts that were complementary to the Greek medical corpus. Romanos, *protomenites* of the Myrelaion Xenon in the tenth - century, acknowledged in the *prooemion* to his *περὶ σημείων ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν*, the needs of doctors for a convenient digest of diagnosis and therapy²⁷. He says of himself, as compiler of just such a digest, *ἐγγεγύμνασμαι τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν ἀρχαίων*, and makes extensive use of the corpus with a result that is, as Criscuolo observes, *ni originalité ni progrès*²⁸. Much the same can be said for the three texts studied in this paper, and for numerous other comparable texts, preserved or transmitted and modified in copies up to the sixteenth - century and beyond. While much remains to be studied in these and other *xenon* texts, Ieraci-Bio's description of their place in the *xenones* as witnessing *une activité intense qui n'était pas seulement de conservation et de transmission mais aussi d'appropriation et d'utilisation des connaissances scientifiques précédentes* has much force²⁹. Extant texts ascribed to the *xenon*, and other compilations of the late Byzantine period alike, combine the legacy of the Greek medical corpus with the immediacy of *πείρα*. The three texts examined in this paper may now allow us to view at least those compilations whose contents cannot readily be ascribed to the corpus of Greek medical writers, as potentially originating in the records of *xenones* and of the doctors who practised in them. In this perspective, the *xenon* bequeaths a more considerable legacy than its texts have hitherto granted to Byzantine medicine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND NOTES

1. PHILIPSBORN A., *Der Fortschritt in der Entwicklung des Byzantinischen Krankenhauswesens*. BZ 1961; 54: 338 - 365. HARIG von G., *Zum Problem 'Krankenhaus' in*

- der Antike. *Klio* 1971; 53: 179 - 95. MILLER T.S., *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*. Baltimore & London 1985 & 1997, especially chapter 9.
2. It has been estimated that there are still preserved some 2,200 Greek medical manuscripts. See TOUWAIDE A., *The Corpus of Greek Medical Manuscripts: A Computerised Inventory and Catalogue*. In: STEVENS W.M., *Bibliographic Access to Mediaeval and Renaissance Manuscripts: A Survey of Computerised Data Bases and Information Services*. New York 1992, pp.75- 92.
 3. A list of these MSS is to be incorporated in the author's forthcoming dissertation *Xenonica: Medical texts associated with hospitals in the late Byzantine period* (Royal Holloway College, University of London).
 4. IERACI-BIO, A.M., *Sur une 'Αποθεραπευτική' attribuée à Théophile*. In: GARZYA A. & JOUANNA J. (ed.), *Storia e Ecdotica dei Testi Medici Greci*. Naples 1996, p.192.
 5. IERACI-BIO, A.M., see note 4, p.193.
 6. The fevers chapter contains 983 words in Vat.gr.292, 1047 in Vat.gr.299 and 907 in Laur.75.19.
 7. MERCATI G., & FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI P. (eds.), *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, 1. Rome 1923, pp.407 & 425; BANDINI A.M., *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Laurentianae*; 3, Florence 1770, col.166-68.
 8. ROSTAGNO, E. & FESTA, N., *Indici dei codici greci Laurenziani non compresi nel catalogo del Bandini*. Studi italiani di filologia classica; 1893:1: 217.
 9. The title of Cod.Vat.gr.292 is also to be found in cod.Vindob.med.gr.37 at f.83, and cod.Ambros. P90 Sup., olim T353 (gr.633) at f.93. The Vindobonensian MS contains a fragment of the ensuing text (410 words); the Ambrosian MS is a fifteenth-century copy of cod.Vat.gr.292.
 10. Cf. cols. 2 & 3 for orthography in respect of ξενῶνος/ξενόνων.
 11. Cod.Laur.75.19, f.82 verso.
 12. MERCATI G. & FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, P., see note 6, p.408. *Quae praecedunt omnia conlectionem unam efficiunt, ...*
 13. MILLER T.S., see note 1, p.146 etc. & IERACI-BIO, A.M., see note 4, p.193.
 14. The phrase τοῖς <δὲ> ἄλλῳς πῶς πάσχουσιν, although marginally differing from the comparable phrase in the title, appears at f.209 recto (penultimate line) in the chapter περὶ ἰσχυδιακῶν where it prefaces a prescription for phlebotomy.
 15. MILLER T.S., see note 1, p.177.
 16. The headings appear to have been added after the copying of the text, almost certainly by the same hand. For the Ambrosian MS, P90 Sup., olim T353 (gr.633), see MARTINI, A. & BASSI, D., *Catalogus Cod.Graec.Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, 2, Mediolani 1906.
 17. MAAS, P., *Textual Criticism*, Oxford, 1985.
 18. For example, Vat.gr.292, ῥόδινον, Vat.gr.299, τὸ ρόδινον, Laur.75.19, αὐγορόδινον (Vindob.gr.med.37 probably has the correct reading, ῶρορόδινον); or, Vat.gr.292, ἀμβληχροῦ, Laur.75.19, ἀβληχροῦ, Vat.gr.299, βληχροῦ.
 19. Cod.Vat.gr.292, f.204 verso, l.24 - 205 recto, l.3 οἰνάνθιν · οἰνάνθη ἐστὶ, τῶν κλημάτων τῶν εὐρισκομένων|| ἐν ταῖς φράκταις · καὶ ποιοῦσι σταφυλᾶς ἀτελεσφόρους. λέγεται δὲ, καὶ τῶν ἡμέρων σταφυλῶν τὰ ἄνη ·
 20. For example, Vat.gr.292, f.205 verso, l.6 μῆ δέν, Laur.75.19, μηδὲν & Vat.gr.292, f.203, l.19, οἰνοσχοινέλαιον, Laur.75.19, σχινέλαιον = mastich oil.
 21. MS reading.
 22. The medical collection in Vat.gr.299 amounts to 1547 chapters in 300 folios.
 23. See Table 3§3. For the office, see KAZHDAN A., in: *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 2, New York, Oxford 1991, p.766, s.v. *Exaktor*.
 24. This topic is examined in the forthcoming Ph.D.dissertation (see note 3). For discussion of the arguments, see IERACI-BIO A. M., ref.4, pp.191 - 2. HUNGER, H., *Die*

- hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2, Munich, 1978, p.299. Eftychiades proposes a writer named Theophilus of the fourteenth - century. EFTYCHIADES A.Ch., *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Θεραπευτικὴν*. Athens, 1983, p.298.
25. For transmission of the mediaeval medical text generally, see WALLIS F., *The experience of the book: manuscripts, texts, and the role of epistemology in early medieval medicine*. In: BATES D. (ed), *Knowledge and the scholarly medical traditions*. Cambridge, 1995, pp.101 - 126.
 26. See also cod.Vat.gr.285, f.151 recto for a record of Ioannes Argyropoulos' teaching on pulses.
 27. Cod.Vat.gr.280, f.162 verso.
 28. CRISCUOLO U., *Pour le texte du médecin Romanos*. In: GARZYA A. (ed.), *Histoire et ecdotique des textes médicaux grecs*. Naples, 1996, p. 119.
 29. IERACI-BIO, A.M., see note 4, p.193.

Correspondence should be addressed to:

D.C.Bennett, 5 Sion Walk, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN1 1UG, GB.