



SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA



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



Exploring the medical *excerpta* and *opuscula* in the Greek manuscript collection of the Estense Library and their connections with Giorgio Valla's *œuvre* – Part 1: MUT. GR. 61, ff. 31^r-33^r; MUT. GR. 213, 239^r-242^r.

MEDICINA NEI SECOLI

Journal of History of Medicine
and Medical Humanities

36/3 (2024) 65-78

Sandro Passavanti

Southern Denmark University - Odense, DK

Revised: 03.06.2024

Accepted: 04.09.2024

DOI: 10.13133/2531-7288/3022

Corresponding author:

sandropassavanti@hotmail.it

ABSTRACT

The catalogue of the Greek codices preserved at the Biblioteca Estense in Modena (compiled in 1896 by V. Puntoni, eventually revised by E. Mioni in 1965) records within Mut. gr. 61 (ff. 31-33) and Mut. gr. 213 (ff. 224-242) some unspecified *excerpta* and *opuscula medica*: excerpts of works on medical topics, taken from various authors and gathered in an apparently disorganised manner. The study of these folios has shed more light on their content, revealing well-known texts alongside with composite writings still difficult to identify, conspicuous reworkings from other authors, and uncollected witnesses of treatises attested elsewhere.

In this paper, I will give the first overview of two unedited anonymous writings – a fragment on the phases of diseases (Περὶ καιρῶν, Mut. gr. 61, ff. 31^r, 1 -31^v, 2) and a short treatise on bloodletting (Περὶ φλεβοτομίας, Mut. 213, ff.239^v-242^r) – along with an overall examination of the texts contained in Mut. gr. 61, ff. 31^v, 2 – 33^r, 7 (a selection of Hippocrates' *Aphorisms* from the indirect tradition, interpolated with texts allegedly from Galen and Theophilus). The inquiry will pave the way to the investigation of possible links between these writings and Giorgio Valla's scientific production.

Keywords: Estense Library - *Mutinenses Graeci* - Mut. gr. 61 - Mut. gr. 213 - Giorgio Valla's *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus* - Ancient Greek and Byzantine medicine - Renaissance medicine - Medical Humanism

We owe the Greek manuscripts catalogue of the Estense Library to the Italian philologist Vittorio Puntoni (1859-1926) who, over a few months in 1895, compiled his roughly 170-page *Indice dei codici greci della Biblioteca Estense di Modena* (Bologna, 1896). Although carried out on the grounds of some notes taken in the first half of that year, “under conditions far from being propitious to systematic and uniform work”, “at intervals and [...] in spare moments”, as Puntoni himself modestly warned¹, this achievement remains today the main means of access to the Greek *Mutinenses*. Despite some inexactitude in the dating of the codices and in the identification of their content, the *indice* is counted still today among those old Italian library catalogues that may serve as a starting point for further philological and textual investigations². This is particularly the case with Puntoni’s description of two manuscripts, the *Mutinenses graeci* 61 (III B 19 = α .U.9.4) and 213 (III G 9 = α .G.3.12), whereby we find two similarly loose headings pointing out portions of text of medical content. In Mut. gr. 61, ff. 31^r-33^r, Puntoni reported “various excerpts from the works of Theophilus, Galen, Hippocrates, and other medical authors” (*excerpta varia ex Theophili, Galeni, Hippocratis et ceterorum medicorum operibus*); in his description of Mut. gr. 213, he listed under the heading “various medical minor works and excerpts” (*opuscula et excerpta medica varia*) a lengthy sequence of *incipits* of the medical writings contained in ff. 224^v-242^r. Apart from what figured in his headings, Puntoni added no further information about the *excerpta* transmitted in the manuscripts: in total, we are left with forty pages that would thus have every reason to elude scholarly investigation, and whose precise content is therefore almost entirely unknown.

Although to different degrees of certainty and relevance, both manuscripts can be related to the making of Valla’s encyclopaedical work *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus*, published by his adopted son Pietro Cademosto a year after the author’s death in 1501. Only the Mut. gr. 61 undoubtedly belonged to Valla, as we know from the possession note on f. 1^v. That the Mut. gr. 213 was once owned by the humanist has long been claimed after an assumption made by Vivian Nutton in his monograph on the English physician John Caius³. Yet, some years ago, Caroline Petit argued that the Mut. gr. 213 could be dated to the years 1525-1530 – thus excluding any direct connection with Valla, who died in 1500 – and held that this manuscript, along with four others penned by the same scribe, could have been exploited by the Modenese physician Agostino Gadaldini for the Giunta’s edition of Galen (Venice, 1565)⁴. However, Petit’s arguments do not rule out that the *content* of Mut. gr. 213 could be known to Valla: its model(s) (as with other Modenese medical manuscripts) is still unknown, and Valla – both in the *De expetendis* and in some of his translations – demonstrates knowledge of at least two of the texts contained there.

The hypothesis that the antigraph(s) of 213 may have been owned or consulted by Valla will be considered in more detail by Tamara Martí Casado in the following paper. For the moment, we will stop on a close-up analysis of these sets of folios

grouped by Puntoni as medical *excerpta* and *opuscula*. In this paper, I will deal with Mut. gr. 61, ff. 31^r-33^r and Mut. gr. 213, ff. 239^v-242^r. Tamara Martí Casado will examine the content of Mut. gr. 213, ff. 224^v-239^r in the following contribution. Our aim is to shed light on these excerpts to enrich our knowledge of the codices in which they are transmitted, looking for the connections they may reveal with the work of Giorgio Valla as a translator and compiler of medical texts.

1. MUT. GR. 61 ff. 31^r, 1-12 – 31^v, 2

The Anonymi medici *De morborum temporibus* and its (partial) translation by Valla

The first text we encounter upon when opening the Mut. gr. 61 at folio 31^r is a short, anonymous (and unedited) text running for twenty-six lines over a little more than a folio. We entitle it *Anonymi medici de morborum temporibus* after the Latin heading added *in margine* in the only other known witness of this writing (Vat. Pal. gr. 143, f. 172^v), concurrently identified by Thibault Miguet in his enquiry on our Mutinensis⁵. The collation of the two witnesses (penned by the same copyist) does not allow to fully address the corrupted state of this text. Since a thorough edition would be beyond the scope of this paper, we will focus on those points of the writing that appear sufficiently firm, both conceptually and textually, not to be in patent danger of being challenged by future conjectural emendations. First, its overall content, as we may gather it from the beginning of the fragment, the only part which is sufficiently well preserved: a summary — or, rather, an unprecedented variant, as we will shortly see — of the medical doctrine concerning the four “phases” (*kairoi* or *chrónoi*) in which, according to the so-called Methodical sect, the diachronic progression of diseases must be subdivided. This theory, a development of the typically Hippocratic attentiveness to disease chronobiology, played a major impact in the Imperial period, when the Methodists reached the height of fame and success in the Roman world⁶. It was widely adopted in medical theory and practice in Late Antiquity and beyond, even after the demise of Hellenistic medical schools. In Ancient evidence, the doctrine of *kairoi* invariably splits every disease into 1) “onset” (*archē, initium*), 2) “increase” or “ascent” (*auxēsis, anábasis, epídosis, augmentum*), 3) “paroxysm” or “crisis” (*akmē, status, superpositio*), and 4) “decline” (*parakmē, declinatio*), and links every phase to specific dietetic and therapeutic measures⁷. Our text does not move away from this usual division. Yet it expresses it through unparalleled and suggesting phrasings, focuses on aspects overlooked or omitted in extant evidence, and even displays some doctrinal eccentricity. Let us therefore read it⁸:

Πάντα μὲν τὰ νοσήματα ὁμολογουμένως ἔχουσι τοὺς δ' καιροὺς: ἀρχήν, ἀνάβασιν, ἀκμὴν καὶ παρακμὴν. Ἐπὶ τούτων ζητεῖται· τί ἀρχή, καὶ τί ἀνάβασις, καὶ πότε ἀκμή, καὶ πότε παρακμή. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἂν μὴ προγινώσκωμεν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ νοσήματος, καὶ τὴν ἐναλλαγὴν

τοῦ καιροῦ, οὐκ ἂν εὐλόγως θεραπεύσομεν τὴν ἀληθῆ θεραπείαν. Καὶ εἴπωμεν ἀρχὴ νοσήματος ἐστίν, ὅτε οὐπω ἦν ἡ φύσις νικηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς νοσοποιοῦ ὕλης· ἡ γὰρ τρίτη τῶν ἡμερῶν ποιεῖ τὴν αὐξῆσιν τῆς νοσοποιοῦ ὕλης. Ἀνάβασις δὲ ὅταν αἱ ὀδύνη αὐξῶσιν, καὶ ὁ πυρετὸς πλείον, καὶ τὰ ἀλγύματα νυγματώδη. Ἀκμὴ δὲ ὅταν ταῦτα πάντα φυλάξωσι καιρόν, καὶ οὔτε πλείονα οὔτε ἐλάττονα. Παρακμὴ δὲ ὅταν αἱ ὀδύνη καὶ τὸ βηχίον καὶ ἡ δύσπνοια μετὰ πυρετοῦ τῷ σώματι περιφέρωνται. Ἀμήχανον γὰρ νοουσαχθεῖα φῶτα σαῶσαι.

1 Πάντα V : Ἐὰν τὰ M || ἔχουσι V : ἔχουσι M || 2 προγινώσκωμεν V : προγινώσκομεν M || 4 ἦν *scripsi* : ἦν VM || 5 αὐξῶσιν *scripsi* : αὐξουν VM || 7 περιφέρωνται V: περιφέρονται M.

All diseases, as commonly agreed, have the four phases: onset, increase, peak, and decline. Of these, it is examined [here]: what is the onset, what the increase, when the peak occurs, and when the decline. For unless we know beforehand the nature of the disease and the phase in which the patient is, we will not pursue reasonably the correct therapy. And we say: the onset of the disease is when the nature [of the patient] has not yet been overcome by the disease-causing matter (for the third day produces the increase of the disease-causing matter). The increase is when the pains intensify, the fever even more, and the pains are pricking. The peak is when all these things persist over time, neither greater nor lesser. The decline occurs when the pains, accompanied by a slight cough and difficulty in breathing with fever, spread throughout the body. It is impossible then to save the man burdened by the weight of the disease (my transl.).

It is known that our knowledge of Methodism relies almost entirely on indirect, and generally hostile, sources⁹. And this is all the more true when it comes to the doctrine of the four *kairoí*, whose main attestations, in Ancient literature, are to be found in the production of Galen, the most inimical amongst ancient witnesses on the *secta*. But if we cannot expect exhaustive and objective reports from such informants, it remains that our text, against this background, stands out for the attention it pays to the *symptomatic* features which characterise and make recognisable every *kairós*. The author thus downplays the more usual connection between the orderly succession of phases and the therapies to be adopted for each of them, and proceeds to a thick overview of the patient's conditions chiefly through the lens of symptomatology¹⁰. This point is at times touched upon in Classical sources, but never explored in detail. The author of the Pseudo-Galenic *Introductio sive medicus*, for instance, hastily alluded to the “significant appearances” (*episēmasiai*) to examine in each phase of the disease, while Galen, in his *De crisibus*, lays stress on the importance of the *epiphainómena* of pathologies in view of correctly pinpointing their different stages¹¹. But it is only in Byzantine medical writings, as we will see later, that we may recognize a focus on symptomatology somehow comparable to what appears in our text, where this issue is made explicit and developed, at least as regards the three last *kairoí*.

The first, the *archē*, is defined without symptomatologic concerns as the period in which the “nature” (*physis*) of the patient “has not yet been overcome (*nikētheisa*) by the disease-causing matter”¹². The image of the pathologic process as a “fight” between the patient and the disease is rooted already in the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*,

although expressed differently through military metaphors. But, interestingly, similar phrasings recur in medical literature often in connection with this work (as it is also the case with our fragment, as we will see in next paragraph)¹³.

The passage to the second phase is defined by the increase of the *materia peccans* that takes place on the third day after the onset of the disease: this corresponds to what, from Methodist jargon onwards, was called *diatriton/diatritus*, and designated in Classical sources the three-day period at the end of which the disease turns to paroxysm¹⁴. But here, conversely, this threshold leads to the intermediary phase of *anabasis*, when sufferings and fevers intensify, and “pains [become] pricking” (*algēmata nygmatōdē*): once again, we are dealing with a standard expression in medical language¹⁵, relatively frequent in Greek medical literature in connection to pleurisy, cough, fever, and dyspnea¹⁶. In our fragment, such symptoms characterize the “decline” of the disease (*parakmē*) and are not mentioned with reference to *anabasis*, where it would be more natural to find them. However, this is not the last of the oddnesses one may spot in these few lines. The *akmē*, against all expectations, is not described as the climax of the disease’s strength, as it was the case since the Hippocratic writings, but as the phase in which the symptoms of the *anabasis* stabilise and do not vary either in nature or in intensity. It is instead in the *parakmē* that the patient’s conditions are said to worsen, at the opposite of what we find in other medical texts. Take, for instance, the definition of *parakmē* given by Aëtius of Amida: “The decline is when some or all of the aforementioned symptoms begin to *diminish*, and the pulses return to a certain extent to regularity”¹⁷. Quite a different picture from the one we find described in our anonymous text, where we read that pains spread all over the body as fever, cough and difficulty of breathing arise. The author also makes use of a sophisticated language to express in these lines the hopelessness of the patient’s situation: “it is impossible to save the man burdened by the weight of the disease” (ἀμήχανον γὰρ νοσηχθῆα φῶτα σαῶσαι). Here he assembles the compound νοσηχθῆα φῶτα, attested so far only in Oppian’s didascallic poem *Halieutica*, with the Homeric infinitive σαῶσαι¹⁸.

I will attempt a complete edition of this text in a further study since what follows the section quoted *supra* appears corrupted and uncertain to the point of being unintelligible in several points. All in all, it is not easy to frame our excerpt within a precise context. Its focus on symptoms makes it surely closer to Byzantine developments on the ancient doctrine of *kairoí* than to Classical sources on the same topics¹⁹. Still, as far as we can judge from Medieval medical literature in Greek, its content and style, and the theoretical variations it displays if compared to other sources enable us to consider it as an unexplainable exception: how might the *akmē* of a disease be something different from its peak? How could its decline be the moment in which symptoms are most significant? We are left with the doubt that the text simply lacks consistency, and that his doctrinal and stylistic extravagances are nothing but the reveries of a medical student lately ended up under the eyes of an inadvertent copyist.

However, Valla's judgment on this text (that he reads directly in the Mut. gr. 61) must have been different, since we find a Latin translation of it in his *De expetendis et fugiendis* immediately after a short section on the prognosis of diachronic development of diseases²⁰. His version stops at roughly the same point where we had to interrupt the transcription of the handwritten text, most likely for the same reasons. He entitles the text *Præsagia medicorum clarorum alia* ("other prognostic signs according to some renowned physicians"):

Præterea cum morbi ut receptum iam est quatuor habeant tempora principium, ascensum, acumen, et declinationem in his quaeritur principium et reliqua. Nam nisi morbi naturam praesagiamus et temporis mutationem, non satis idoneam adhibere curam poterimus. Principium ergo morbi est cum natura non amplius opponitur superata ab ea, quæ gignit morbum materia. Ascensus est cum dolores capiunt incrementum et febris intendit, doloresque exulcerant. Acumen cum hæc omnia tempus custodiunt, neque maius, neque minus. Declinatio cum dolores difficultas anhelitus et si ita evenit tussis cum febris in corpore divagantur. Hic intendenda medico acies in ægri pariter et morbi naturam.

The theoretical strangenesses of the passage seem to have gone unnoticed by its translator, who chooses to polish its textual asperities without questioning its content. Valla resolves fluently the *errata lectio* of his codex (ἐὰν τὰ μὲν τὰ νοσήματα, 31^r, 1), perhaps suspecting a mutilated *incipit*, and renders the remainder of its source with no significant variations. He leaves aside the literary-fashioned *iunctura* at 31^r, 15 (ἀμήχανον γὰρ etc.), replacing it with a maxim-like sentence ("the physician must pay attention to both the nature of the patient and that of the illness") which is probably an attempt to make sense of a mangled clause running from 31^r, 22 to 31^v, 2, whose substance is attributed there to Galen. Then, he skips almost completely the lines between 31^r, 15 and 31^v, 2, also far from being clear, and leaps directly to the next readable section of his manuscript. We will walk in step with Valla, taking briefly into account what follows the *De morborum temporibus* in the Mut. gr. 61 and in the *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus*.

2. MUT. GR. 61 ff. 31^v, 4 – 32^r, 4 and 32^r, 20 – 33^r, 7

a. Hippocratic *Aphorisms* and other *excerpta*

Another feature linking our fragment on the phases of diseases to Byzantine medical erudition is its close connection to the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. In some cases, notably in Theophilus Protospatharius, the doctrine of *kairoí* works as a hermeneutical tool for elucidating and commenting those aphorisms emphasising the diachronic progression of pathologies and, consequently, the therapy to be administered in each case: the Methodic typology of the four phases gives an exact shape in which to enclose the aphoristic empiricism of Hippocrates²¹. Although reversed, a similar pattern is recognizable in the layout of the folios we are dealing with. Here, after two sentences supposedly rephrasing the teachings of Galen and Hippocrates (31^r, 22 – 31^v, 4), the text of which

is mostly nonsensical as we read it, we find a lengthy selection from the *Aphorisms*, not preceded by any heading or subtitle, alternating with texts attributed *in margine* to other authors. Yet, in lieu of a commentary on single aphorisms clarifying the original text through the rule of the four phases, as usual in other sources, we have here an unconventional account of this doctrine followed by a sequence of some thirty extracts.

It is difficult to discern a common thread in this anthology. The reading of the excerpts shows that only four of them deal with moments or degrees of disease, namely the first quoted in the series (which reads here *ὁκόταν γὰρ ἀκμάζη τὸ νόσημα, τότε λεπτοτάτη διαίτη ἀναγκαῖον χρέεσθαι*, 31^v, 4-6, “it is when the disease is at its height that it is necessary to use the most restricted regime”, *Aph.*, I, 8, transl. Jones]), while any evident compilatory logic seems to lie behind the choice of the following ones, taken from four over the seven *tmēmata* (“sections”) of which the whole work is divided into²². Besides, other details indicate that the text we read here does not come from the direct tradition of the *Aphorisms* but from those witnesses assembling in text form the lemmas taken from later commentary²³. It shows similarities with variants attested in the lemmas of later commentaries to the work²⁴, and, most importantly, it includes in its selection a spurious aphorism attested only in Theophilus’ commentary²⁵. Only a rigorous comparison of these lines with the other witnesses related to the indirect tradition from the commentaries could indicate a possible antigraph of these folios in Mut. gr. 61. Nevertheless, we have now more elements to confirm the relation of the fragment *De morborum temporibus* with Theophilus we already noticed from different points of view.

Other short excerpts are also included in these pages. A note apparently by the same hand in the left margin on f. 31^v, approximately at lines 4-5, indicates the presence of an excerpt from Philumenos (Φιλουμένου). This attribution can be confirmed. The text running from lines 7 to 9 corresponds to a quotation of this author made by Aëtius on nosebleeds in fevers²⁶. On f. 32^r, 4 a margin note ascribes to Theophilus a portion of text (ll. 4-13) lacking any relevant correspondence with other extant works, while at lines 14-19 a text attributed *in margine* to Galen turns out to be a further quotation from Philumenos transmitted by Aëtius (it is a text describing the “appropriate timing” (*kai-rós*) for the administration of “cold compresses” in the therapy of *kausos* – namely, the *akmē*)²⁷. From this point onwards, the anthology from the *Aphorisms* continues until the end of the section of Mut. gr. 61 that we intended to analyse here (33^r, 7).

b. Valla’s translation of the Aphorisms

In the *De expetendis*, Valla makes follow his rendering of *De morborum temporibus* by a translation of the *Aphorisms* contained in the next folios. Untitled and separated from what precedes simply by a full stop, this version covers half-page (the sixth) in the paragraph *Præsagia medicorum clarorum alia*. Valla’s interest along these pages of his codex goes primarily to the *Aphorisms*, even if he does not always distinguish

what is genuinely Hippocratic from what it is not, unless when pointed out in the margins of his manuscript. But, as we already know, not every part of the text unrelated to the *Aphorisms* was marked as such by the copyist, and the sequence of the excerpts was thematically coherent enough to mislead anyone not fully acquainted with the style and language of the work. This was probably the case with Valla, as he merged the obscure wording of the alleged paraphrases of Hippocrates at f. 31^v 2-4 with the text of the *Aph.* I, 8 immediately following (4-6), attempting to give meaning and structure to those muddled lines:

Ἱπποκράτης δὲ τὴν ἀκμὴν ὀπάζειν ζαμενῶς λεπτὴν τροφήν καὶ χνοώδη, μὴ ποιῶσαν ἄραδον ἐν ταῖς πέψεσιν· ὀκόταν γὰρ ἀκμάζει τὸ νόσημα, τότε λεπτοτάτη διαίτη ἀναγκαῖον χρέεσθαι.

Hippocratis in continuis tenuissimum victum esse oportere ducit, ne qua inter concoquendum perturbatio orta, augeat morbum.

Later, he omits to translate a few words that could have had all the appearance of a mutilated aphorism and moves then on to what we have already recognised as a variant reading of a sentence from Theophilus (at least in the form we read it today in Aëtius)²⁸. Valla's version, however, misses the point of the passage, where it is stated precisely that nosebleeds in feverish people on the fourth day of illness are a dangerous and bad sign (σφαλερόν τε καὶ κακ[ι]όν). Which he renders instead as follows:

Quarto die in febricitantibus e naribus stillans sanguis, tam malum, quam bonum potest portendere.

Accepting the authorships suggested in the margin notes on f. 32^r, Valla similarly skips lines 4-20 (on which see *supra*) and continue his translation from the resumption of the text of the *Aphorisms* (l. 20). A global analysis of Valla's translation of this anthology is another of the points I hope to return to in a future study, along with the identification of the sources of the continuation of the chapter *De praesagia aliorum clarorum medicorum*, in which, along with Hippocrates', are mentioned the names of Aëtius and Galen.

3. MUT. GR. 213, ff. 239^r, 3 – 242^r, 15.

Anonymi opusculum *De Phlebotomia*

We now leave the Mut. gr. 61 having probed its novel relationships with Valla's *De Expetendis*, and we turn to the analysis of Mut. gr. 213, ff. 239^v, 3 – 242^r, 15. In his catalogue, Puntoni reported the title, the incipit, and the desinit of the *opusculum* on bloodletting contained in these folios (Ἑρμηνεία τῆς φλεβοτομίας · καὶ ὅσαι φλέβες εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ σώματι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου *inc.* Ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἔχει φλέβας δύο ὀπίσω εἰς τὰ ὠτία *des.* καὶ μακρὰ γίνεται ἡ ζωὴ · καὶ πρὸς ὑγίαν τῶν ταύτην ἐν καιρῷ πρὸς φερομένων

ἑαυτοῖς). At least four further witnesses of this treatise are already known, as a simple search in the *incipitaire* of the database *Pinakes* may reveal²⁹.

The text is a short compendium of venesection, in which a few anatomical rudiments on the number and location of veins in the human body are accompanied by descriptions of phlebotomy techniques, indications on the preparation of remedies to revive the patient in the event of fainting or for the treatment of inflamed or swollen incisions. The author urges attention to the individual condition of patients – age, sex, general disposition, and temperament – and concludes his text with an optimistic commendation of the beneficial effects of bloodletting:

Τί δὲ ἔστι τὸ ὄφελος ἐκ τοῦ φλεβοτομεῖσθαι ; καθαρίζονται φρένες, ληθαργία παύει, καθαρίζεται κύστις, μυελοὶ κεφαλῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ὀστέων θερμαίνονται, ἡ ἀκοὴ ἀνοίγει, τὰ δάκρυα σφίγγει, ἀνορεξία παύει, ὁ στόμαχος καθαίρεται, ἡ κοιλία προτρέπεται, ἡ φωνὴ ἀνορθοῦται, ἡ νόησις ὀξύνει, οἱ ἦχοι τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῶν ὠτῶν παύονται, ἡ δίψα σβέννυται, τὸ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀρμόδιον αἷμα τρέφεται, τὸ ἀλλότριον διώκεται· καὶ μακρὰ γίνεται ἡ ζωὴ καὶ πρὸς ὑγίαν τῶν ταύτην ἐν καιρῷ προσφερομένων ἑαυτοῖς.

1 πάβεται V || 2 θερμαίνεται V || 3 σβεννύεται M A P Ps || 4 τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα V || 4-5 διώκεται. ἡ ζωὴ πρὸς ὑγίαν τῶν ταύτην αἰρούντων V.

What is the benefit of undergoing venesection? The mind is cleansed, lethargy ceases, the bladder is cleared, the marrow of the head and all the bones are warmed, hearing opens, tears cease, inappetence stops, the stomach is cleared, the abdomen is stimulated, the voice is restored, thinking sharpens, noises in the body and in the ears cease, thirst is quenched, the pure and well-balanced blood is nourished and the superfluous is expelled. Life is prolonged, and [oriented] towards the health of those who conduct it with moderation for their own benefit³⁰.

A search for the contents of this text in Valla's *De expetendis* produced no results. Valla dealt with venesection in a dozen of chapters of his *De Medicina*, gathering knowledge allegedly from Hippocrates, Galen, Aëtius, and Antyllus, though without accurate references to his sources³¹. Apart from unspecific resemblances due to general character of the topic, the comparison of these chapters with the *opusculum* contained in Mut. gr. 213 did not highlight any parallels. Of course, the lack of any relationship between Valla's work and our *Hermeneia tēs phlebotomías* does not prove that the Italian humanist did not know the manuscript(s) from which the Mut. gr. 213 would be copied two or three decades after his death. He could have compiled his chapters on bloodletting from far more reliable and prestigious authorities than from an anonymous (and rather trivial) treatise, and this choice would certainly need no further justification. Be as it may, once brought to its end our share of this exploration of the *excerpta et opuscula medica* reported by Puntoni, we leave the inquiry on the links between the works contained in Mut. gr. 213 and Valla's encyclopedia to the following paper by Tamara Martí Casado.

Bibliography and notes

Primary sources

- Aetii Amideni Libri medicinales V-VIII, edidit Alexander Olivieri, CMG VIII 2, Berlin: In Aedibus Academiae Litterarum; 1950.
- Aetii sermo sextidecimus et ultimus, erstens aus Handschriften veröffentlicht mit Abbildungen, Bemerkung und Erklärungen von Dr. Skevos Zervos. Leipzig: Anton. Mangkos; 1901.
- Apollonii Citiensis, Stephani, Palladii, Theophili, Meletii, Damascii, Ioannis, aliorum Scholia in Hippocratem et Galenum e codicibus mss. Vindobonens. Monacens. Florentin. Mediolanens. Escorialens. etc. | Primum graece edidit Fridericus Reinholdus Dietz. Königsberg: Borntraeger; 1834.
- Caelii Aureliani Celerum passionum libri III, Tardarum passionum libri V, edidit Bendz G, In linguam Germanicam transtulit I. Pape. Pars I: Cel. pass. lib. I-III; Tard. pass. lib. I-II; Pars II: Tard. pass. lib. III-V; Indices composuerunt Kollesch J et Nickel D, CML VI 1, Berlin 1990/1993; editio altera lucis ope expressa (Pars II). Berlin: Akademie Verlag; 2002.
- Claudii Galenii Opera omnia. Editionem curavit D. Carolus Gottlob Kühn. Leipzig: Cnobloch; 1821-1833.
- Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos herausgegeben vom Byzantinischen Institut der Abtei Scheyern. Bd II: Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως. Expositio fidei. Besorgt von P. Bonifatius Kotter o.s.b (*Patristische Texte und Studien*). Berlin: De Gruyter; 1973.
- Galenus De constitutione artis medicae ad Patrophilum, edidit et in linguam Italicam vertit Stefania Fortuna (CMG V 1, 3). Berlin: In Aedibus Academiae Scientiarum; 1997.
- Galenus De locis affectis I-II, edidit, in linguam Germanicam vertit, commentatus est F. Gärtner (CMG V 6, 1, 1). Berlin: De Gruyter; 2015.
- Galenus Peri Kriseon, Überlieferung und Text von Bengt Alexanderson. Stockholm, Göteborg, Uppsala: Almqvist und Wiksell (Studia graeca et latina Gothoburgensia. 23. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis); 1967.
- Galien, Le médecin. Petit C (éd. et tr.), Introduction. Paris: Les Belles Lettres (CUF); 2009.
- Magdelaine C, Histoire du texte et édition critique, traduite et commentée, des *Aphorismes* d'Hippocrate. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris IV; 1994 (voll. I, II & III).
- Georgii Vallae Placentini viri clariss., De Expetendis, et Fugiendis Rebus Opus (voll. I & II). Venice: Aldus Manutius; 1501.

Studies

- Gourevitch D, Le vie della conoscenza. La medicina nel mondo romano. In: Grmek MD (a cura di), Il pensiero medico occidentale. 2007 [1993]. pp. 133-134.
- Johnston I (transl.), Galen. On Diseases and Symptoms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
- Jouanna J (éd.), Hippocrate. De l'ancienne médecine. Paris: Les Belles Lettres (CUF); 1990.
- Leith D, The *diatrius* and therapy in Graeco-Roman medicine. *Class Q.* 2009;2.
- Maniaci M, La catalogazione dei manoscritti greci conservati in Italia: stato e prospettive. In: Crisci E, Maniaci M, Orsini P (coord.), La descrizione dei manoscritti: esperienze a confronto. Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, Dipartimento di Filologia e Storia; 2010. p. 117-120.
- Nutton V, John Caius and the manuscripts of Galen. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society (Supplementary Volume) 1987;13:40.

- Nutton V, *Ancient Medicine*. London and New York: Routledge; 2013².
- Pellegrin P, *Ancient Medicine and its Contribution to the Philosophical Tradition*. In: Gill ML, Pellegrin P (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford etc: Blackwell; 2006.
- Petit C, *Les manuscrits de Modène et la tradition de l'Introductio sive medicus du Pseudo-Galien*. In: Boudon-Millot V, Garzya A, Jouanna J, Roselli A (a cura di), *Ecdotica e ricezione dei testi medici greci*. Atti del V Convegno Internazionale. Napoli, 1-2- ottobre 2004. Napoli: D'Auria; 2006. p. 167-185.
- Petit C, *Gadaldini's Library*. *Mnemosyne* 2007;60(1):132-138.
- Samberger C (hrsg. v.), *Catalogi codicum Graecorum qui in minoribus bibliothecis Italicis asservantur*. In duo volumina collati et novissimis additamentis aucti. Indicem adiecit Dino Raffin. (*Catalogi codicum Graecorum lucis ope reimpressi*) Lipsiae: Zentral-Antiquariat der deutschen demokratischen Republik; 1965-1968.
- Savino C (ed.), *Galeno. Commento agli Aforismi di Ippocrate. Libro VI. Testo, traduzione e commento*, Berlin: De Gruyter (*CMG*, VI 1, 2); 2020.
- Tecusan M, *The Fragments of the Methodists. Volume One: Methodism outside Soranus*, Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2004.

1. See foreword to the anastatic reimpression of Puntoni's *Index* in: Samberger C (hrsg. v.), *Catalogi codicum Graecorum qui in minoribus bibliothecis Italicis asservantur*. In duo volumina collati et novissimis additamentis aucti. Indicem adiecit Dino Raffin. (*Catalogi codicum Graecorum lucis ope reimpressi*) Lipsiae: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik; 1965-1968. p. 295.
2. Cfr. Maniaci M, *La catalogazione dei manoscritti greci conservati in Italia: stato e prospettive*. In: Crisci E, Maniaci M, Orsini P (coord.), *La descrizione dei manoscritti: esperienze a confronto*. Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, Dipartimento di Filologia e Storia; 2010. p. 117-120.
3. Nutton V, *John Caius and the manuscripts of Galen*. The Cambridge Philological Society (Supplementary Volume) 1987;13:40.
4. Petit C, *Les manuscrits de Modène et la tradition de l'Introductio sive medicus du Pseudo-Galien*. In: Boudon-Millot V, Garzya A, Jouanna J, Roselli A (eds), *Ecdotica e ricezione dei testi medici greci*. Atti del V Convegno Internazionale, Napoli, 1-2- ottobre 2004. Napoli: D'Auria; 2006; *Ead.*, *Gadaldini's Library*. *Mnemosyne* 2007;60(1):132-138.
5. See Miguet T, *A significant medical manuscript belonging to Valla: the Mutinensis a.U.9.4 (gr. 61)*. *Medicina nei secoli* 2024;36(2): 43-56.
6. See Magdelaine C, *Histoire du texte et édition critique, traduite et commentée, des Aphorismes d'Hippocrate*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris IV; 1994. vol. I, pp. 17-20 for the distinction of different phases of diseases in Hippocratic *Aphorisms*.
7. See Gourevitch D, *Le vie della conoscenza. La medicina nel mondo romano*. In: Grmek MD (ed.), *Il pensiero medico occidentale*. 2007 [1993]. pp. 121-165, pp. 133-134; Nutton V, *Ancient Medicine*. London and New York: Routledge; 2013. p. 195; Pellegrin P, *Ancient Medicine and its Contribution to the Philosophical Tradition*. In: Gill ML, Pellegrin P (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford etc: Blackwell; 2006. pp. 664-685, p. 676.
8. I edit this section of the *De morborum temporibus* after the collation of both witnesses Mut. gr. 61 (M), f. 31r, 1-14 and Vat. Pal. gr. 143 (V), f. 172r, 10 – 172v, 2.
9. The only Methodist works fully preserved until our time are Caelius Aurelianus' *Celeres et tardae passiones*, a 5th-century Latin enhanced paraphrasis of a lost treatise on acute

- and chronic diseases written by the 2nd-century Greek physician Soranus of Ephesus, and the extant gynecological œuvre by this latter, the *Gynaecia*.
10. For the essential connection between the phases of disease and the phases of treatment, which the Methodists seem to have conceived in terms of plain identity, see [Gal.], *Opt. sect.*, XXXV-XXXVI (Kühn I: 195, 8 – 197, 2 = fragm. 279 Tecusan, ll. 17-41, esp. ll. 35-38: “The phase of the disease and the phase of remedy is one and the same. For it is possible to speak, in one sense, about the phase of the disease [...], and, in a different sense, about the phase of the remedy”, in: Tecusan M (transl.), *The fragments of the Methodists. Volume One: Methodism outside Soranus*. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2004. pp. 724-725]), and [Gal.], *Intr.*, XIII, 7 In: Petit C (ed.), *Galien. Le médecin*. Introduction. Paris: Les Belles Lettres [CUF]; 2009. pp. 49, 24-50, 1 = K XIV: 731, 9-12): Οἱ δὲ καιροὶ τῶν βοηθημάτων ἐν τε ὄλῳ τῷ νοσήματι καὶ ταῖς μερिकाῖς ἐπισημασίαις εἰσὶ τέσσαρες, ἀρχή, ἐπίδοσις, ἀκμή, παρακμή, “The phases [for the administration] of the remedies, both in the entire disease and in the symptoms relating to its parts, are four: onset, ascent, peak, and decline” (my transl.; see also *ivi*: XIII, 10 for differences in the treatment of *causis* depending on whether the disease is in its *archē* or *akmē*, and similarly Cael. Aur., *Chron.*, III, 1, 11 In: Bendz G, Pape I (eds), *Cælii Aureliani Celerum Passionum libri III Tardarum Passionum libri V*. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR (*Corpus Medicorum Latinorum* VI. 1). Berlin: 1990. p. 684, 32-33] as regards the treatment of different *tempora* in asthma).
 11. [Gal.], *Intr.*, XIII, 7 Petit C (ed.), see previous note); Gal., *Cris.*, I, IX (Kühn IX: 582, 18 = Alexanderson 1967: 90 = fragm. 143 Tecusan, l. 4).
 12. I think that the notion of *physis* should be understood here in line with its Hippocratic meaning of “individual innate complexion of a patient”, as opposed to its momentary variations (see Jouanna J (éd.), *Hippocrate. De l’ancienne médecine*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres [CUF]; 1990. p. 167).
 13. On the imagery of the disease as a “fight” in the *Aphorisms*, see on this Magdelaine M (Magdelaine M, Ref. note 6.). vol. I, p. 14. In Galen’s *De symptomatum causis*, the syntagm φύσις νικηθεῖσα indicates the lethal unbalance of a patient’s complexion caused by feverish rigours (it is a gloss on *Aph.* IV, 46: Kühn VII: 190, 6-11: λέγει οὖν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἐν ἀφορισμοῖς, ἦν ῥίγος ἐμπύκτη πυρετῷ μὴ διαλείποντι, ἤδη ἀσθενεῖ ἔοντι, θανάσιμον. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ῥίγεσιν ὄρμησε μὲν ἡ φύσις ἐπὶ τὸ διώσασθαι τὰ λυποῦντα, νικηθεῖσα δὲ καταπίπτει καὶ κατασβέννυται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν ὀλέθριον τὸ σύμπτωμα, “thus Hippocrates, in the *Aphorisms*, said: ‘If in a continued fever without intermission a rigor attacks someone already weak, it is fatal sign’. For in such rigors, the *nature* [of the patient] sets in motion distressing things for the purpose of expulsion but, *having been overcome*, it collapses and is quenched, and because of this the symptom is fatal”, transl. in Johnston I (ed.), *Galen. On Diseases and Symptoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006. p. 258 with slight modifications). In Theophilus Protospatharius, the doctrine of the four *kairoi* serves retrospectively to elucidate an *Aphorism* by Hippocrates (I, 8) on the necessity of following a light regime when the disease reaches its height (*akmázei*). Theophilus writes that the *archē* occurs “when the nature fights against (*agōnizetai*) the disease”, conveying the same thought of the anonymous author of our fragment with negligible variations. See Theoph. Protosp., *In Hipp. Aph.*, Dietz: II, 267, 35 – 167, 1 8 (on which cfr. *infra*). See also Io. Act., *De urinis*, IV, 15, 1 (though without any reference to the *Aphorisms*): ἡ φύσις [...] τῷ πλήθει [χρῶν] νικηθεῖσα. Another variant in Steph. Med., *In Gal. Ad Glauco.*, Dietz: I, 343, 1-2: ἡ φύσις οὐκ ἀνέχεται ποιήσασθαι τὸν τοῦ

- νοσήματος ἀγῶνα. – The phrasing may also echo religious figures of speech, see notably Io. Dam., *Fid.*, III, 20 (Kotter, p. 162, 64, 15: ἡ φύσις ἡ πάλαι νικηθεῖσα), where it designates the human “nature”, “overcome” by the sin, before being redeemed by the Christ.
14. On the *diatrius* see Leith D, The *diatrius* and therapy in Graeco-Roman medicine. *Class Q.* 2009;2:581-600.
 15. See Paul. Aeg., III, 22, 26, 4 (carcinoma); *ibid.*, IV, 18, 8, 9; Sor., *Gyn.*, III, 37, 5; *Id.*, *Sign. fract.*, 15, 1, 4-5; Orib., *Coll. med.*, VII, 13, 9, 2; *Id.*, *Syn. ad Eusth.*, IX, 7, 2, 3; [Orib.], *Eclog.*, 149, 2, 4; Gal., *De cur. rat. per ven. sect.*, XXIII (Kühn xi: 316, 2); *Id.*, *In Hipp. Aph.*, VI, 5 (Savino: 92, 12-13 = Kühn xviii: 14, 1-2 [τὸ ἀλγημα... μηδὲ νυγματῶδες]); Aët., VII, 11, 24; VIII, 34, 39 (Oliveri: 263, 30; 447, 24); XVI, 75, 11 (Zervos: 120, 7); [Gal.], *De rem. parabil.*, I, *Prooem.* (Kühn xiv: 314, 12-14).
 16. See Paul. Aeg., VI, 96, 1, 7-9 (no mention of fever); Sor., *De sign. fract.*, 17, 1, 3; Alex. Trall., *Therap.*, VI, 1 (Puschmann: II, 229, 6-9); Gal., *De constit. artis med.*, 14 (Kühn i: 274, 5-6 = Fortuna: 98, 28-29); *Id.*, *De loc. aff.*, II, 5, 11 (Kühn viii: 86, 9 = Gärtner: 324, 22); II, 8, 35 (Kühn viii: 110, 15 = Gärtner: 352, 22-23), II, 10, 4 (Kühn viii: 121, 15 = Gärtner: 366, 6); *De cris.*, I, 2 (Kühn ix: 554, 6-8) and I, 5, (Kühn ix: 563, 13-14); *Id.*, *In Hipp. Aph.*, I, 12 (Kühn xviii: 399, 13-15).
 17. Aët. med., V, 14, 1-3 (= Oliveri: 12, 5-7): παρακμὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀρχομένων μειοῦσθαι τινων ἢ πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων συμπτωμάτων καὶ τῶν σφυγμῶν ποσῶς εἰς ἐταξίαν ἐρχομένων.
 18. Cfr. Opp., *Hal.*, I, 298.
 19. See for instance Anon. Schol. *In Hipp. Aph.*, I, xii (Vind. med. gr. 28, ed. in Dietz: II, 273); Theoph. Protop., *In Hipp. Aph.*, II, i (Dietz: II, 294-295); *ivi*: II, xxx (Dietz: II, 324).
 20. Valla G, *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus*. Venice: Manutius; 1501. vol. II, lib. xxiv = *De Medicina I*, 5 (pages are not numbered). Credit for the finding goes to Tamara Martí Casado.
 21. Cfr. the examples *supra*, n. 14.
 22. The aphorisms quoted here are: I 8, VII 84 (dubious, see *infra* n. 30), IV 49, IV 46, IV 50, IV 52, VI 22, VI 54, VII 1, VII 4, VII 42, IV 48, IV 29, IV 30, IV 31, VII 59, I 86, IV 35, IV 43, IV 53, IV 54, IV 55, IV 58, IV 57, IV 59, IV 60, IV 61, IV 63, IV 65, IV 66, IV 67, IV 82.
 23. See Magdelaine C (ref. n. 6 and 13): I, 162-196 for the *Aphorisms*' indirect tradition stemming from Galen's and Theophilus' commentaries. The Mut. gr. 61 was not collated by Magdelaine in her edition. It is nevertheless of no value for the edition of the text.
 24. See for instance f. 31v, 18-19: Ὅσα ἀλγήματα καὶ ῥήγματα ἐκ τοῦ νότου εἰς τοὺς ἀγκῶνας καταβαίνει, φλεβοτομή λύει = Hipp., *Aph.*, VI 22 (cfr. ed. Magdelaine 1994: II, 452, 9-10: ὁκόσα ῥήγματα ἐκ τοῦ νότου ἐς τοὺς ἀγκῶνας καταβαίνει, φλεβοτομή λύει – The reading ὅσα is attested only in the lemmas of Galen's commentary [specifically in Marc. Gr. 278 and Scorial. Φ III], while ἀλγήματα καὶ ῥήγματα, besides in the oldest witness of the direct tradition of the *Aphorisms*, the Par. Suppl. gr. 446, in two codices containing the commentary of Theophilus' [Vat. gr. 283 and Vat. Urb. gr. 64]; cfr. ed. Magdeleine: II: *ad loc* and ed. Savino: 116).
 25. Ed. Dietz: II, 422, 30: τὰ ἐν ἀρτίησι ἡμέρησι κρινόμενα δύσκριτα καὶ φιλυπόστροφα (*om. ἡμέρησι M*). Cfr. *ad loc.*: *hic aphorismus in vulgatis nostris editionibus omittitur*.
 26. Cfr. Aët., V, 128 (Oliveri: 103, 26-28): Ἐκ τῶν Φιλουμένου (*Mmg Φιλουμένου*). τὴν ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν πυρετοῖς γιγνομένην ἐκ τῶν ρίνων στάξιν τοῦ αἵματος κάκιστον σημεῖον (*M ἐν τοῖσι πυρεταίνουσι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ρίνων γιγνομένην ἀπόσταξιν αἵματος, καὶ σφαλερόν τε καὶ κάκιον*) Ἴπποκράτης λέγει.

27. Aët., V, 78 (Olivieri: 54, 10-15): καιρὸς δὲ τῶν ἐμψυχόντων ἐπιθεμάτων καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων ἢ ἀκμῇ τῆς ἐπισημασίας. κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπιδόσεις τῶν παροξυσμῶν, ἀνωμάλως ἔτι τοῦ σώματος (M ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος) διακειμένου καὶ τῆς θερμασίας περὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα συνεδρευούσης, προσαγόμενα ταῦτα διαχέει μὲν τὴν αἴσθησιν ἐπ' ὀλίγον, ἀποκρουόμενα (M ἀποκρουόμενον) δὲ τὸ θερμὸν εἰς (M ἐς) τὸ βάθος πλείονος βλάβης αἴτια γίνονται.
28. F. 31v, 6: Περὶ τῶν ἐν πυρετοῖς ῥεουσῶν αἷμα ἐκ τῶν ῥινῶν, cfr. *Aph.*, VII 84 Magdelaine: ὁκόσοισιν ἂν ἐν τοῖσι πυρετοῖσι τεταρταίοισιν ἐοῦσιν αἷμα ἐκ τῶν ῥινῶν ῥυῆ, πονηρόν. The title-like line in MUT. GR. 61 could nonetheless have served as the heading of Philumenos paragraph quoted after (it reads as follows in Aëtius: Θεραπεία ἐφ' ὧν στάξις αἵματος ἀπὸ ῥινῶν ἐν πυρετοῖς παρακολουθεῖ, V, 128, Olivieri: 103, 25).
29. Laur. Ant. 101 ff. 71r, 1 – 74r, 12 [= A], Par. gr 2303 ff. 79r, 1 – 82r, 13 [= P], Par. Suppl. gr. 1193 ff. 1r, 1 – 6r, 5 [= Ps], Vat. Gr. 293 ff. 79r-84v [= V]). I have collated all the witnesses with a view to an eventual edition of the treatise.
30. My translation (the last period is most likely incomplete and my translation therefore tentative).
31. Valla 1501: Liber XXIV (= *De medicina*, I), VI. *De missione sanguinis*. VII. *Quid considerandum in missione sanguinis*, VIII. *Hippocrates*. Liber XXVI (= *De medicina*, II), IX. *De sanguinis detractioe per venas quam græci phlebotomiam vocant ex eis que Galenus scripsit & Aetius*. Cap. X. *De mensura detractioe* Cap. XI. *Quae sint secundae venae*. Cap. XII. *De concisionis magnitudine, ex Antylo (sic)*. Cap. XIII. *De figura concisionis* Cap. XIV. *Quo tempore sit detrahendus sanguis ex Galeno*. Cap. XV. *De detractioe ex Galeno*. Cap. XVI. *De arteriæ sectione ex Galeno*. Cap. XVII. *De astrictione arteriaca*.