

Articoli/Articles

*ABIIT... NOSTER CELSUS AD EXCELSOS.*  
SOME LOST EDITIONS OF LATIN MEDICAL AUTHORS

VIVIAN NUTTON

Dept. of History of Medicine, First Moscow State Medical University, Moscow, RU

SUMMARY

*Although the English scholar John Caius recorded in 1570 that his editions of Celsus and Scribonius, with commentaries, were ready for the press, they still remained unpublished at his death three years later. In 1621 a volume of his Castigationes surfaced in Denmark and was taken to Padua by Johan Rode, who planned to use it for his projected editions of Celsus and other medical writers. Rode recorded some of Caius' collations and emendations in his own edition of Largus and in his De acia, but his own work on Celsus and Vegetius was left unfinished at his death. His material was handed over to his friend Thomas Bartholin to revise and publish, only to be destroyed in a fire in Bartholin's country house at Hagested in 1670. This article examines traces of the work of Caius and Rode.*

The English scholar John Caius (1510-1573) was famous in his own day for his work as a naturalist and as an editor and translator of Galen. He published Greek editions of nine Galenic texts, as well as translations of three others, and had plans for several more editions<sup>1</sup>. During his time in Italy, between 1539 and 1543, he visited many libraries in search of Greek manuscripts, inserting his collations (as well as those of others he later examined in England and his own emendations) into his copy of the 1538 Basle edition of the *Opera omnia* of Galen. Some of his collations come from codices no longer

*Key words:* John Caius – Johann Rode – Celsus – Vegetius – manuscripts

extant, while the emendations that he or his London colleagues made often show a sound appreciation of Galen's style. In 1570 he concluded his autobibliography, *De libris suis*, with a plea for owners of Galenic manuscripts not to hide their treasures away but to allow medical scholars to inspect and publish them. Not only would they, in his opinion, be performing a great service to medicine but they would be emulating Cosmo de' Medici in their generous support of scholarship. Less well known is his similar work on Latin medical writers, and in particular on Cornelius Celsus and Scribonius Largus<sup>2</sup>. As well as his Galen, Caius took with him on his journey around Italy a copy of Celsus, into which he transcribed readings from codices in Florence and Padua<sup>3</sup>. In Florence he took down readings from three manuscripts in the Laurentian library. One he described as "roughly nine hundred years old", i.e. *Plut.* 73.1, a ninth-century MS once in Milan, which, as F, is one of the most important manuscripts of that author. The other two were much younger, *Plut.* 73.5 and 73.6. The former, which had belonged to Pietro de' Medici, was written by the elder Antonio di Mario in 1427, the other, *Plut.* 73.6, was copied by the younger Antonio di Mario in 1453 and formerly owned by Politian, as Caius discovered from the subscription of the MS<sup>4</sup>. He also compared his copy with three printed editions, that recently published by Gryphius at Lyons in 1542 (which he thought the best), a Venetian edition and one of the two recent Solingen editions<sup>5</sup>. Since the edition into which he copied his collations also contained a text of Scribonius Largus, this must have been the Paris edition put out by Christian Wechel in 1528/9, a folio volume large enough to take his collations and emendations<sup>6</sup>. From Florence he went on to Urbino, where he collated another Celsus manuscript, now Vatican, *Urb. Lat.* 249, and on his return to Padua an as yet unidentified Celsus belonging to the distinguished professor, Lazzaro Bonamico. He mentions further collations of manuscripts he later examined back in England, but without giving any more precise information about

their ownership or contents. He records nothing about any collations of Scribonius, but this is not surprising, since the sole manuscript surviving in full today, Toledo Cathedral 98.12 = T, was probably not then in Italy, and the source of the Paris edition is now lost<sup>7</sup>.

For both authors he claims to have provided an improved text with a commentary, similar to what he supplied for Galen's *Anatomical Procedures*, in which he explained difficult passages and gave reasons for his choices. In addition, before the commentaries on Celsus and Scribonius he inserted a preface dealing with the style and argument of Celsus, the weights and measures used by Celsus and Scribonius, (an updating of the early imperial poem of Remnius Palaemon printed in some editions of Celsus), and a discussion of the Roman denarius, illustrated with an engraving of a silver Roman denarius in his possession. Both editions were almost ready to go to press in 1570, but Caius felt that they should take second place in the queue behind his editions of Galen. Alas, his death in 1573 prevented any publication, and none of the editions of Celsus recorded then in his London library, as far as can be ascertained, were ever handed over to his College Library<sup>8</sup>. His judgment and editorial methodologies as outlined in his *Autobibliography* seem remarkably modern. He realised the importance of *F* as a better manuscript than the *recentiores*, but was also aware of its limitations and of the disagreements between the manuscripts that he had copied. His knowledge of Hippocratic texts also allowed him to decide between competing readings, for he had identified many unacknowledged borrowings from the Greek in Celsus. He also filled in lacunae in the drug book of Scribonius Largus by his discovery that many of his recipes were transmitted also by a later writer, Marcellus of Bordeaux. When these strategies failed, he resorted to his own emendations, which he justified in his commentary. It is clear from what he says that the resulting editions, had they been published, would have made a substantial improvement to the text of both authors<sup>9</sup>.

Traces of them, however, still remain beyond his account in his *Autobibliography*, for a volume of his *Castigationes* survived until 1670 and some of his emendations were actually printed in works by one of its owners, the Danish doctor and scholar, Johan Rode, Rhodius. None has been noticed by a modern editor, partly because of the unlikely history of the volume and the relative obscurity of the sources where it is mentioned.

Rode (1587-1659) had studied medicine at Wittenberg, Marburg, Basle, and Copenhagen, before moving to Padua, where he became the superintendent of the university botanical garden in 1631. It was a post he swiftly gave up “for domestic reasons”, but he remained in Padua as a physician, allowing foreign visitors and students to have access to his remarkable collection of coins and manuscripts in Latin and Greek<sup>10</sup>. Even before his departure for Italy in 1621, Rode, an excellent Latinist, had planned to publish the whole corpus of ancient Latin medical texts, and particularly Celsus. He discussed his intentions with the celebrated Danish scholar and antiquarian Ole Worm (1588-1654), and it was Worm who persuaded the Danish Chancellor, Kristian Friis of Kragerup (1581-1639), to pass on a copy of Celsus to Rode to take with him<sup>11</sup>. Friis was a central figure in the intellectual life of Denmark for half a century, sponsoring many young Danes, including Rode himself, to travel and study elsewhere in Europe<sup>12</sup>. It is not clear from Worm’s letter whether Friis, the owner of a substantial library, had had the volume in his possession for some time, and had earlier loaned it to another scholar, or was merely an intermediary in obtaining it from this individual, whom Worm does not name and of whose intellectual abilities he had no high opinion. How or when the book arrived in Denmark remains unclear. At this stage Worm appears not to have known the identity of the annotator, save that he was a learned man, although either he or Rode soon discovered that he was John Caius<sup>13</sup>.

Once in Padua, the volume was proudly shown off to visitors. In 1639 Rode's friend, Giacomo Filippo Tomasini, recorded it in his catalogue of manuscripts in Paduan libraries, describing it as containing "emendations (*castigationes*) of the Briton John Caius to Celsus"<sup>14</sup>. He also noted a manuscript of Celsus "in no way inferior to any others" in Rode's library, but made no mention of Scribonius Largus or of any prefatory material.

Tomasini's description of manuscripts in Paduan libraries, although still valuable, is far from accurate, as can be seen from an Oxford scholar's reminiscences of his visit to Rode's collection. The English doctor and traveller John Greaves arrived in Padua in November 1635, staying there for several months. A decade or so later, he began an important work on numismatics, in which he tried to establish the relationship between the weights and measures of the ancients and those of his own day, and particularly the denarius<sup>15</sup>. This was something that, in his view, had been either completely neglected or treated superficially, except by two scholars, the Frenchman Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637) and John Caius. Greaves vaguely remembered that Caius had written a special study of the Roman denarius as part of the preface to his edition of Celsus, illustrated with a drawing of a coin from his own collection, but confessed that he did not know what had become of the tract. However, he knew that Caius' copy of Celsus,

*w<sup>th</sup> many variae lectiones out of y<sup>e</sup> best MSS is in y<sup>e</sup> hands of Rhodius a Dane, who promised me att Padua to publish it, & I hope will performe it<sup>16</sup>.*

This was not the first time that Greaves had referred to this volume and his visit to Rode, for in a marginal note in an *Almanac* of 1637, but probably not entered until 1639-40, he had described four items "(to be?) edited by the scholarly Rode" (*Rhodii arte emenda(nda) ta?*): Caius' notes on Celsus, a preface on the style and argument of

Celsus along with a true explanation of the denarius; and Pomponius Largus, emended in Italy<sup>17</sup>. This entry confirms that the volume in Rode's library contained material on both authors, as well as the prefatory matter, rather than simply textual notes to Celsus, as might be gathered from Tomasini<sup>18</sup>.

The information provided by Worm, Tomasini and Greaves also makes it clear that what they saw was not a manuscript of Celsus but a single volume with collations and emendations that began with Celsus and ended with Scribonius Largus, and that also included some prefatory matter. It contained material that Caius had noted down while in Italy, since the phrase 'emended in Italy' must have been found somewhere in the volume, possibly in a note on the frontispiece or first page. Rather than assume that this was a later transcript of Caius' notes either made for him or for a friend, it is best to conclude that this was Caius' annotated copy of Celsus that he took round Italy, and into which he would have later tipped the two discursive sections<sup>19</sup>. This identification would also explain Rode's perplexity about the absence of almost any indication of Caius' work on Largus, known to him from the *Autobibliography*, for no manuscripts of Largus were available in Italy, and any commentary appears to have post-dated Caius' return to England. Had Caius died, Rode wondered, before he could complete the edition, or was there another volume that was now lost<sup>20</sup>? Both possibilities are open, although a lost draft of the commentary prepared for the printer would appear to fit better with these descriptions and Caius' own comments in the *Autobibliography*.

Rode was well aware of the importance of Caius' notes. In the preface to his edition of Scribonius Largus, he expressed his thanks to Friis for his kindness in passing on this remarkable book. It contained many conjectures to the text of Celsus that brilliantly elucidated the text, and revealed Caius' genius at solving textual difficulties that had defeated others through his outstanding knowledge of ancient

literature<sup>21</sup>. Rode may well have been inspired by Caius' example to write his own study of *Weights and Measures* and a *Life of Celsus*, both published by Thomas Bartholin as a sort of Appendix to the revised version of Rode's *De acia*<sup>22</sup>. But the one reference made by Rode to Caius in them, on the date of Celsus, p. 44, is more likely to be taken from the *Autobibliography*, and both of his dissertations contain much material from later writers.

Although Rode says almost nothing about Caius' work on Largus, he does, however, cite him several times for emendations of Celsus both in his own edition of Largus and in his earlier study of ancient suturing, *De acia*. So, for instance, in the commentary on Largus, *Comp.* 53: p. 33,8 ed. Sconocchia, he remarks that Caius had replaced all the instances of "forceps" in Celsus with "forfex", which is found in the early editions of Scribonius, and was a change that was accepted by Friedrich Marx in his edition of Celsus, p. 457, and by more recent editors. A few pages later, he credits Caius with correcting the vulgate *παροντίδας* to *παρυντίδας* in Celsus, VI, 13, 4, on the basis of the parallel in Largus (*Comp.* 61: p. 36,11 ed. Sconocchia). Elsewhere he commends Caius for emendations that have been accepted by modern editors on the basis of good manuscript readings, some of which Caius may already have found during his examination of Florentine manuscripts, above, p. 696, At Celsus VI, 9, 6 = p. 284,6 ed. Marx, Rode accepts the reading "*isque per testas excidet*", on the basis of MSS in Milan and Venice, noting that Caius had already approved of it: *auctoritate codicis Ambrosiani, Divi Antonii Venetiis et Rhodii. quod etiam Caius probavit*. At Celsus II, 33 = p. 98,1 ed. Marx, Rode follows Caius in reading "*tamarix*", citing in support a Venetian codex. Similarly, at Celsus, III, 21, 10 = p. 133,9 ed. Marx, he justifies his and Caius' reading: *& scilla cocta delingitur*, as one he had found in the best of the Florentine codices, which Caius had also collated earlier. At Celsus, V, 26, 23 D = p. 221,21 ed. Marx, Caius is praised for retaining the MS reading "*transuit*",

when others wished to change it, although Rode wondered what he might have written, had he wished to emend. Finally, in two places, Celsus, VII, 4 and VIII, 10,1H = p. 391,4 ed. Marx, he accepts Caius' reading "*vinctura*" in place of the vulgate "*iunctura*", a correction demanded by the sense of the passage as well as by the authority of the oldest Florentine manuscript<sup>23</sup>. All these changes can be found in modern editions, although ascribed there to manuscripts rather than to Caius' ingenuity. No wonder then that Rode valued the work of his predecessor so highly, and was disappointed to find so little that he could use in his edition of Scribonius.

Rode's plans for a complete edition of ancient Latin medical texts soon became known across Europe, and scholars in Italy and elsewhere eagerly provided him with information on their own and others' manuscripts. It was a huge task, like rolling a stone up a hill, as his great friend Thomas Bartholin (1616-80) remarked in a poem of encouragement, but for Rode, as for Sisyphus, the task proved unending<sup>24</sup>. He was always on the point of publishing, and constantly promising to do so. Worm, who often discussed difficult passages in the two authors with Rode, grew increasingly frustrated<sup>25</sup>. From at least 1637 until he died, his letters are filled with requests to Rode to publish and to Danes in Padua to find out exactly what was going on<sup>26</sup>. Henrik Fuiren reported back in 1639 that the Scribonius was almost finished and that Rode had stopped working on his Celsus, since all that remained was to produce a fair copy for the press<sup>27</sup>. But it was a further sixteen years before the edition of Scribonius appeared, although Rode had already sent at least a copy, and possibly his original draft, of the *Largus* to Worm in 1653. Worm's letter of that year to another relative, Willem Worm, in Padua implies that the Celsus was also now finished, and that the young man should be able to bring it or a copy back to Denmark with him on his return<sup>28</sup>.

Although Rode himself never came back to Denmark, many of his books did. His personal copy of the first edition of his *De acia*, heavily



annotated and considerably enlarged, was in the hands of Bartholin's relative, Thomas Fuiren, and Bartholin was able to publish this revised version in 1672, thanks to an earlier copy made by Fuiren. Much of his famous library also reached Copenhagen, inherited by his widow's brother-in-law, Thomas Bang (1600-1661), professor of Greek at Copenhagen and university Librarian. It was he who passed on Rode's edition of Celsus, along with all the other relevant material, to the great Danish anatomist, Thomas Bartholin, who undertook to revise it for the press<sup>29</sup>. The promised edition, when it arrived, proved a great disappointment. Both it and Rode's planned edition of Vegetius' *Horse Medicine* contained little more than a substantial number of variant manuscript readings in a somewhat confused and undigested state<sup>30</sup>. Bartholin set to work to provide a proper commentary on Celsus, but, alas, he had only reached the end of Book V, when in 1670 fire destroyed the Bartholin family mansion at Hagedsted, along with most of his library. As Bartholin wittily wrote, *abiit ... noster Celsus ad excelsos*<sup>31</sup>. This was a great loss, for Bartholin had little opportunity of repeating Rode's collations of all the manuscripts of Celsus and other ancient writers. Nor had he the familiarity with ancient medical sources that Rode displays in his commentary on Scribonius Largus, a work that has been highly commended by all who have sought to edit or translate this difficult author. Rode's indexes would also have been useful in the centuries before the advent of the computer. Rode is not entirely to blame for his failure to complete his proposed editions of Celsus and Vegetius. He was something of a perfectionist, and a search for manuscripts of any ancient author before the twentieth century was a laborious and hazardous process in the absence of printed catalogues. Even in the age of the internet, new manuscripts may suddenly emerge from collections previously uncatalogued, incompletely described or known only to local antiquarians. In his day, Rode had to rely on the help of others in his quest, and his letters reveal both his hopes and his frustrations.

He had received information on a manuscript from Salzburg, but getting anything out of Spain was proving difficult<sup>32</sup>. Nicolaus Heinsius (1620-1681) checked manuscripts for him in the Ambrosiana Library in Milan, and acted as intermediary in dealing with other scholars<sup>33</sup>. But even his best correspondents occasionally failed. Father Sfondrati at the Vatican was very dilatory, and Heinsius was unable to confirm that his Dutch colleague Petrus Scriverius (1576-1660) did indeed own a manuscript of Vegetius' *Mulomedicina* as rumour suggested<sup>34</sup>. The Leiden professor of medicine Johannes Walaeus (1604-1649) unfortunately died before he could fulfil his promise to send Rode his emendations and collations of Celsus<sup>35</sup>. No wonder that his project took so long and was ultimately left incomplete<sup>36</sup>.

Like Rode, our honorand has a passion for Latin medical texts, although, unlike him, he has largely succeeded in his project to examine all existing pre-Salernitan manuscripts and he has continued to publish his most interesting findings speedily for the benefit of his fellow scholars. He too has played a major role in the worldwide *respublica litterarum*, assisting with his advice and criticism anyone who has an interest in ancient medicine. But the internet is a far more fragile repository of his correspondence than the libraries and archives that house what remains of Rhode's letters. Future researchers will have to peruse innumerable footnotes and acknowledgments to reconstruct Klaus-Dietrich Fischer's network of friendship, which, as I know from almost forty years of collaboration, goes far beyond the merely academic.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY AND NOTE

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to Andrew Burnett, whose query about John Greaves started my hunt for Rode.

*Some lost editions*

1. Nutton V, John Caius and the Manuscripts of Galen. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume 13. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society; 1987. Boudon-Millot V, John Caius (1510-1573) traducteur de Galien: le cas du *De libris propriis* et du *De ordine librorum suorum*. In: Garzya A, Jouanna J (ed.), *I testi medici greci. Tradizione e ecdotica. Atti del III Convegno Internazionale* (Napoli, 15-18 ottobre 1997). Naples: M D'Auria; 1999. pp. 17-27; Guardasole A, *Les marginalia de John Caius au De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos de Galien dans l'édition de Bâle (1538) de l'Eton College*. In: Boudon V, Garzya A, Jouanna J, Roselli A (ed.), *Storia della tradizione e edizione dei testi medici greci. Atti del VI Colloquio internazionale Paris 12-14 aprile 2008*. Naples: M. D'Auria; 2010. pp. 337-352; Nutton V, John Caius. *An Autobiography*. London and New York: Routledge; 2018.
2. No modern editor mentions Caius' work on any ancient medical author except for Galen.
3. Caius J, *De libris suis*. London: Seres W, 1570. ff. 14v-16r; Roberts ES (ed.), *The Works of John Caius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1912. pp. 86-88; Nutton V, Caius. *An Autobiography*... ref.1.
4. He did not collate two others *Plut.* 73,6 and 73,2, although it is not clear whether he was given sight of them.
5. *Celsus* was printed at Venice in 1524 by Lucantonio Giunta and in 1528 by the Aldine press, and at Solingen by Johann Soter in 1538 and 1540. The referee's addition is irrelevant. There are other editions: the footnote gives the possibilities for the Venetian and Solingen editions specifically mentioned by Caius.
6. *Cornelii Celsi de re medica libri octo. Accessit huic thesaurus, verius quam liber, Scribonii Largi, titulo Compositionum medicamentorum: nunc primum, tineis & blattis, ereptus industria Joannis Ruellii*. Paris: Christian Wechel; 1528/29. (The date on the title page is 1528, on the colophon, 1529). This is likely to have been the volume numbered 36 in Philip Grierson's list of Caius' books, Grierson P, *John Caius' Library*. In: Prichard MJ, Skemp JB (ed.), *The Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*. VII.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1978. pp. 509-525 [at p. 515], which is valued higher than his other copies of *Celsus*.
7. Details are given in the editions of *Scribonius Largus* by Sconocchia S, Leipzig: Teubner; 1988. pp. ix-x; Jouanna-Bouchet J. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2016. pp. cxiii-cxx.
8. None of the copies there today shows any sign of being owned by him.

9. Caius described his plans at length in his Autobiography, ref. 3. His use of Marcellus antedates, as we shall see, that of Rode and any other editor, *pace* Sconocchia S, ref. 7, p. xviii.
10. Tomasini GF, *Gymnasium Patavinum*. Udine: N Schiratto; 1654. pp. 98, 305; Hoffmann FL, Ein bibliothekarsches Gutachten, abgegeben im Jahre 1631 von Johann Rhodius. *Intelligenz-Blatt zum Serapeum, Zeitschrift für Bibliothekwissenschaft, Handschriftenkunde und ältere Literatur* 31, 1856. pp. 2-5, 10-13, 17-21, 25-28, 33-37; Bruun CW, Paa hundrede-aarsdagen efter at det store kongelige bibliothek. Heri Johan Rode, født i København 1587, død i Padua 1659. Copenhagen: Thieles Bogtrykkeri; 1893. Ducceschi V, Un epistolario inedito di dotti padovani della prima metà del Sec. XVIII. *Atti e Memorie della R. Accademia di Scienze, Lettere Arti in Padova*, n.s. 46, pp. 317-323 [319-20], summarising letters in Rome, *Biblioteca Lancisiana*, Ms V.13; Snorrason E, Danskeren Johan Rhode: i det 17. århundredes. Padua. Copenhagen: Mönlycke; 1965 adding little to Bruun); Mariani P, Johann Rhode. In: Minelli A (ed.), *L'Orto botanico di Padova-1545-1595*. Padua: Marsilio; 1995. pp. 71-72; Grell OP, Three seventeenth-century manuals on how and where to study medicine. In: Grell OP, Cunningham A (ed.), *Medicine, Natural Philosophy and Religion in Post-Reformation Scandinavia*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge; 2017. pp. 136-52 [144-146].
11. Bruun CW, ref. 10, p. 67 Worm O, *Wormii et ad eum doctorum virorum epistulae*. 2 vols, Copenhagen: n.p.; 1751. I, p. 60.
12. Bruun CW, ref. 11, pp. 25-28.
13. Worm O, ref. 11, I, p. 60: *apud alium, hisce, ut nosti, impari latitabat*, dated 28/2/1621. In the following letter, *ibid.* pp. 60-61 he advised Rode to look at the second volume of the *De piscibus* of Gesner, dedicated to Caius, especially his contributions towards the end of the second volume, "*quo ad eius commendationem haud parum faciet.*"
14. Tomasini GF, *Bibliothecae Patavinae publicae et privatae*. Udine: Schiratto N, 1639. p. 138. For the relations of Rode with Tomasini, see Bruun CW, ref. 10, pp. 44-51, 146-148; Snorrason, ref. 10, pp. 53-54.
15. For Greaves, see Maddison F, Greaves, John. In: Harrison B (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004;23;486-487; Shalev Z, The Travel Diaries of John Greaves. In: Hamilton A, Van den Boogert MH, Westerweel B (ed.), *The Republic of Letters and the Levant. Intersections, Yearbook for Early Modern Studies*, 5. Leiden: Brill; 2005. pp. 77-102.
16. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add MS C 299, f.114: neither Greaves nor this section of this miscellaneous manuscript is mentioned in: Madan F, A Summary

*Some lost editions*

- Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Vol. 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1905. pp. 305-306, no. 27613. I am grateful to Andrew Burnett for this information and for a photograph of the entry, which he considers to be part of an unpublished preface to Greaves' *On the Roman Foot and Denarius*, published in 1647.
17. *Jo. Caii comm. In Celsum. Praefatio de stylo et argumento Celsi; De ponderibus et mensuris, item de vera denarii ratione; Pomponius Largus in Italia emendatus. Rhodii arte emenda(nda/ta?)* Shalev, ref. 15, p. 83, note 26: p. 84, pl. 1, showing the entry, rightly suggests that Pomponius is a mistake for Scribonius.
  18. Caius uses "*castigo*" / "*castigatio*" to indicate changes to the text, often, but not exclusively, his own emendations, see Nutton V, Manuscripts... ref. 1.
  19. This is likely to have been the volume numbered 36 in Grierson's list of Caius' books, ref. 6, p. 515, which is valued higher than other copies of Celsus.
  20. Rhodius J, Scribonii Largi Compositiones medicae cum notis. Padua: P. Frambotto; 1655. sig. B 2r : Quod vero de Libris propriis memorat Johannes Caius in emendando Largo institutum vel interruptum fatum, vel cura posteritatis minor euertit.
  21. *Ibid.*, sig. B 1r: Nec [Frisius] verbis id tantum prolixè testatus magna sibi curae, verum libro etiam Ioannis Caii Britanni diligentia olim in Italia emendato e literarum suppellectili sua optimis cuiuscunque generis autoribus refertissima benigne comitatum dimisit; sig. B 2r: Unum igitur ab ingenio praesidium restabat, cui artificiosa coniectura tot difficultates eluctari integrum videbatur. Conatus accessit genius in hoc literarum genus procliuis qui non mediocri priscorum librorum usu iam diu perceperat varias tot errorum causas, quibus plerique turpiter scatent. I prefer to keep the transcription; the main points are clear.
  22. Bartholin T, Rhodius J (preface to), *De acia dissertatio ad Cornelii Celsi mentem... Accedit de ponderibus et mensuris ejusdem autoris dissertatio, & vita Celsi*. Copenhagen: Godicchenius; 1672. sig. B 1r-2v.
  23. The first reference cannot be found, but Rode may have meant to cite VII, 20, 1 = p. 340,24 ed. Marx, rather than VIII, 8, 1, A or VIII, 22, 2 = pp. 385,23 and 409,4 ed. Marx. The emendations are found respectively in Rhodius J, Largus, ref. 20, pp.: 93r; 121r, 453r, 201r, 291r; De acia, ref. 22, pp. 143, 160, 161-162.
  24. Bruun CW, ref. 10, pp. 68-69.
  25. On problems in Celsus, Worm, ref. 11, I, p. 74 (31 December 1641); I, p.76 (5 April 1642); I, p.77 (16 April 1642); I. p. 84 (5 September 1644).

26. *Ibid.*, I, p. 68 (1637), quid Celsus noster? An in carceres damnatus?; I, p.554 (8 September 1639) sed ecquando integrum Celsum tantopere expectatum?; I, p. 560 (8 September 1639, to Henrik Fuiren); I, p. 71 (1640); I, p. 73 (March 1641); I, p. 94 (1650); II, p. 1122 to Willem Worm (17 December 1553).
27. *Ibid.*, I, p. 556 (1 December 1639, from Henrik Fuiren): Cornelius Celsus vero ejus opera repurgatus jam quiescit, nihil fereque ad ejus impressionem desideratur quam ut nitide describatur.
28. *Ibid.*, II, p.1122 to Willem Worm (17 December 1553): Cum Patavium perveneris, Celsum habebis egregiis notis a Rhodii illustratum. Nuper specimen transmisit Scribonii.
29. Bartholin T, *Epistolarum medicinalium centuriae. Variis observationibus curiosis et utilibus refertae*. Copenhagen: M Godicchenius for P Haubold; 1667. Vol. III, pp. 307-308, *Ep.* 83, a letter of 7 September 1662 to Jacob Horst; Vol IV, pp. 208-209, *Ep.* 34, a letter of 18 October 1662 to Guy Patin: De Cornelio Celso Rhodii nostri quid sperandum sit, indicabo. Suppellex viri beati transiit in possessionem Thomae Bangii, Affinis illius, Academiae nostrae Professoris meritissimi, qui mihi tradidit & concredidit quicquid inter reculas ejus inveniri potuit ad Celsum spectans. Presumably Caius' Castigationes was included among the other items of relevance.
30. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 209: Habeo igitur Rhodii Varias lectiones, ejusdem Notulas & Lexicon pene absolutum. Promisi me in ordinem cuncta reducturum, ubi per ocium licuerit, ne tanto thesauro & indefesso labore privetur Respubl. Literaria. Sed magno mihi labore stabit, quum confusa pleraque sunt scripta. Possideo & eiusdem Rhodii Varias Lectiones, Notas et Lexicon in Vegetium Mulomedicum. It is uncertain whether Rode had proceeded far with his plans to collect readings in Serenus, Q, Macer Floridus and perhaps other pre-Salernitan writers, mentioned in letters to Heinsius and Worm, but Bartholin knew nothing of them. Quotation above is given as in the original.
31. Bartholin T, *De Bibliothecae incendio dissertatio ad filios*. Copenhagen: M Godicchenius; 1670. pp. 56-58; O'Malley CD (translated by), Thomas Bartholin, *On the Burning of his Library and On Medical Travel*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Libraries; 1961. pp. 21-22, with a damning verdict, that despite collecting collations and emendations, Rode had never seriously applied himself: numquam serio manum admovit, by contrast with his work on Scribonius. The proposed edition of Vegetius, again with reports of many variant readings, also perished in the flames, Bartholin, *De incendio*, p. 80 = O'Malley, *Burning*, p. 30, but there is no mention of any

*Some lost editions*

- work by Rode on other Latin authors. See also Worm, ref. 11, I, p. 77-78, for Rode's knowledge of Vegetius.
32. Burmann P (ed.), *Sylloges epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum tomus quintus*. Leiden: S Luchtmans; 1727. Ep. 396, pp. 450-4, a letter to Heinsius of 18 and 19 April, 1651. The manuscript had still not reached him a year later, although, to judge from the one reading he knew of, it was likely to be better than any he had seen, *ibid.*, Ep. 403, p. 457, of 19 April 1652.
  33. *Ibid.*, Ep. 393 p. 448 (31 May 1648). Heinsius will have provided him with readings from Ambrosianus E 154 (Marx F (ed.), *A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt*, Berlin and Leipzig: Teubner; 1915. p. lv) and perhaps I. 128.
  34. Naudé G, *Epistolae*. Geneva: Widerhold JH; 1667. P. 405, a letter of March 1636. Burmann, ref. 32, Ep. 389, p. 445; for Scriverius, *ibid.*, Ep. 392- 393, pp. 447-448 (21 and 31 May 1648), and 400, p. 455 (undated).
  35. *Ibid.*, Ep. 191, p. 446; Ep. 392, p. 447 (21 May, 1648) and Ep. 394, p. 448 (22 August 1649). For Walaeus' collations, see also Van der Linden JA, *Corn. Celsi A, de Medicina Libri octo*. Leiden: Elsevier J; 1657. pref., n.p.
  36. For other references by Rode to the progress of the edition, *Ibid.*, Ep 395, p. 450 (20 October, 1649), on his hopes for a manuscript from the Escorial, and Ep 400, p.455 (28 June 1651), 401, p. 456 (10 August 1651, plans to obtain Walaeus' collations from his heirs, and news that Vorstius was arranging for Scaliger's notes to be copied by Thomas Bartholin). Rode, Ep. 401, says that he has details of a copy of Vegetius, annotated by Hadrian Junius, as well as collations provided to him of a Vatican ms and two Florentine mss. He seeks Heinsius' help to find out about similar mss. in Paris and in England (as reported by Isaac Vossius).

Correspondence should be addressed to:

vivian@nutton.org.uk

