



SAPIENZA  
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

## A Significant Medical Manuscript Belonging to Valla: the *Mutinensis* α.U.9.4 (gr. 61)



© Author(s)  
E-ISSN 2531-7288  
ISSN 0394/9001



Thibault Miguet

Université Paris-Est Créteil, Fr

### MEDICINA NEI SECOLI

Journal of History of Medicine  
and Medical Humanities

36/2 (2024) 45-58

Received: Febbraio 2024

Accepted: Aprile 2024

DOI: 10.13133/2531-7288/2980

Corresponding Author:

thibault.miguet@u-pec.fr

### ABSTRACT

The *Mutinensis* α.U.9.4 (gr. 61) is a 15<sup>th</sup> century manuscript containing several classical and Byzantine medical texts and excerpts. It is well-known that it was used by Valla for his Latin translation of Symeon Seth's *Syntagma de alimentorum facultatibus*. But the volume itself received insufficient scholarly interest, whether it be from a codicological or a philological point of view, especially as far as the other medical texts are concerned.

This contribution aims at examining in detail the entire manuscript and Valla's reading of it in order to show that the *Mutinensis* can be replaced in a flourishing context of other manuscripts, scribes and readers and that it thus represents a key moment in medical humanism. In particular, the relationship between the *Mutinensis* (and its copyist, Emmanuel Zacharides) and volumes copied by Demetrios Damilas, sheds a new light on connections that hadn't been insisted upon in previous studies.

Key words: Bizantine medicine - Medical humanism - Giogio Valla - Greek manuscripts

As we know, Giorgio Valla was very interested in medicine. Admittedly, this was not unusual among the humanists of his time. In his case, however, the interest was enduring and sincere, as shown by the prominence given to medicine in his encyclopaedia (*De expetendis et fugiendis rebus*), the editions of medical texts he produced and the manuscripts he owned.

In this context, the *Mutinensis* α.U.9.4 (Puntoni 61) plays an important role: it was from this manuscript that Valla translated several treatises on Greek and Byzantine medicine (Theophanes' *De alimentis*, Symeon Seth's *De alimentorum facultatibus* and Ps.-Galen's *Praesagitio*). It is primarily for this reason that it has so far attracted the attention of researchers. However, the manuscript contains other elements of interest, which would be worth examining more thoroughly.

Firstly, its physical description, which is still based on Puntoni's catalogue from the late 19th century. Secondly, its content: it is a mixed manuscript comprising several texts on classical Greek and Byzantine medicine. Some have been the subject of recent editions (Hippocrates' *Oath* in verse, *Praesagitio* by Ps.-Galen) or serious studies (*De alimentis* by Theophanes and *De alimentorum facultatibus* by Symeon Seth)<sup>1</sup>, while others have yet to be identified, either because they are anonymous or because they offer an atypical recension. The *Mutinensis* therefore also deserves a philological study to assess its importance for the tradition of the texts it contains. This raises the question of the possible or probable models for the manuscript, which has not yet been addressed. This inevitably leads us to question the cultural and intellectual context in which this manuscript was produced, and we will see that it is linked to other manuscripts produced by other well-known copyists.

### Codicological analysis

The *Mutinensis* (Mut) is not a complex manuscript. It is a small paper manuscript (220 × 160 mm) with 99 folios, so it is not very thick. It consists of 13 quires signed on the recto of the first and on the verso of the last folio: 12 regular quaternions (fol. 2-97) and a thirteenth quire (fol. 98-99) which is probably a binion with two cut folios: fol. 98-99 are from two different sheets, and there is no signature at the end of the quire. The manuscript bears Valla's ownership note on fol. 99<sup>r2</sup>. On fol. 1<sup>v</sup>, which is a 16<sup>th</sup> century guard-leaf, there is a hand-note by Marc Mousouros indicating that the manuscript belonged to Alberto Pio di Carpi<sup>3</sup>, a pinax in Latin and erased Latin notes. Only a watermark is visible: "Balance dans un cercle surmontée d'une étoile" similar to Briquet 2512 (a. 1494)<sup>4</sup>. The copyist has been identified by the authors of the *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten (RGK)* as <Emmanuel Zacharides>, a Cretan active in the second half of the 15th and early 16th centuries<sup>5</sup>. The written area is 140 × 85 mm, with 22 lines per page. Since the manuscript contains notes in Valla's hand, the *terminus ante quem* for its copy is 1500 (the date of the Placentin scholar's death). It must therefore date from the 1490s, or perhaps the middle of the decade.

## Content

The *Mutinensis* is particularly noteworthy for its contents. It contains several opuscles on Greek and Byzantine medicine, varying in size but all of considerable interest. The author proposes to review the texts in the manuscript in the order in which they appear, highlighting the surprising elements.

### The Theophilus mystery (fol. 2<sup>r</sup>-14<sup>r</sup>)

The manuscript begins with the *De urinis* by Theophilus Protospatharius, a very famous treatise that has been copied many times in manuscripts. No critical edition currently exists<sup>6</sup>. Examining the text of the *Mutinensis*, one is struck by several elements: it has numerous variants from the other manuscripts to the point that it cannot be compared with any of them, which seems surprising for a manuscript that, after all, is rather late and does not appear, at first glance, to have undergone any scholarly reworking at the time of copying. In addition, there are some marginal notes, most probably taken from the model. These notes, which are not found in any other manuscript, serve the role of what we might call “side-note gloss”. For example, about the colour of urine, we read (fol. 6<sup>r</sup>): αὐτὸς γάρ φησιν λευκὸν γλαυκὸν προσελθὼν φοινικοῦν ἐποίησε, λαμπρὸν ὀνομάζων τὸ αἷμα. τοῦτο δὲ ὀνομάζουσιν οἱ βαφεῖς φλόγινον. This is a reworking of Theophilus’s text: ὡς τὸ τοῦ ἐκ λευκοῦ χρώματος λαμπρῶ προσελθόντος, ὅπερ καὶ ἡ βαφή φλογίνη ἐστίν. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Γαληνὸν φοινικοῦν ὀνομάζουσι. Another note, on fol. 11<sup>v</sup> (πρόσχευ ὧδε ὧ ἡτρῆ) does not resemble the observation of a Renaissance reader (as a variant, for example), but rather appears to have been copied from an older copy (note on the other hand the ionism ἡτρῆ). Secondly, the text contains a significant gap (corresponding to eight pages in the Ideler’s edition), which shortens it considerably. This is in the last line of fol. 9<sup>v</sup>: εἴρηται οὖν οὕτως τῷ Ἱπποκράτει (Ideler I, 273, l. 8) εἰ δὲ καταλάβει πυρετὸς κατὰ τὰς [fol. 10<sup>r</sup>] τοῦ σώματος τρεῖς διαστάσεις (Ideler I, 281, l. 8). This omission occurs without there being any material lacuna in the manuscript: it is therefore a gap in the model (loss of several folios or a quire, for example).

But there are two additions to the text that particularly caught the author’s attention and make the *Mutinensis* an exceptionally valuable witness. The first addition is found between the end of fol. 10<sup>v</sup> and fol. 11<sup>v</sup>, l. 14<sup>r</sup>: it is a long scholium of over a page that is not by Theophilus, but rather a sort of medical commentary on the text. At the beginning of this passage, we find a series of conditional phrases such as ἐὰν ..., γνῶθι ὅτι / ἴσθι ὅτι, which are more like questions and answers. Having finished the scholium, Theophilus’ text continues to the end (fol. 11<sup>v</sup>), with the usual desinit. Immediately following, on fol. 12<sup>r</sup>-14<sup>r</sup>, l. 5, is an unpublished text that the author has been unable to identify. It seems to be the result of several pieces of text put together, each with its own style and content. The beginning of the text (inc. Κατὰ πόσας αἰτίας

γίνεται ἡ ἀπεψία;) is a series of questions and answers about urine. Then, in the following part, the author was able to find some parallel passages in the *De urinis* of Ps.-Galen<sup>8</sup>, but the variants are numerous, and the text is longer in the *Mutinensis*. Here are the elements presented in table form (for fol. 13<sup>r-v</sup>):

<i>Mutinensis</i> , fol. 13 <sup>r</sup> , l. 13-13 <sup>v</sup> , l. 9	Ps.-Galen, <i>De urinis</i> , ed. Kühn, vol. XIX, 577, l. 14-578, l. 11
<p>ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν νεφρητικῶν ὡς ὅταν λίθου γεννηθέντος ἐν τοῖς νεφροῖς ἢ φλέγματος ἐκεῖσε κατασπασθέντος. ἐμφραττομένων τῶν οὐρητήρων διηθεῖται ἤγουν διαλύεται τὸ οὖρον καὶ φέρεται λεπτὸν καὶ λευκόν. Ἔτερον κακὸν σημαίνει τὸ τοιοῦτον οὖρον. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ διακαοῦς καὶ καυσώδους πυρετοῦ ἐστὶ φανήναι τὸ οὖρον λεπτὸν καὶ λευκόν, <b>μαντευόμεθα φρενίτην γενέσθαι</b>. Καὶ τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν τὸ καυσώδες; ἵνα μὴ τις ὑπολάβῃ ὅτι περὶ τοῦ ἐπιζέσει συνόχου λέγει. Ἐπειδὴ κατὰ πολὺ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔστιν ἢ ζήτησις καὶ ἡ αἰτία. ὁ οὖν καυσώδης πυρετὸς ἐπισηπομένη (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>) <b>χολῆ</b> κινεῖται καὶ ἐντὸς τῶν ἀγγείων τὴν ὕλην ἔχουσαν ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ οὖρα καταβαφῆν δέχεσθαι καὶ γίνεσθαι ξανθόν. Ἐὰν ἐπὶ τούτῳ φανῆ τὸ οὖρον λεπτὸν καὶ λευκὸν δηλόντι οὐ μένει ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις ἢ χολῆ ἀλλὰ τῇ οικείᾳ κουφότητι εἰς τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἀνέδραμε. ἐὰν δὲ τοῦ ὄρου (<i>sic</i>) λεπτοῦ καὶ λευκοῦ ὑπάρχοντος [<i>in marg.</i>: θεοφίλου] καὶ τοῦ πυρετοῦ καυσώδους μὴ εἶναι δὲ φρενίτης <b>μαντευόμεθα φρενίτης γενέσθαι</b>. εἰ καὶ παρ' ἐνίων τὸ ὑδατῶδες ἐκρίθη οὖρον, ἐν ὑδρωπικοῖσιν ὠφέλιμον, δηλοῖ καὶ γὰρ ὡς τὸ ἔνδον πάθος καὶ τὸ πλεονάζον ἀφλέγματος.</p>	<p>τὸ γὰρ τῶν μελαγχολικῶν τῇ παχύτητι τὰς ὁδοὺς σφῆνον, ὥσπερ διητισμένον τὸ οὖρον, φαίνεται λεπτὸν καὶ λευκόν. ἕτερον δὲ μέγιστον σημαίνει κακὸν καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον οὖρον. <b>κὰν γὰρ ἐπὶ διακαεῖ καὶ καυσώδει πυρετῷ ἐπιφανῆ λευκὸν καὶ λεπτόν, σημαίνει φρενίτην</b>. εἰ γὰρ ὁ πυρετὸς πλῆθος δηλοῖ χολῆς, οὐκ ἐπιχρώννεται δὲ τὸ οὖρον, εὐδὴλον ὡς ὅτι οὐ μένει ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις χολῆ, ἀλλ' ὅτι οικείᾳ κουφότητι περὶ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἀνέδρασεν. εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ πάρεστιν ἢ φρενίτης τοῦ οὖρου τυγχάνοντος λεπτοῦ καὶ λευκοῦ, ἀλλ' εἴη πυρετὸς καυσώδης, <b>μαντευόμεθα φρενίτην</b>. εἰ δὲ τοιοῦτον μὲν εἴη τὸ οὖρον, <b>πάρεστι δὲ ἢ φρενίτης, προσαγγέλλει θάνατον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ</b>. οὐ γὰρ ὑπομένει ἡ δύναμις ἢ ἐγκεφάλου σώζεσθαι κατὰ τῆς χολῆς ἀνιώσης καὶ δακνούσης τῇ δριμύτητι.</p>

As can be seen, the parallel passages (in bold) are quite varied; among these passages, there is one text (non bold) that is not found in Ps.-Galen.

The end of the added portion (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>, l. 9-14<sup>r</sup>, l. 5), written in the first person, uses very rare terms, mostly found in epic poetry (see the transcription in appendix), which sharply contrast with the rest of the extract.

#### *De succedaneis*, lexicon, Hippocratic phrase (fol. 14<sup>r</sup>-23<sup>r</sup>)

The rest of the manuscript (fol. 14<sup>r</sup>-17<sup>v</sup>) contains a text well known to specialists in Greek medicine: it is a list of *succedanea* taken from Galen, found in Paul of Aegina (VII, 25) and arranged alphabetically. In our manuscript, the letters η and φ are missing. The bo-

tanical lexicon that follows (fol. 17<sup>v</sup>-23<sup>r</sup>) is also in alphabetical order. It is mentioned by Alain Touwaide in his study of lexicons, where it corresponds to category C.6 shared by several manuscripts<sup>9</sup>. There is nothing particularly noteworthy, except that the order of the entries at the beginning differs from that of the edition. Finally, we find (fol. 23<sup>r</sup>), isolated, an anonymous quote that is actually from Hippocrates' *Letter 17*: οἱ γὰρ νοσέοντες ἅμα τῷ σώζεσθαι ἢ θεοῖσιν ἢ τύχῃς (sic) τὴν αἰτίαν προσνέμουσι. This sentence, at first glance, has nothing to do with the content of the preceding or following text<sup>10</sup>.

#### Ps.-Galen's *Praesagitio* and *De uenae sectione*, isolated sentence (fol. 23<sup>r</sup>-29<sup>f</sup>)

On fol. 23<sup>r</sup>-25<sup>v</sup> is the *Praesagitio* attributed to Galen. This short pseudo-Galenic text is attested in only three manuscripts, contemporary with ours, as we shall see. It was the subject of a recent edition by Elsa García Novo<sup>11</sup>. According to García Novo, the text is a late elaboration (perhaps later than the 9<sup>th</sup> century) based on several classical medical sources. The *Praesagitio* is followed by another pseudo-Galenic treatise, the *De uenae sectione* (fol. 25<sup>v</sup>-29<sup>r</sup>, anonymous in the manuscript). This opusculum is itself composite: in the Kühn edition, it is followed by a paragraph on the same subject attributed to Paulos of Aegina (Παύλου, anonymous in the manuscript) and another to Hippocrates (ἐξ Ἴπποκράτους; in the manuscript, “Ἴπποκράτους” is found in the margin)<sup>12</sup>. At the end of these two treatises, we find in the *Mutinensis* another isolated medical sentence, as anonymous as the first: πλέον δέ φησι Γαληνὸς εἰς τὴν θεραπείαν δύνασθαι τὴν ὅλην διαίταν ἢ τὴν (sic) φάρμακα. It is in fact taken from Book I of Galen's *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*, again with no apparent connection to the earlier text<sup>13</sup>.

#### Hippocrates, *Oath* in verse with two extracts on fever (fol. 29<sup>v</sup>)

The Hippocratic Oath in verse is found on fol. 29<sup>v</sup> of the *Mutinensis*. Our manuscript is mentioned by Jacques Jouanna in his recent edition<sup>14</sup>. There follows a first extract on fevers, marginally attributed to Ætios of Amida, but which, according to Jouanna, actually corresponds to a passage attested in both Palladios and Stephanus of Athens<sup>15</sup>. The second paragraph deals with the cachrys seed, which induces sweating (author unidentified).

#### On weights and measures (fol. 30<sup>r-v</sup>)

The text on weights and measures on fol. 30<sup>r-v</sup> is not in the Hultsch edition, although it is similar to some of the texts edited by the author<sup>16</sup>. In fact, it appears to be a reworking.

#### Medical extracts from fol. 31<sup>r</sup>-33<sup>r</sup>

Sandro Passavanti and Tamara Martí Casado have devoted a study to the medical extracts on fol. 31<sup>r</sup>-33<sup>r</sup> in this volume and will not be discussed here.

### Theophanes Chrysobalantes and Symeon Seth, on foodstuffs (fol. 33<sup>r</sup>-99<sup>r</sup>)

The rest of the manuscript consists of two famous Byzantine treatises on foodstuffs: the first (fol. 33<sup>r</sup>-49<sup>v</sup>) is the *De alimentis* by Theophanes Chrysobalantes (10th century), attributed in the manuscript to Michael Psellos. The second (fol. 50<sup>r</sup>-99<sup>r</sup>) is the *De alimentorum facultatibus* by Symeon Seth (11th century)<sup>17</sup>. As Anna Maria Ieraci Bio has shown, the *Mutinensis* served as a model for Valla's Latin translations of these two treatises<sup>18</sup>.

According to Sonderkamp, fol. 43<sup>r-v</sup> of Theophanes' treatise contains a chapter on bread (chapter 1 of part 2 of the treatise) that is not published in Ideler<sup>19</sup>. In Symeon Seth's treatise, Marie Cronier pointed out to the author (personal communication) that the manuscript included a (probably apocryphal) chapter on cannabis, which is unique in this manuscript along with another, which will be discussed later. The manuscript concludes with an unpublished epigram in dodecasyllables about Hippocrates, Galen, and Magnos<sup>20</sup>. Although the ink is different from that of the main text, the handwriting, according to the author, seems to be the same as that of the main copyist.

In summary, then, our *Mutinensis* contains several texts, some of them with unique features.

### The *Mutinensis* constellation: model manuscripts and similar manuscripts

Is it possible to find the model(s) of the *Mutinensis* or, at least, similar manuscripts? Let us start from the information that can be gathered from the editions, taking as a starting point a rare text: the *Praesagitio* of Ps.-Galen. As previously mentioned, it is preserved in only two other manuscripts, contemporary with ours: the *Vat. Palatinus gr.* 143 and the *Parisinus gr.* 2269. Interestingly, the *Palatinus* is also compared with the *Mutinensis* by Jacques Jouanna in his edition of the *Oath*: besides being close to the *Oath*, both contain the same material of medical extracts around the *Oath*. For the text of the *Prognostikon*, Jouanna, following Alexanderson and his study of the manuscript tradition, also compares the *Palatinus* with *Paris. gr.* 2269<sup>21</sup>. We thus have a group of three potentially related manuscripts. It is now time to examine the two manuscripts just mentioned.

### Palatinus gr. 143

*Palatinus gr.* 143 (Pal) is a late fifteenth-century manuscript of literary and medical content on paper<sup>22</sup>. It consists of three blocks: the first (fol. 7<sup>r</sup>-118<sup>r</sup>) contains Philostratus, the *Imagines* and the *Heroica*; the second (fol. 119<sup>r</sup>-136<sup>v</sup>) contains the *Histories* of Palæphatos (fol. 119<sup>r</sup>-126<sup>v</sup>) and Xenophon's *Hieron* (fol. 127<sup>v</sup>-136<sup>v</sup>). Finally, the third part (fol. 137<sup>r</sup>-179<sup>r</sup>) contains varied and complex medical contents. The copyist of the manuscript was identified by Paul Canart as Georgios Moschos<sup>23</sup>. Moschos is actually responsible only for the second part of the book (fol. 119<sup>r</sup>-136<sup>v</sup>).

The first part was written by an anonymous scribe. The third part (which we are interested in) is the work of an as yet unidentified anonymous person. However, at first glance, it is clear that the copyist is Emmanuel Zacharides. Furthermore, the watermark “Balance dans un cercle” (noted by S. Follet) is probably identical to ours. Finally, the size of the book (205 × 160 mm) is very similar to those of our *Mutinensis*, and the number of lines per page is the same.

In fact, there are several texts in common in Mut and Pal:

- the isolated sentence of Hippocrates (*Letter* 17): fol. 23<sup>r</sup> Mut = fol. 167<sup>r</sup> Pal.
- the *Praesagitio* and the *De venae sectione*: fol. 23<sup>r</sup>-29<sup>r</sup> Mut = fol. 167<sup>r</sup>-172<sup>r</sup> Pal. The end of the *Praesagitio* in Pal, absent according to the editor of the treatise, is found there but moved to fol. 162<sup>r</sup>.
- of *De venae sectione*, we do not have the part taken from Paulos of Aegina; that taken from Hippocrates has been moved to fol. 163<sup>v</sup>.
- the *Oath* of Hippocrates in verse: fol. 29<sup>v</sup> Mut = fol. 167<sup>r</sup> Pal

García Novo and Jouanna believe that these are twin manuscripts, descended from a common model. This model is not specified for the *Oath*. García Novo mentions another manuscript containing the text, which she considers a “cousin” of our two manuscripts: it is *Paris. gr. 2269*. Let us take a look at this manuscript.

#### *Parisinus gr. 2269*

*Parisinus gr. 2269* (Par) is a late fifteenth-century paper manuscript whose contents are exclusively medical (numerous treatises by Galen, Hippocrates’ *Prognostikon*, Stephanus of Athens). The copyist has been identified by RGK authors as Demetrios Damilas<sup>24</sup>.

The *Praesagitio* is found on fol. 114<sup>r</sup>-117<sup>r</sup>; it is followed by the *De venae sectione*, this time in its entirety (fol. 118<sup>r</sup>-121<sup>v</sup>). More interestingly, after this treatise, in red, is the quotation from Galen’s *Secundum locos* found on fol. 29<sup>r</sup> of the Mut: πλέον δέ φησι Γαληνός εις την θεραπείαν δύνασθαι την ὄλην δίαιταν ἢ τὰ φάρμακα. We thus have the same sequence of texts as in Mut, in the same order (unlike Pal where the texts are not in the same order), with the isolated sentence in the same place as Mut. This is a point worth emphasising.

But there is more: according to Henri Omont’s catalogue entry, *Paris. gr. 2269* contains, on fol. 94<sup>r</sup>-113<sup>v</sup>, that is, immediately before the *Praesagitio-De venae sectione* group, a text described as “*Hippocratis, etc., excerpta de urinis*”. This is a group of extracts on urine by various authors. Now on fol. 101<sup>r</sup>-113<sup>v</sup> we find Theophilus’ *De urinis* introduced by the words ἕτερον in the title and θεοφίλου in the margin. An examination of the text reveals that this *De urinis* has the same philological characteristics as our *Mutinensis*: identical single lessons; identical marginal notes; omission of a long passage; scholium inserted towards the end; and above all, an unpublished final part.

Thus, we have two closely related manuscripts, and given the rarity of Theophilus' recension, it seems very likely that one is a copy of the other. A collation that the author has carried out on the unpublished section on urine shows that Mut is an apograph of Par: indeed, Mut contains errors and omissions that are not present in Par:

fol. 11<sup>r</sup>, l. 2 *ab imo* (Mut): διὰ ψυχρότητα τοῦτο [πάσχειν Par. om. Mut.] τὸν ἄρρωστον  
 fol. 12<sup>v</sup>, l. 10-11 (Mut): ἡ ἀσθένειαν δυνάμεως ἢ ἔμφραξιν ἢ μετὰστασιν τῆς χολῆς καὶ ἀσθένεια [ἀσθένειαν Par] τῆς δυνάμεως

fol. 13<sup>r</sup>, l. 4 *ab imo* (Mut): Καὶ τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν [οὐκ ἠρκέσθη εἰπεῖν τῷ διακαῆς πυρετῷ μόνον, ἀλλὰ προσέθηκε καὶ Par om. Mut.] τὸ καυσῶδες ;

Mut is thus an apograph of Par. It is tempting to make Par the model for Mut also for the *Praesagitio-De venae sectione*, and likewise Pal for this same set. However, the editor García Novo considers Par and Mut as manuscripts dependent on a common archetype, and Pal and Mut as twins. On the other hand, the collations the author has made are not entirely convincing. Without delving into details that would take this article too far from its purpose, Mut and Pal, for example, have common errors and a missing chapter title in Par. It could be assumed a model-copy relationship of the type Par → Mut → Pal, but Mut offers an omission where Pal has the correct text; conversely, Par → Pal → Mut, would not explain the common errors between Par and Mut with respect to Pal.

In any case, our *Mutinensis* is closely related (according to the author, a copy at least for one of the texts) to a manuscript copied by Demetrios Damilas. It is also very close to Pal, copied by the same Zacharides and with the same watermark (it could be assumed that the two manuscripts were copied at the same time or within a very short period).

What about the rest of the content of the *Mutinensis*? The opuscle on *succedanea* (περὶ ἀντιβαλλομένων) is found in many manuscripts. The Pinakes database<sup>25</sup> and its search function have been very helpful, allowing the author to find a manuscript in which the text on weights and measures, the *succedanea* and the botanical lexicon appear in succession: London, British Library, Additional 10058.

### *Londinensis* Additional 10058

*Londinensis* is a late fifteenth-century medical manuscript primarily containing Nicolas Myrepse (*Antidotarium*, fol. 7<sup>r</sup>-73<sup>r</sup>) and Theophanes (*Synopsis de remediis*, fol. 74<sup>r</sup>-143<sup>v</sup>). Between fol. 150<sup>v</sup>-161<sup>r</sup>, there are three opuscles found in the *Mutinensis*: the text on weights and measures (fol. 150<sup>v</sup>-151<sup>r</sup>), the text on *succedanea* (fol. 151<sup>r</sup>-154<sup>v</sup>) and the botanical lexicon (fol. 155<sup>r</sup>-161<sup>r</sup>, not mentioned by Touwaide). Interestingly, following the botanical lexicon, the isolated Hippocratic phrase (*Letter* 17) is annotated, exactly as in Mut and in the same place.

Examining these texts in the *Londinensis*, one realises that they exhibit the same philological characteristics as Mut: the text on weights and measures, which was not present in the editions, is the same here; the text on *succedanea* shows the omission



of the letter η and the letter φ. The copyist of the *Londinensis* is none other than Demetrios Damilas<sup>26</sup>. This is a second witness who can be linked to this scribe. The author did not have sufficient time to conduct thorough collations on these texts to determine which serves as the model and which as the copy, but one may assume that our *Mutinensis* is a copy of the *Londinensis*.

#### Theophanes' *De alimentis* and Seth's *De alimentorum facultatibus*

Finally, the two texts on foodstuffs remain to be analysed: as previously pointed out, for Seth's *De alimentorum facultatibus*, the Mut was the only one, along with another manuscript (*Ambrosianus* T 19 sup), that had an additional (probably apocryphal) chapter on cannabis. Marie Cronier also confirmed to the author (personal communication) that the two manuscripts have the same order of chapters, which is significant because, for this treatise, almost all manuscripts have a different order.

#### *Ambros. T 19 sup (Amb)*

*Amb* is a luxurious manuscript of medical content, copied on very thin parchment: it contains Theophanes' *De alimentis* (fol. 1r-24v), Seth's *De alimentorum facultatibus* (fol. 24v-91v), Hippocrates' *Aphorisms* (fol. 92r-121v) and the *Definitiones* of Ps.-Galen (ff. 122r-177v). The copyist is Demetrios Damilas<sup>27</sup>.

Again, the common (and rare) textual features it shares with our *Mutinensis* suggest a model-copy relationship between the two: in what sense? The collations made by the author demonstrate that our Mut is an apograph of *Amb*: indeed, in the Mut, we find errors and omissions that are present in *Amb*, as shown here:

fol. 27<sup>r</sup> *Amb* = fol. 51<sup>v</sup> *Mut*: δύναμιν δὲ ἔχει ψυκτικὴν καὶ μετρίως ξηραντικὴν [πραυντικὴν ὁμοῦ τῶν δριμέων καὶ ἐμπλαστικὴν ed *Amb om. Mut*] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δυσεντερικοῖς ἀγαθὸν ἐστὶ φάρμακον

fol. 32<sup>v</sup> *Amb* = fol. 55<sup>v</sup> *Mut*: τὴν τε σύστασιν καὶ τὴν κρᾶσιν τῆς τε ὀρούδου φύσεως καὶ τῆς τυρώδου. [Ὅσα μὲν οὖν γάλα τοῦ ὀρώδου πλέον κατέχει, ταῦτα καὶ εὐχρηστότερα εἰσὶν· ὅσα δὲ τοῦ τυρώδου ed *Amb om. Mut.*], βλαπτικὰ ἐμφράξεις τῷ ἥπατι καὶ λίθου ἀπογεννῶνται

In these two examples, *Mut* presents two omissions due to two “sauts du même au même”, while *Amb* has the correct text.

As for Theophanes, *Amb* is strangely ignored by Sonderkamp. For what could be observed, there are numerous marginal notes in the manuscript that were clearly on his model (*Amb* is a luxury manuscript and has not been the subject of scholarly reading). Yet Zacharides includes only a few of these notes in *Mut* (for example, he omits the note on fol. 5<sup>v</sup> of *Amb*: ὅσα τὰ πεπώνια κακοστόμαχα), which is a further indication that *Mut* is indeed a copy of *Amb* and not vice versa. Finally, *Amb* also contains the *Aphorisms*: it would be useful to see the relationship between the version of *Amb* and *Pal. gr.* 143, which also contains the *Aphorisms*.

## Conclusion

An analysis of the *Mutinensis* has been proposed, highlighting the interest of its content from a textual perspective, and comparing it with four other manuscripts: the *Vaticanus Palatinus* gr. 143, the *Parisinus* gr. 2269, the *Londinensis* Add. 10058 and the *Ambrosianus* T 19 sup. Notably, three of these four manuscripts were copied by Demetrios Damilas; for two of them (*Paris.* gr. 2269 [Theophilus] and *Aubr.* T 19 sup), it is believed that it was Zacharides who copied the Damilas' manuscripts. For the other texts (*Paris.* gr. 2269 [*Praesagitio-De venae sectione*] and *Londinensis*), this is considered probable, but more precise collations are needed. In any case, all these manuscripts are very closely related, whether the model-copy relationship is one way or the other.

Be that as it may, the *Mutinensis* sheds light on the relationship between Damilas and Zacharides (and, through him, Valla) which, to the best of the author's knowledge, had not been clearly highlighted before. In what context was our *Mutinensis* copied? Given the variety of its content and that of the manuscripts that Zacharides may have used, it is believed that it was copied at the request of (and perhaps under the supervision of) Giorgio Valla, in order to provide him with a manuscript from which to draw the Latin translations of Greek medicine, first published in 1498: Ps.-Galen, *Praesagitio* (1498<sup>28</sup>), Theophanes (in 1498 and later in *De expetendis rebus* in 1501), Seth (in *De expetendis rebus* of 1501).

Valla intervened in Mut (14 folios where such interventions occurred have been noticed), but these interventions remain rather modest and it is difficult to determine to what extent they are conjectures, verifications of the model or the use of another model. The few investigations conducted suggest that it is more likely to be conjectures, either because the models identified do not provide the lessons that Valla notes, or because Valla proposes corrections to the unpublished (and almost unique) part of Theophilus. In another case, however, he fills in an omission, and it might be possible to understand which manuscript he is referring to.

There is also an interesting case in Seth: in the chapter on the pear (ἄπια) (fol. 26<sup>r</sup> Amb = fol. 51<sup>r</sup> Mut), there is a marginal note in Damilas' hand (τὸ ἄπιον εὐστόμαχον | μετὰ τροφῆς καὶ ἄδιψον). Zacharides does not copy it in the margin, but adds it at the end of the chapter in a slightly reworked form: εἰσὶ δὲ εὐστόμαχα μετὰ τροφήν καὶ ἄδιψα. Now Valla copies this note in the margin, as found in Amb, also making a correction to the text at the beginning of the chapter (πρώτην *add. sup. lin.*, corresponding to Amb). What are we to think? That Valla may have corrected Zacharides's copy with Amb before his eyes? An answer to this question has yet to be found.

Finally, what is the relationship between Demetrios Damilas and Emmanuel Zacharides? They did not work in the same places: Zacharides in Venice and Damilas in Florence and Rome. It is therefore unlikely that the two copyists were in direct

contact, or that Damilas supplied the manuscripts he copied directly to Zacharides for him to make copies. It seems more probable that Zacharides had access to a rich medical library in or near Venice, where a large number of the manuscripts copied by Demetrios Damilas would have been found: Pier Leone da Spoleto or Alessandro Benedetti come to mind, but these are hypotheses that will have to be verified later<sup>29</sup>.

## Bibliography and notes

### Appendix

Transcription of the unpublished text on urine found on fol. 13<sup>v</sup>, l. 9-14<sup>r</sup>, l. 5 of *Mutinensis* α.U.9.4 (gr. 61).

Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ καλῶς ἐγνώσθη καὶ ἐπενοήθη τῶν πόρων δίχα φλεγμονῆς διασώζεσθαι· τουτὶ γὰρ μόνῳ σπουδῇ καὶ τάχους καὶ ἐπιμελείας εὐτόνου δεῖται καὶ σχεδὸν εἰπεῖν καὶ ἰάσεως. Ὡσπερ οὖν τοὺς τὸ ἐναντίον ὡς φθισήνορον ἀποστρέφεσθαι καὶ ὠκύμορον ἐκπηδᾶν. Ἐγὼ δὲ τοίνυν καὶ ὡς μινυνθάδιον καταμεφόμεαι καὶ διζυρὸν ἀποσειόμεαι· ἐπιγίγεται γὰρ μοι ποτὲ λευκὸν τε τὸ παρυφιστάμενον καὶ λεπτὸν καὶ μὴ ἀλλοίαν βαφὴν ἐν τούτῳ ἐμπειριεῖσθαι καὶ περιφέρεσθαι καὶ ἢ δυνάμεως εἶχον ὥστε τὸ διζήμενον ἀπακέεσθαι ἐνεδειξάμην καὶ οὐκ ἀπήλλαξα. ἢ γὰρ τοῦτο σχοῦσα γυναικᾶ ἦν καὶ μήτε σπλάγγων ἐξογκουμένη μήδε ὑδαλέουσα καὶ οἰδαίνουσα. ποσὶ δὲ μόνῃ σὺν περιτονέῳ φυσσομένῳ καὶ τὸ προσώπιον καὶ τὸ εἰθισμένον σχεδὸν ὡς φροῦδον ἀνεφάνη καὶ ὄλωλεν, ὡς μήδε ἰκμάδα προΐεσθαι καὶ τῆς ἐφεστῶσης ἀνάγκης κα(φ. 14r)χεξίας ἀλεγεινῆς τοῦτο γέγονε χαλεπότερον. νοσηλία γὰρ ἀνεφύησαν καὶ ῥαγδέαι καὶ ὀλοφώαι καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται λάθρα παρεῖχον ταύτη ἀφειδῶς καὶ οὐ δαυιλῶς ὡς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀπήλλαξαν τάχιον. ἀσφελείας δὲ χάριν βεβαιώσεως καὶ μαθήσεως διεσημάνθη καὶ διεγνώσθη καὶ διερμηνεύθη ὡς λῶιον.

1. For bibliographical references, see below.
2. Γεωργίου τοῦ Βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ | βιβλίον.
3. Τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς ἄρχοντος ἀλβέρτου τὸ βιβλίον
4. Briquet CM, *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier*. 4 vol. Hildesheim-New York: Georg Olms Verlag; 1977.
5. Gamillscheg E, Harlfinger D, Hunger H, *Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten 800-1600* (3 vol.). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 1981-1997: I 114, II 146, III 189.
6. Edition in Ideler J L (ed.), *Physici et medici Graeci minores*. Vol. I, Berlin: G. Reimeri; 1841. pp. 261-283. The treatise was the subject of a critical edition by the late Piero Tassinari.
7. End of fol. 10v: [Theophilus] καὶ τοῦ παρυφισταμένου. [addition] ἐὰν δὲ τὸ οὖρον ῥοδίνον ἦ, γίνωσκε ὅτι ξανθὴ [fol. 11r] χολὴ πλενάζει (*sic pro* πλεονάζει) καὶ ἐὰν ἔστιν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ νεφέλη μέλαινα, ἔστι θανάσιμον (...); fol. 11v, l. 12: [addition]...Εἰς πόσα διαιρεῖται ἡ σύστασις τοῦ οὔρου; Εἰς τρία, εἰς λεπτότατον, παχύτατον καὶ εἰς σύμμετρον [Theophilus] καὶ τὰς μὲν οὖν συμμετρίας ἀμφοτέρων.
8. Edition in Kühn KG (ed.), *Claudii Galeni opera omnia* vol. XIX, Lipsiae: Car. Cnoblochii; 1830. pp. 574-601.
9. Touwaide A, *Lexica medico-botanica byzantina. Prolégomènes à une étude*. In: Τῆς φιλικῆς τὰδε δῶρα. *Miscelánea médica en memoria de Conchita Serrano*. Madrid: CSIC;

1999. pp. 211-228, ici p. 216-217. Ce lexique est édité par Delatte, dans Delatte A, *Anecdota Atheniensia et alia*, vol. 2. Textes grecs relatifs à l'histoire des sciences. Liège-Paris: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fascicule LXXXVIII; 1939. pp. 372-377.
10. Littré E (ed.), Hippocrate, (Œuvres complètes. Vol. 9. Paris: J. B. Baillière et fils; 1861. pp. 376, l. 1 *ab imo*-377, l. 1.
  11. García Novo E, Pseudo-Galeno, Praesagitio omnino vera expertaque: primera edición crítica. Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos 2021;31:107-122.
  12. Edition in Kühn KG (ed.), Claudii Galeni opera omnia vol. XIX, Lipsiae: Car. Knoblochii; 1830. pp. 519-528.
  13. Edition in Kühn KG (ed.), Claudii Galeni opera omnia vol. XII, Lipsiae: Car. Knoblochii; 1826. p. 410.
  14. Jouanna J (ed.), Hippocrate, Tome I, 2e partie. Le serment, Les serments chrétiens, La loi. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2018. p. 123; see below for details.
  15. Jouanna J (ed.), Hippocrate, Tome I, 2e partie. Le serment, Les serments chrétiens, La loi. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2018. p. 125, with notes 40 and 41.
  16. Hultsch F, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*. Vol. 1, Leipzig: Teubner; 1864.
  17. A study of the manuscript tradition of the first of these two treatises can be found in Sonderkamp JAM, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Theophanes Chrysobalantes* (sog. Theophanes Nonnos), Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH; 1987; for the second treatise, Marie Cronier, Alessia Guardasole and Antoine Pietrobelli set up a working group a few years ago to study the manuscript tradition and produce a new edition of the treatise.
  18. Ieraci Bio AM, Symeon Seth, *Syntagma de alimentorum facultatibus: la versione latina misconosciuta di Giorgio Valla*. Galenos. Rivista di filologia dei testi medici antichi 2020;14:257-276.
  19. Sonderkamp JAM, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Theophanes Chrysobalantes* (sog. Theophanes Nonnos), Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH; 1987. p. 127
  20. Transcription: Ἱητροὶ ὄλω τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν τρεῖς μόνου | ὑγείαν οἱ μέροσιν ῥῆα παρέσχον | ὡς ἡ τρίφωτος τριάς ἐν οὐρανίοις | Ἱπποκράτης θεῖος Γαληνός τε καὶ Μάγνος.
  21. Jouanna J (ed.), Hippocrate, Tome III, 1e partie. Pronostic. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2013. pp. CXIV-CXV (avec n. 119).
  22. On this manuscript, see Follet S, *Un manuscrit associant Philostrate, Hippocrate et Galien, le Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 143*. In: Garzya A (ed.), *Storia e ecdotica dei testi medici greci*. Atti del II Convegno Internazionale, Parigi, 24-26 maggio 1994. Napoli: M. D'Auria; 1996. pp. 133-139. See also the descriptive note on the Heidelberg Library website: <https://doi.org/10.11588/diglit.39797> (accessed on 7 February 2024).
  23. Canart P, *Additions et corrections au Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten 800-1600, [Teil] 3*. In: Martin J (ed.), *Vaticana et Mediaevalia, Études en l'honneur de Louis Duval-Arnould* (Millennio medievale 71). Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo; 2008. pp. 41-63, ici p. 45.
  24. Gamillscheg E, Harlfinger D, Hunger H, *Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten 800-1600* (3 vol.). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 1981-1997. I 93, II 127, III 160.
  25. <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/>
  26. Gamillscheg E, Harlfinger D, Hunger H, *Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten 800-1600* (3 vol.). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 1981-1997. I 93, II 127, III 160.

27. See Martinelli Tempesta S, Per un repertorio dei copisti greci in Ambrosiana. In: Gallo F (ed.), *Miscellanea Graecolatina I*. Roma: Bulzoni; 2013. pp. 101-153, in particular p. 137.
28. Georgio Valla Placentino interprete. Hoc in volumine haec continentur. Nicephori logica. Georgii Vallae libellus de argumentis. Euclidis quartus decimus elementorum. Hysiclis interpretatio eiusdem libri Euclidis. Nicephorus de astrolabio... Aristotelis de coelo. Aristotelis magna ethica... Rhazes de pestilentia. Galenus de inequali distemperantia .. Alexander Aphrodisaeus de causis febrium. Psellus de victu humano, Impressum Venetiis per Simonem Papiensem dictum Bevilaquam. 1498. Die ultimo Septembris.
29. I would like to thank *Ciro Giacomelli* for suggesting this line of research.

