When Galen was still living, pseudo-Galenic texts were sold in Rome under his name, as Galen himself tells us in the initial passage of his bio-bibliographical work De libris propris. In Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, there were more Pseudo-Galenic texts available in Latin than Galenic works, as Klaus-Dietrich Fischer showed in a seminal article published in this journal in 2013. Later on, Pseudo-Galenic texts continued to be added to the Galenicum Corpus, which increased over time until the 17th century. This paper examines the Pseudo-Galenic texts in the twenty-five complete editions of Galen published in Latin, in Greek and in Greek-Latin from 1490 to 1689, particularly how their number, their identity, the way they were defined and considered, and whether they have been the subject of philological investigation.

1. Introduction
The first complete edition of Galen was published in Venice in 1490. It contains seventy-nine Latin translations and texts, of which twenty-four (about 30%) are Pseudo-Galenic, according to the contemporary scholarship. Even though the Pseudo-Galenic works account for a much lower percentage in terms of pages – because none are as vast as Galen’s treatises, e.g. Methodus medendi, De simplicium medicamentorum facultatibus, De usu partium, and De sanitate tuenda – they are nonetheless a significant portion of the first complete edition of Galen.
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From 1490 to the seventeenth century, twenty-five complete editions of Galen’s works were published: two Greek editions, i.e. the Aldine (1525) and the Basle edition (1538); twenty-two Latin editions, and finally a Greek-Latin edition by René Chartier, printed in 1638-1689. Galen’s Latin editions can be divided into three groups that also follow a chronological order: the first seven editions, from 1490 to 1528, which are mainly based on medieval translations; the ten editions from 1541 to 1565, which are mainly based on humanist translations (where the four Giuntines by Agostino Gadaldini collect the best philological work done on Galen in the Renaissance); and the last five editions, from 1576 to 1625, all of which are Giuntines, mostly reprints of Gadaldini’s 1565 edition.

This article examines the Pseudo-Galenic texts in the complete editions of Galen, particularly how many they were, which ones they were, the way they were defined and considered, and whether they have been the subject of philological investigation.

2. Bonardo’s edition, 1490

In the preface to Galen’s first edition, printed by Filippo Pinzi in Venice in 1490, the editor Diomede Bonardo, a physician from Brescia, writes that it was difficult to collect Galen’s works, because they were scattered in libraries all over Italy: Tantum namque dispersa erant Galieni volumina, ut opus non leve fuerit in quam plurimis Italiae gymnasiis ea perquirere. Bonardo found seventy-nine Latin translations and texts by Galen and Pseudo-Galen dating from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages, and published them in two volumes.

The most numerous translations in this edition are those by Niccolò da Reggio, who translated about sixty works of Galen, Pseudo-Galen, and Hippocrates at the Angevin court of King Robert I in Naples, in the first half of the fourteenth century. Niccolò used very good Greek manuscripts from Southern Italy and Constantinople.
that seem to have been lost. However his translations – too literal for readers who did not know Greek – did not enjoy wide circulation, as also reflected by the fact that some are preserved in a small number of manuscripts and others only in printed editions. Bonardo published more than forty of Niccolò translations, of which twelve are Pseudo-Galenic, as follows:

- Introductio sive medicus (chapters 1-10);
- De virtutibus nostrum corpus dispensantibus (Oribasius);
- De theriaca ad Pamphilianum;
- De theriaca ad Pisonem;
- An omnes partes animalis, quod procreatur, fiunt simul;
- De optima secta ad Thrasybulum (chapters 1-7);
- De vinis (Oribasius);
- De bonitate aquae (Oribasius);
- De virtute centaureae;
- De anatomia oculorum;
- De cura icteri (Rufus of Ephesus);
- De remediis facile paralibus II.

The translation of De optima secta ad Trasybulum (chapters 1-7) is preserved only in printed editions, whereas there are no extant Greek manuscripts of the translations of De virtute centaureae, An omnes partes animalis, quod procreatur, fiunt simul, and De anatomia oculorum. Moreover, Bonardo’s edition included medieval translations from Greek, and especially Arabic, that had been part of the New Galen, the collection of Galen’s works used in universities from the thirteenth century onwards. The New Galen also included some Pseudo-Galenic translations and texts, of which the following are found in Bonardo’s edition:

- Liber secretorum ad Monteum, tr. Gerard of Cremona (1114-1187);
- Compendium pulsuum, tr. Burgundio of Pisa (1110-1193);
- De dissolutione continua, tr. Accursio of Pistoia (1185-1263);
- De iuvamento anhelitus, David Dinant (1160-1217).
The most popular of the latter translations is Gerard of Cremona’s *Liber secretorum ad Monteum*. Gerard, who was active in Toledo in the twelfth century, was a renowned translator of scientific and philosophical works from Arabic. His translations of Galen dominated European medical teaching for a long time. This is especially true of the *Ars medica* and the commentaries on Hippocrates’ *Prognosticon* and *Regimen acutorum*, which were included in the *Articella*, the basic medical handbook that was compiled in the School of Salerno and was subsequently adopted by all European universities until the sixteenth century. In contrast, the literal translations from Greek by Burgundio, a judge from Pisa who held political appointments that took him as far as Constantinople, circulated only as long as there were no Arabic translations, as is the case of the *Compendium pulsuum*.

Finally, Bonardo’s edition included some translations and texts from the period predating the School of Salerno, of which the Pseudo-Galenic ones are the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
De \ dinamidiis & \ (1); \\
De \ passionum \ mulierum; \\
De \ catharticis; \\
De \ simplicibus \ medicaminibus \ ad \ Paternianum; \\
De \ podagra & \ (Alexander \ of \ Tralles), \ an. \ transl.
\end{align*}
\]

The translation of *De podagra* is appended to the pre-Salernitan translation of *Ad Glauconem*, constituting its final chapters. Bonardo’s edition is very similar to medical manuscripts in that it lacks a title page and the text is arranged in two columns. Moreover, the works are not ordered by subject; for example, the first volume begins with *De sectis*, Galen’s work on medical schools (which also opens the *Alexandrine Canon*), followed by other introductory works like *Introductio sive medicus* and *Ars medica*. Yet, not all introductory works are grouped together: for instance, *De constitutio artis*
medicae and De partibus artis medicae are found approximately in the middle of the first volume. Of course, the Pseudo-Galenic works are not reported in a separate section. Only two Pseudo-Galenic works are described as such in the explicit:

De dissolutione continua: Explicit liber de dissolutione continua qui a quibusdam attribuitur Galieno;
De catharticis: Explicit liber de catarticis medicinarum attributus Galieno.

It is difficult to say whether Bonardo took an original stance; however, the authenticity of these works does not seem to be questioned in any manuscript.

Bonardo’s two-volume collection remained almost unchanged in the six editions that followed until 1528, whereas the 1528 Giuntine is in four volumes, with two supplementary volumes being printed in 1531 and 1533. From the first edition of 1490 to the Giuntine of 1528, the number of Galen’s and Pseudo-Galen’s works rose (especially through the addition of humanistic translations), their order changed, and the Latin texts were corrected. Similar changes are also found in the subsequent editions, including Chartier’s last edition in the seventeenth century.

3. Addition of Pseudo-Galenic translations and texts

Galen’s second edition was printed by Bernardino Benali in Venice, in 1502. In the preface the editor, Girolamo Suriano, a physician from Rimini, narrates that he was visited like in a dream by Galen himself, who asked for a new edition of his works because the one by Bonardo was full of mistakes, and gave him his own Latin manuscript. Indeed, Suriano collected Latin manuscripts to improve Bonardo’s edition and added eleven translations or texts. There is a single Pseudo-Galenic translation by Niccolò da Reggio – of De historia philosopha, for which there is no extant manuscript – and seven Pseudo-Galenic works, all described as spurious with the ex-
ception of *De compagine membrorum*, which Suriano seems to have considered genuine:

*De spermate*: Explicit libellus Galieno attributus;
*De compagine membrorum* (Constantine the African);
*De anatomia parva*: Incipit liber de anatomia parva ascriptus Galieno;
*De anatomia vivorum*: Incipit liber de natura vivorum Galieno attributus;
*De natura et ordine cuiuslibet corporis* (Vindicianus): Incipit liber de natura et ordine uniuscuiusque corporis ascriptus Galieno;
*De dinamidiis*: Incipit liber de dinamidiis Galieno medicorum principi attributus;
*De incantatione* (Costa ben Luca): Incipit liber de incantatione, adiuratione et colli suspensione Galieno ascriptus.

*De spermate*, which had been part of the *New Galen*, was found in the first volume, after *De semine*, without its incipit, whereas the other new Pseudo-Galenic works were found at the end of the second volume. Suriano tried to organise Galen’s works by content: the first volume includes texts on biology, anatomy, physiology, and dietetics, while the second contains tracts on pathology and therapy as well as the new works. His edition thus published the Pseudo-Galenic works printed by Bonardo in two volumes, adding readings and corrections in the margins.

Further medieval translations of Galen – of which the most important were the commentaries on Hippocrates’ *Aphorisms, Prognosticon*, and *Regimen acutorum* found in the *Articella* – were added in the fourth edition, printed in Pavia by Giacomo Pocatela di Borgofranco in 1515-16. The editor, Antonio Rustico from Piacenza, collected them in a new, third volume. Volume three also contains a translation of Pseudo-Galen’s *De oculis*, probably by Constantine the African (d. 1087), the monk of Montecassino Abbey who translated from Arabic several medical texts used by the School of Salerno. Additions of medieval translations to Galen’s editions then stopped, except for the Giuntine of 1565, which published for the first time a translation of
Pseudo-Galenic Texts

the Pseudo-Galenic *De plantis* by Grumerus, a judge from Piacenza who translated it from Arabic in Marseille in the second half of the thirteenth century.

Galen’s second edition of 1502 contains a single humanist translation, that of *Ars medica*, by Lorenzo Lorenzi (c.1460-1502), a Florentine physician and a pupil of Demetrios Chalcondylas. Galen’s fourth edition by Rustico contains further humanist translations of Galen by Lorenzi, Niccolò Leoniceno (1428-1524), and Giorgio Valla (c. 1447-c. 1500), which were printed in the third volume together with the humanist translations of four Pseudo-Galenic works: *Praesagium experientia confirmatum*, *De urinae significatione*, *Quaesita in Hippocratis de urinis*, and *De succedaneis*, the first three by Giorgio Valla and the last by his adopted son Giovanni Pietro. However, most humanist translations of Galen were done immediately after 1525 – when the first Greek edition was published in Venice by the heirs of Aldus Manutius – until the early 1540s, when the Giuntine (1541-42) and the Farri (1541-45) edition were printed. Over this short period, Galen’s works were translated several times, both tracts that had medieval translations and works that were unknown in Latin, such as those on anatomy, ethics, and psychology, and a number of Hippocratic commentaries. The two rival Venetian editions commissioned new translations, or reviewed and reprinted existing published translations. However, the number of Pseudo-Galenic works that were translated and published for the first time was very limited:

*An animal sit id quod est in utero;*
*De fasciis;*
*Definitiones medicae;*
*De melancholia;*
*De ponderibus;*
*De remediis facile parabilibus* I and III;
*De renum affectus dignotione;*
This means that the two Greek editions, the Aldine (1525) and the Basle edition (1538), contained very few new Pseudo-Galenic works, whereas the Pseudo-Galenic works translated into Latin after this time, and added to the later editions, were the majority. For example, the 1565 Giuntine first published the translations of four works: Galen’s *Synopsis de pulsibus* and Pseudo-Galen’s *De humoribus*, *De diaeta Hippocratis in morbis acutis*, and the above mentioned *De plantis*. Galen’s last edition by René Chartier (1572-1654) was the first to include three Pseudo-Galenic works: *Praeceptum de humani corporis constitutione*, *De pulsibus ad Antonium*, and *De urinis compendium*. Chartier found them in Greek manuscripts from the French Royal library and printed them together with their Latin translations, even though he was aware that they were not genuine\(^4\).

Thus, Galen’s editions did not establish a canon of his works, but merely collected medical works, Galenic, Pseudo-Galenic, and even forgeries. Commentaries on Hippocrates’ *De humoribus*, *De alimento*, *Epidemics* II, and *Epidemics* VI (books VII-VIII) were printed in the Giuntines from 1576-77 or 1586 as newly discovered Galenic texts, but were in fact forgeries prepared by Giovanni Battista Rasario (1517-78), a translator and editor of Galen, at a time when Galen the physician was attracting less interest than Galen the interpreter of Hippocrates.

4. The order of Galen’s works

Luca Antonio Giunta planned a new Latin edition of Galen based on humanist translations that was published in 1541-42 by his sons, after he died in 1538. Its editor was Agostino Gadaldini (1515-1575) – a young physician and philologist whose father Antonio was a
printer in Modena – who worked on the texts with several collaborators to provide new translations or correct existing printed ones. The edition was organised by Giovanni Battista Da Monte (1498-1555), a distinguished professor in Padua medical school, who laid down the order in which Galen’s works would be published. He described his decisions in a long letter to Giunta that was printed in all the Giuntines from 1541-42. Da Monte’s order of contents was based on *De constitutione artis medicae*, an introductory work where Galen describes the various medical disciplines, from biology to therapy. Da Monte thus established seven subject-based sections – biology, anatomy, and physiology; dietetics; pathology; semiotics; pharmacology; surgery; and therapy – and three sections containing respectively introductory works, *extra ordinem* works, i.e. tracts on general topics or ones that could not be included under the other sections; and spurious works.

Not all the Pseudo-Galenic tracts published in this edition were included in the section of spurious works. This was mentioned by Da Monte in his letter: he included *Oratio suasoria ad artes* and *Introductio sive medicus* among the introductory works; *De urinis* in the semiotics section; and *De remediis facile parabilibus* II and III, *De oculis*, and *De renum affectus dignotione* in the therapy section. Additional works explicitly defined as Pseudo-Galenic were printed together with the genuine ones, at least *Quod qualitates in-corporeae sint* and *Definitiones medicae* (introductory works), *An animal sit id quod est in utero* (biology section), *De incantatione* (therapy section). Da Monte explained his decision with the excellence of these works, which provided a key contribution to the various sections and ensured an exhaustive approach to the subject. It is not surprising, then, that the dietetics section includes a treatise by Hippocrates, *De aere, aquis et locis*. Da Monte specified that he would have printed Galen’s commentary on it, but that he could not find it.
... liber Hippocratis De locis, aere et aqua, quem Galenus De habitationibus, aquis, temporibus et regionibus inscribi maluit, speravique hactenus me tibi super eo divina Galeni commentaria traditurum, sed ab amico id pollicentem frustratus sum.

The Giuntine of 1541-42, the first of the new series, is a comprehensive collection of medical texts by Galen and by physicians in his tradition.

As regards the spurious works, Da Monte explained that they were included only to provide an exhaustive collection, but that they added nothing to medicine or simply repeated what Galen had said; in sum they were useless and superfluous: 18

Sunt vero et alii quidam libri, partim ex Arabia partim ex Graecia delati, non spurii tantum, sed etiam magna ex parte supervacui, quoniam in eis vel nihil tractatur quod ad artem medicam spectet, vel, si tractatur, totum illud a legitimis libris decerptum est, ut ibi frustra repetatur quod alibi copiose explicatum meminimus. Ne tamen et illos (varii enim gustus hominum sunt) omissos aliqui conquerantur, voluimus eos omnes separatim in unum corpus colligere, ut scirent qui id curae haberent et facile invenire quod quaererent, et inventum simul cognoscere non esse inter Galeni monumenta connumerandum.

The section ascripti libri of the Giuntine of 1541-42 contains thirty-one works, most of which had already been published in the first four editions of Galen 19. Two are actually genuine works by Galen – *De partibus artis medicae* translated by Niccolò da Reggio and *De motibus dubii* translated by Mark of Toledo – that were considered as spurious, probably because they were preserved only in Latin. The section also contains Latin texts from Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, and medieval translations from Arabic and Greek, of which seven are by Niccolò da Reggio. There are also humanist translations: the three translations by Giorgio Valla printed in the fourth edition of 1515-16 (*Praesagium experentia confirmatum*, *De urinae significatione*, and *Quaesita in Hippocratis de urinis*) and three
humanist translations that had never been published in any previous complete edition. These are Prognostica de decubitu by Joseph Struthius (1510-69) and De historia philosopha and De melancholia by Marziano Rota, who edited the 1528 Giuntine and the supplementary volumes of 1531 and 1533. The latter three translations had used the Greek texts found in the fourth volume of the Aldine, where they were printed in a new special section of spurious works. The order of Galen’s works followed in the first Giuntine edited by Da Monte was substantially preserved in the later editions: the subsequent eight Giuntines until the final one of 1625, the three Froben editions from 1542 to 1561-62, and the Frelon edition of 1549-51. Only three editions followed a different order, those by Agostino Ricci (1541-45), Giovanni Battista Rasario (1562-63), and René Chartier (1638-89), all of whom motivated their decisions: however, Ricci’s text is not extant and may have never been published. Rasario divided Galen’s works into eight sections based on the De partibus artis medicae which, like Ricci before him, he considered genuine and printed among the libri extra ordinem. He explained his choice in the Liber in quo ratio ordinis, quo Galeni libri dispositi sunt, reeditur, which was published in the initial part of Galen’s edition printed by Vincenzo Valgrisi in Venice in 1562-63. Rasario wrote that it was very important to identify the spurious works: minime par est rivulos fontibus admiscere. He posed as a philologist but, as noted above, he also was an extraordinary forger. The section ascripti libri of his edition included as many as forty-one works. Though ostensibly a large number, it is actually the sum of the works published in the Giuntines as spurious and of those defined as spurious but not printed there. In sum, Rasario did not make original decisions, but closely followed the Giuntines and the Farri edition. Indeed, Galen’s collection printed by Farri in Venice in 1541-45 and edited by Agostino Ricci (1512-64) already placed all spurious works in a separate section. Ricci’s and Rasario’s edi-
tions are almost identical; the main difference is the *Oratio suasoria in artes*, which Ricci considered genuine but Rasario – following Da Monte – attributed to a different Galen, the son of Menodotus, based on the title printed in the Aldine. Of course, Ricci was right.

The spurious works do not seem to have been the subject of much philological interest after Suriano’s edition\(^4\). This is probably due not so much to the fact that they were disregarded by Da Monte and others, but rather to the fact that collations and textual corrections in the Farri edition and in Gadaldini’s Giuntines were based on Greek manuscripts, and no Greek manuscripts were available for these works, transmitted only in Latin.

A small number of works included by Da Monte among spurious works were translated again:

*De historia philosopha*, tr. Niccolò da Reggio;
Marziano Rota;
Andrea Laguna;
Giovanni Battista Rasario;
*Prognostica de decubitu*, tr. Joseph Struthius;
Giacomo Marescotti;
*De melancholia*, tr. Marziano Rota;
Janus Cornarius;
Giovanni Battista Rasario;
*De bonitate aquae*, tr. Niccolò da Reggio;
Agostino Gadaldini;
*De vinis*, tr. Niccolò da Reggio;
Agostino Gadaldini;
Giovanni Battista Rasario;
*De partibus artis medicæ*, tr. Niccolò da Reggio;
Vittore Trincavelli.

The Greek text of all these works is extant except for *De partibus artis medicæ*, which is preserved only in Latin. Trincavelli based his new translation on the one by Niccolò da Reggio. However, as noted above, this is a special treatise that Ricci considered genuine.
If Da Monte’s order was preserved in many editions of Galen, the debate on the authenticity of some works continued for several years. For instance, *De partibus artis medicae* was published as a spurious work in the first Giuntine of 1541-42, but in the later Giuntines Gadaldini added the following sentence under the title: “*Liber qui, nisi Galeni fuerit, eo tamen auctore dignus videtur*”\(^\text{25}\). Conrad Gesner (1516-65) shared Gadaldini’s opinion and reported the same words in his catalogue of Galenic works, which was included in Galen’s third edition printed in Basle in 1561-62\(^\text{26}\).

*De motibus dubiis* was included among spurious works in every edition, but in the 1550 Giuntine Gadaldini added the following sentence under the title: “*Liber traductoris magis quam autoris culpa mendis scatens, in quo multa Galeni doctrinam sapiunt, licet quaedam quo-que insint ab eius dicendi consuetudine aliena*”\(^\text{27}\). Conrad Gesner also reported these words in his bibliography, and pointed out that there is a reference to *De motibus dubiis* in Galen’s *De dissectione mus-culorum*\(^\text{28}\). In the Giuntine of 1565, Gadaldini summarised his and Gesner’s considerations as follows: “*Galenus huius libri sui saepius mentionem facit, et in hoc etiam multos suos libros citat, ob varias tamen translationes aliquae mendae in eum irrepserunt*”\(^\text{29}\).

The *Oratio suasoria ad artes* has a different history\(^\text{30}\). The Giuntine of 1541-42 reported it at the beginning of the section containing the introductory works, but attributed it to Galen the son of Menodotus, in line with Da Monte’s interpretation of its title. Even though Galen’s authorship was affirmed by Ricci, Cornarius, and Gesner, the Giuntines continued to report this information.

Finally, *De theriaca ad Pamphilianum* and *De theriaca ad Pisonem* were generally included among the genuine works, in the section devoted to pharmacology. Cornarius, in his edition, disagreed and wrote of the former treatise “*sed non est genuinus hic libellus*”\(^\text{31}\). Gesner shared his view, whereas Gadaldini did not change his mind until the Giuntine of 1565, where he called into question the authen-
ticity of both works, writing “Sed etiam qui opinentur et hunc non esse Galeni librum” of the former and “Sunt qui negent hunc librum esse Galeni, nec sine causa” of the latter. Later on, Galen’s editions became more and more often collections of ancient medical texts. In the seventeenth century René Chartier was proud to publish Hippocrates’ and Galen’s works side by side together with medical texts from Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. In the nine volumes of this edition Galenic and Pseudo-Galenic works were subdivided into thirteen sections. There was no separate section for spurious works, which was introduced in the Greek edition of 1525 and was subsequently found in all of Galen’s Latin editions from the 1540s onwards. Chartier was more interested in finding unpublished medical Greek works, and in integrating the existing ones with newly discovered sources, than in distinguishing among genuine and spurious texts, which in his opinion belonged to the same tradition anyway. Therefore, even though Chartier’s edition was a monumental enterprise, the best philological work on Galen’s writings was produced by the generation of Da Monte, Gadaldini, Ricci, Cornarius, and Gesner.

APPENDIX

1. Pseudo-Galen’s works in Diomede Bonardo’s edition, 1490
Introductio sive medicus, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De iuvamento anhelitus (David Dinant)
De virtutibus nostrum corpus dispensantibus (Oribasius), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
Compendium pulsuum, tr. Burgundio da Pisa
De theriaca ad Pamphilianum, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De theriaca ad Pisonem, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
An omnes partes animalis, quod procreatur, fiunt simul, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De optima secta ad Thrasybulum, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De vinis (Oribasius), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De bonitate aquae (Oribasius), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
Pseudo-Galenic Texts

De motu thoracis et pulmonis (Oribasius), an. transl.
De virtute centaureae, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De dinamidiis (1)
De passionum mulierum
De anatomia oculorum, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De dissolutione continua, tr. Accursio da Pistoia
De cura lapidis (Avenzoar ibn Zuhr), an. transl.
De cura icteri (Rufus of Ephesus), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De cathartics
De remediis facile paralibus II, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
Liber secretorum ad Monteum, tr. Gerardo da Cremona
De medicina expertis, tr. Farag ibn Salim
De simplicibus medicaminibus ad Paternianum
De podagra (Alexander of Tralles), an. transl.

2. Section of spurious works in the Giuntine of 1541-42
De historia philosopha, tr. Marziano Rota
Prognostica de decubitu, tr. Joseph Struthius
De partibus artis medicae, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De dinamidiis (1)
De dinamidiis (2)
De spermate
De natura et ordine cuiuslibet corporis (Vindicianus)
De anatomia parva
De anatomia vivorum
De anatomia oculorum, tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De compagine membrorum (Constantine the African)
De virtutibus nostrum corpus dispensantibus (Oribasius), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De voce et anhelitu, an. transl.
De iuvamento anhelitus (David Dinant)
Compendium pulsuum, tr. Burgundio da Pisa
De motibus dubii, tr. Mark of Toledo
De dissolutione continua, tr. Accursio da Pistoia
De vinis (Oribasius), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
De bonitate aquae (Oribasius), tr. Niccolò da Reggio
Praesagium experentia confirmatum, tr. Giorgio Valla
De urinae significatione, tr. Giorgio Valla
De simplicibus medicaminibus ad Paternianum
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*De virtute centaureae*, tr. Niccolò da Reggio

*De catharticis*

*De passionum mulierum*

*Liber secretorum ad Monteum*, tr. Gerardo da Cremona

*De medicinis expertis*, tr. Farag ibn Salim

*De melancholia*, tr. Marziano Rota

*De cura icteri* (Rufus of Ephesus), tr. Niccolò da Reggio

*De cura lapidis* (Avenzoar ibn Zuhr), an. transl.

*Quaesita in Hippocratis de urinis*, tr. Giorgio Valla
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