

ANSELM AND THE *ARTICELLA*

BY GILES E. M. GASPER AND FAITH WALLIS

ANSELM, MAURICE, AND MEDICINE

Sometime between 1070 and 1077, Anselm, then prior of the monastery of Bec in Normandy, wrote to his friend Maurice, a former Bec monk residing at Christ Church, Canterbury, and asked him to seek out copies of various texts, including Bede's *De temporibus* and the *Regula* of St. Dunstan — presumably the *Regularis concordia*, the platform-document of the English Benedictine reform of the tenth century.¹ Shortly thereafter, Anselm wrote again to Maurice, indicating that another text had been added to his desiderata:

Should it come to pass that, with [Archbishop Lanfranc's] favor always embracing us, you return to us (as is expedient for you, and as you and I desire), bring with you what you will have copied of the *Aphorisms*. In the meantime, however, do as much of the text as you can without inconvenience to yourself, and then, if you are free, of the commentary, giving heed above all that whatever you will have brought with you has been corrected with the utmost diligence. If after your return any of it still remains to be done, and if Dom Gundulf is able to finish it through someone else, leave it to the person whom he designates. But it would be much better if Dom Gundulf were able to obtain by request the exemplar itself, so that it could be lent to me.²

That the *Aphorismi* in question was the book by Hippocrates is confirmed by a later letter from Anselm inquiring into the progress of Maurice's work. This letter reveals that the *Aphorismi* was a text translated from Greek, and that it was accompanied by another medical work.

¹ Anselm, Letter 42, ed. F. S. Schmitt in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1946), 3:154. All subsequent citations of Anselm's letters and works will cite Schmitt's volume and page numbers in parentheses.

² "Si igitur cum eius semper nobis amplectenda gratia te ad nos, secundum quod tibi expedit et ego et tu desideramus, redire contigerit, quod scriptum erit *de Aphorismo* tecum affer. Interim tamen, quantum sine tuo incommodo potes, de textu primum effice, deinde, si tibi licuerit, de glosis; hoc ante omnia servans, ut quidquid ex eo detuleris, diligentissime si correctum. Si quid vero te redeunte residuum inde fuerit: si opportune domnus GONDULFUS per aliquem hoc perficere poterit, eius curae designatum dimitte. Multo tamen melius erit, si exemplum ipsum, ut mihi accommodetur, idem domnus GONDULFUS poterit impetrare" (Anselm, Letter 43 [3:155–56]). Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are our own.

I am pleased if you are able to copy the whole commentary on the *Aphorisms*, but if not, I admonish you not to leave out those terms which are in Greek, or which are unfamiliar. You are pondering how much time you should spend on the little book *De pulsibus*, but I would prefer that you spend what time you have on finishing the *Aphorisms*. Knowledge of that little book is of no use except to those who delve into it very frequently, and with great diligence. If, however, you can [copy *De pulsibus*] after finishing the *Aphorisms*, and following directly upon it, I accept with pleasure. Concerning both [works], I advise you particularly that whatever you do should be worthy to be called perfect, because corrected with painstaking care. For in the case of an obscure and unfamiliar text [or script], I would rather have a part faithfully copied, than the whole [text], but corrupted by mistakes.³

Maurice had been a monk at Bec since the late 1050s or early 1060s; his is the seventy-third name on the profession list, and the fourth after Anselm's.⁴ That he and Anselm were close friends emerges after Maurice's transfer to Christ Church, Canterbury in the 1070s. Anselm took considerable pains to ensure that Maurice's reception at Christ Church would be warm, writing to other friends, including former monks of Bec, asking that they take care of Maurice.⁵ Nearly all were told that Maurice suffered from headaches and were besought to get the lay doctor Albert, whom Anselm also approached, to examine him.⁶ Anselm also wrote to Maurice shortly after his transfer, reassuring him of the warmth and love he bore towards him.⁷ Expressions of friendship and consolation at their separation, put into the context of monastic obedience, feature in a number of Anselm's other letters to Maurice (there are nine addressed to him alone, and three more in which he is addressed along with others).⁸ At some point around 1078 their separation was ended, although only briefly, since the next letter was addressed to Maurice at Conflans Ste-Honorine, situated at the confluence of the Oise and the Seine about 20 miles northwest of Paris, where there was a

³ "Glosas *Aforismi* si omnes potes scribere gaudeo, sin autem, eas quae sunt Graecorum aut inusitatorum nominum ne deseras admoneo. Quod tamen temporis in libello *De pulsibus* insumere deliberas, malo ut ad perficiendum quidquid est in *Aforismo* impendas. Non enim eiusdem libelli scientia utilis est, nisi frequentissimo et diligentissimo uso se illa occupantibus. Si quid tamen post *Aforismum* et de hoc potes, libenter accipio. De utroque hoc praecipue moneo, ut quidquid feceris, studiosissima exquisitione correctum dignum sit dici perfectum. Malo enim in ignota inusitataque scriptura partem integram veritate, quam totum corruptum falsitate" (Anselm, Letter 60 [3:174–75]).

⁴ M. Rule, *The Life and Times of Saint Anselm*, 2 vols. (London, 1883), Anecdoton C, 1:394–96.

⁵ Anselm, Letters 32–36 (3:140–44), 40 (3:151–52).

⁶ Anselm, Letters 36 (3:143–44) and 44 (3:156–58).

⁷ Anselm, Letter 42 (3:153–55).

⁸ Anselm, Letters 42–43 (3:153–56), 47 (3:161), 51 (3:164–65), 60 (3:174–75), 64 (3:180–81), 69 (3:189), 74 (3:195–96), 97 (3:224–28), 104 (3:237), and 147 (3:293–94).

dependency of Bec. Anselm's last letter to Maurice was written from England in 1092, and Maurice is addressed along with other monks of Bec. This need not indicate any breach of friendship; Anselm became archbishop of Canterbury in 1093 and, though he remained emotionally attached to Bec, his responsibilities lay in other directions. From this point on, Bec figures far less prominently in his letter collection.

Maurice had been called to Canterbury by Archbishop Lanfranc (r. 1070–88), formerly abbot of Caen (from about 1063) and before that, prior and monk of Bec, where he had arrived in the early 1040s. As archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc restored and rebuilt the church and monastic buildings after the disastrous fire of 1067, putting the estates and finances of the archbishopric and monastic house into good order, adding to the library, and presiding over a difficult, and at times hostile, process of change within the community in the wake of the Norman Conquest of England.⁹ One of the measures taken by Lanfranc was to summon monks from both his previous abbeys to join him in Canterbury. Those who can be identified are: from Caen, Samuel, Vitalis, and Roger, and the lay doctor Albert; from Caen though originally from Bec, Gundulf and Hernost; and from Bec, Henry, Maurice, and Gilbert Crispin.¹⁰ A number of these figures rose to positions of responsibility within the community and later the English church at large: Hernost and Gundulf were successive bishops of Rochester, Gilbert Crispin became abbot of Westminster, and Henry prior of Christ Church. Of Samuel, Vitalis, Roger, Albert the physician, and Maurice, little is known apart from what can be found in Anselm's correspondence.¹¹

As there are no surviving letters from Maurice to Anselm — although Anselm does allude to letters from him on more than one occasion — it is difficult to fathom the dimensions of their friendship. It is nevertheless clear that there was an intellectual element. The cause of Maurice's own education is raised in a letter congratulating him on attending the grammar lessons given by Arnulf of Beauvais at Canterbury and advising him to study diligently Virgil and other authors.¹² In a letter to Lanfranc accompanying a copy of the *Monologion*, Anselm reveals that Maurice was one of the companions

⁹ M. T. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978), 162–90, and H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003), 104–19, 149–60.

¹⁰ Gibson, *Lanfranc*, 175–77; R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990), 313–14.

¹¹ Gibson, *Lanfranc*, 176. Vitalis, Samuel, and Roger are greeted in Anselm, Letter 74 to Maurice (3:195–96), and Roger is encouraged by Anselm to come to Bec in Letter 76 (3:198). Albert is addressed in Letters 36 (3:143–44) and 44 (3:156–57), and mentioned in Letters 32–34 (3:141–42) and 39 (3:149–51).

¹² Anselm, Letter 64 (3:180–81).

who persuaded him to write the text down.¹³ Maurice may also have played a role in the composition of *De casu diaboli*. While he was at Conflans Ste-Honorine, Anselm sent him a short tract dealing with the question of why the word “evil” signifies something, when evil itself is said to be nothing. It is closely related to chapter 11 of *De casu diaboli* and may reasonably be considered an early draft of the treatise. Maurice was also involved in Anselm’s project to assemble his own letters. A letter to the brothers at Conflans concludes with the remark that “we are still waiting for our letters, which Dom Maurice is supposed to have sent us.”¹⁴ By the time of Anselm’s third visit to England in 1092, the letters had arrived; writing to the monks of Bec, Anselm asked for several of his works to be sent on, and specifically asked Maurice to forward any letters he had not sent previously.¹⁵ In terms of Anselm’s literary life during his time at Bec, Maurice played an important, if inconsistently illuminated, role. It might be speculated whether, had Anselm remained at Bec, Maurice rather than Eadmer might have composed the *Life and Conversation*. But Anselm had many devoted followers, and we see most only dimly.

Bec not only sent personnel to Canterbury, but texts as well; Lanfranc asked Anselm to provide copies of unspecified works by Jerome and Augustine. However, it also gained in intellectual resources, notably because Maurice helped Anselm by identifying and copying texts that he found at Canterbury.¹⁶ The *Regularis concordia*, associated particularly with Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, emblemized the tenth-century Benedictine reform that, in the hands of Eadmer and Osbern of Canterbury, William of Malmesbury, and Orderic Vitalis, would assume the colors of a Golden Age.¹⁷ More prosaically, *De temporibus* was needed in order to correct the

¹³ In Anselm, Letter 72 (3:193–94), Lanfranc is directed to send the copy of the *Monologion* sent to him by Anselm back to Bec with Maurice, should he return in the near future; in Letter 74 (3:195–96) the same instructions are conveyed to Maurice, adding that if he knew he would be delayed he should send it by someone else.

¹⁴ Anselm, Letter 104 (3:237).

¹⁵ Anselm, Letter 147 (3:293–94). The question of the genesis of Anselm’s correspondence collection has not been without controversy and is summarized by Southern, *Anselm: A Portrait*, 459–81; on Maurice’s role, see esp. 462–63.

¹⁶ The traffic in books went in both directions: see Anselm, Letters 23 (3:130–31) and 25–26 (3:132–34). On book-lending between Normandy and England in the later eleventh century, see T. Webber, “The Patristic Content of English Book Collections in the Eleventh Century,” in *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, Their Scribes and Readers; Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and R. Zim (Aldershot, 1997), 191–205, esp. 199–200 for the correspondence between Anselm and Lanfranc. See also R. Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England ca. 1086–1130* (Oxford, 1999), 6.

¹⁷ See M. Philpot, “Eadmer, His Archbishops and the English State,” in *The Medieval State: Essays Presented to James Campbell*, ed. J. R. Maddicott and D. M. Palliser (London, 2000), 93–107; J. Rubenstein, “The Life and Writings of Osbern of Canterbury,” in

existing copy at Bec. However, how Anselm came to know about the *Aphorismi*, its commentary, and the *libellus de pulsibus*, and why he wanted these works, is more difficult to discern.

Anselm's interest in medicine was shared by many monks of his day, and is all too often characterized as an ill-defined Benedictine affinity for, or involvement in, "monastic medicine." This concept, perhaps more than most in the history of medieval medicine, stands in need of fresh perspectives and critical rethinking. Anselm's ideas about medicine must, for example, be understood in the context of the role of medicine in reformed monasticism's liturgical and institutional agendas.¹⁸ Collecting medical works and constructing infirmary complexes was a "marker" for certain ideologies of reform; prominent in Cluny and Gorze, these activities were ostentatiously rejected by the Cistercians.¹⁹ Moreover, monks were interested in certain skills that we would consider medical, such as predicting immanent death, for essentially liturgical reasons.²⁰ Anselm's situation in this broader monastic context has yet to be defined, but there is evidence that he also had a personal interest in medicine, although it does not figure prominently in his works.²¹ On rare occasions Anselm draws an analogy between sin and illness, but on the whole his medical interests seem to be practical, focusing on the symptoms of disease in himself and others. Besides asking the physician Albert to examine Maurice in connection with his headaches, Anselm asked Lanfranc to consult Albert about the health problems affecting his nephew and namesake, and also the monk Osbern, both of whom were at Bec at the time.²² However, Anselm never goes beyond the symptoms to discuss etiol-

Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars 1066–1109, ed. R. Eales and R. Sharpe (London, 1995), 27–40; Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1969–80), 2:238–48; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* 1.14–21, 2.87, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series 52 (London, 1870), 20–34, 188–91.

¹⁸ H. Schipperges, *Die Benediktiner in der Medizin des frühen Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1964), and C. Stoll, "Arznei und Arzneiversorgung in frühmittelalterlichen Klöstern," in *Das Lorscher Arzneibuch und die frühmittelalterliche Medizin*, ed. Gundolf Keil and Paul Schnitzer (Lorsch, 1991), 149–217, remain useful starting points and are commendably free of mystification, but tend to label all early medieval medicine as "monastic medicine."

¹⁹ F. E. Glaze, "The Perforated Wall: The Ownership and Circulation of Medical Books in Medieval Europe, ca. 800–1200" (PhD diss., Duke University, 2000), chap. 5 passim and esp. 192–201.

²⁰ F. Paxton, "Signa morbifera: Death and Prognostication in Early Medieval Monastic Medicine," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 67 (1993): 631–50.

²¹ G. E. M. Gasper, "'A Doctor in the House': The Context for Anselm of Canterbury's Interest in Medicine with Reference to a Probable Case of Malaria," forthcoming in *Journal of Medieval History* 20 (2004).

²² Anselm, Letter 39 (3:149–51).

ogy or pathology; his terminology is straightforward and descriptive, and there is no attempt to invoke medical concepts such as the humors and their qualities of heat, cold, moisture, and dryness. Nonetheless, health and disease were subjects of some importance to him. Southern suggests that he “may have looked on disease as the equivalent in the physical world to evil in the spiritual; it was a negative quality capable of, and requiring, correction by timely action.”²³ It will be recalled that Anselm corresponded with Maurice on the subject of evil only a few years later, when Maurice was at Conflans. As we shall see later, it is not inconceivable that Anselm’s interest in medical texts was connected to at least some of his theological reflections. Our immediate concern, however, lies with his commission to Maurice to copy some particular texts at Canterbury.

ANSELM’S *ARTICELLA*?

When Anselm commissioned Maurice to copy the medical texts, what kind of book did he expect would result? His first letter (no. 43) mentions only the *Aphorismi* and its commentary; did he initially want these alone, and was the *De pulsibus* mentioned in letter 60 an afterthought? Or did he have a composite volume in mind from the beginning? If the latter, did he desire a replica of a particular manuscript anthology at Canterbury? Or did Anselm have an abstract plan for an anthology in mind, and was he searching for the separate textual materials to realize that plan? Were the texts Maurice was copying in a single codex, or did they come from separate exemplars? Can we identify these texts and reconstruct their manuscript context — either the shape of Maurice’s exemplar(s) or of Anselm’s projected volume? Finally, if we are able to answer these questions, what might this reveal about Anselm’s motivation for acquiring these texts?

Despite their brevity, Anselm’s two letters yield a considerable amount of information about the texts and the manuscripts. The first letter (no. 43) reveals that Maurice is copying the *Aphorismi* of Hippocrates together with *glosae* from a single exemplar at Canterbury. Anselm states that if Maurice cannot complete the copying project before leaving Canterbury, he is to leave the job with Gundulf, who will find a substitute scribe. However, Anselm adds that it would be preferable if Gundulf could get hold of the exemplar itself (*exemplum ipsum*) in order to lend it to Anselm. As *exemplum* is singular, we may conclude that only one volume was involved. Moreover, the text of the *Aphorismi* that it contained must have been a full text, not merely lemmata embedded within the commentary, for Anselm wants Maurice to complete the text before proceeding to the *glosae*. Letter

²³ Southern, *Anselm: A Portrait* (n. 10 above), 171.

60 adds further details: Maurice has been working on the *glosae* but has not yet completed the main text. Were the *glosae* in the margins of the main text, it would be difficult to copy them before the main text was laid out on the page. It is very likely, then, that the *glosae* constituted an extended commentary, not marginal explications.

It is not clear who owned the *exemplum ipsum*. It did not belong to Gundulf himself, for Anselm specifies that Gundulf might have to request (*impetrare*) its loan. If it ever belonged to the library at Christ Church, it either disappeared before the earliest inventories, or it was catalogued under the title of a leading text, which was not one of those Maurice was copying.²⁴ There are, however, other possibilities. The codex may have been housed in the infirmary, or it could have belonged to the lay physician Albert, whom Lanfranc brought from Caen to Canterbury. Since Gundulf also came from Caen, he may have been the channel through which knowledge of Albert's book reached Maurice and Anselm; he would also have been better placed than the Bec monk Maurice to negotiate its loan.

Letter 60, however, reveals that, while continuing to work on the *Aphorismi* and its commentary, Maurice was simultaneously engaged in copying a short work (*libellus*) on pulses. Anselm evidently desired this work as well, but it is not clear whether it was included in Maurice's assignment from the outset. Nonetheless, the letter shows Anselm's detailed knowledge of the philological features and content of both texts. Anselm was anxious that Maurice had not yet finished the *Aphorismi* or the *glosae* and risked being distracted by *De pulsibus*. It seems that Maurice was bogged down in Hippocrates because both the text and the *glosae* contained unfamiliar terms, many of them Greek. Anselm counseled Maurice to take his time with these and not succumb to the temptation to omit them. He was also to check his work with care, for when it came to an unfamiliar and unusual text (*in ignota inusitataque scriptura*) Anselm would rather have an accurate partial copy than a complete copy full of errors. In short, Anselm knew that this version of the *Aphorismi* and its commentary contained much Greek and technical vocabulary; indeed, it seems that it was part of what he valued in this text.²⁵

²⁴ There is no catalogue for Christ Church before that of prior Eastry (1284–1331), and although this catalogue does list medical works, including copies of the *Articella*, this does not help to identify their age or provenance: M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), 55–62. A list of books at Christ Church drawn up ca. 1170 contains no medical works at all (*ibid.*, 7–12), and no manuscript identified by Tessa Webber as being produced at Christ Church in the aftermath of the Conquest is medical in character: "Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest," in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, 145–58, esp. 157–58.

²⁵ As with the case of *De temporibus*, the need for a good text was paramount in Anselm's mind. Eadmer records that as prior, Anselm "by night . . . corrected the books,

It should be noted, however, that the phrase *in ignota inusitataque scriptura* could carry another meaning: “when it comes to an unfamiliar and unusual script.” If this was Anselm’s meaning, then it was not just the vocabulary that was slowing Maurice down but also the hand in which the exemplar was written. Could the manuscript have been a very old one, in an archaic style of writing? Or, did it come from a region with a distinctive local script, such as Beneventan, which the Norman monk found difficult to decipher?

The exact meaning of *scriptura* is of interest, for on it hinges the codicological relationship of the *Aphorismi* and its commentary, on the one hand, and *De pulsibus* on the other. After admonishing Maurice not to omit Greek terms, Anselm instructs him to give priority to completing *quidquid est in Aphorismo*, and to leave *De pulsibus* until later. Knowledge of *eiusdem libelli*, he goes on, is of use only to those who study it frequently and assiduously. Since Anselm has referred to *De pulsibus* as a *libellus* in the preceding sentence, these comments must concern *De pulsibus*. We shall return to them shortly. Anselm added that if Maurice was able to copy the short work on pulses *post Aphorismum et de hoc*, he would be very grateful. What does *de hoc* mean, and what is the antecedent of *hoc*? This phrase has been rendered as “after the *Aphorisms* and this book,”²⁶ but this translation poses some grammatical problems: why did Anselm not say *post Aphorismum et hunc [librum]*? What is the force of the preposition *de*? A more logical reading would begin from the assumption that the antecedent of *hoc* is *Aphorismum*, and that the phrase *et de hoc* means “following directly after” (as in *diem de die*). We may translate *post Aphorismum et de hoc* as either “[copy *De pulsibus*] after [you have finished] the *Aphorismi* and following directly upon it” — i.e., the order of the texts in the copy should be (1) *Aphorismi* (plus commentary), (2) *De pulsibus* — or “after [you have finished] the *Aphorismi* [copy *De pulsibus*, which] follows directly upon it” — i.e., the order in the exemplar was (1) *Aphorismi* (plus commentary), (2) *De pulsibus*. Anselm goes on to explain that in both works (*de utroque*), Maurice is to exercise the care required *in ignota inusitataque scriptura*. If *de hoc* means “which follows directly upon it,” the two works are the *Aphorismi* (plus commentary) and the *De pulsibus*; and if *scriptura* refers to the script, the two works are in the same difficult and unfamiliar hand — in other words, in the same exemplar.

which in all countries before this time were disfigured by mistakes” (*Vita Anselmi* 1.8, ed. and trans. R. W. Southern [Edinburgh, 1962], 14–15).

²⁶ This is the translation offered by W. Fröhlich, *The Letters of St. Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols., Cistercian Studies Series 96 (Kalamazoo, 1990), 1:173.

Anselm also provides some hints about the content and form of *De pulsibus*. The *scientia* in this *libellus*, he explained, is *utilis*, but only to those who study it frequently and diligently. In Anselm's view, then, the work is on a certain level a practical one, a work to be consulted often. We may provisionally conclude that *De pulsibus* was not about the physiology of pulse, but rather a guide to differentiating and interpreting pulse.

To sum up the argument thus far: it is quite probable that Anselm wanted a copy of a manuscript available at Canterbury that contained at least three texts: the *Aphorismi* of Hippocrates, an extended commentary on that work, and a short tract on differentiating and interpreting pulses. The Canterbury exemplar was not easy for Maurice to copy for a number of reasons: the *Aphorismi*, and perhaps its commentary, contained numerous technical and Greek words, and all the texts were either written in an unfamiliar script or contained numerous obscurities (depending on how one translates *scriptura*).

An anthology containing the *Aphorismi* and a short work on pulses — whether it was an anthology already available at Canterbury, or an anthology planned by Anselm — would look strikingly like the torso of the *Ars medica* or *Articella*. The *Articella* is a stable anthology or suite of texts linked to the nascent academic study of medicine, and apparently assembled in southern Italy.²⁷ Some of its component texts can be linked to the Monte

²⁷ Recent scholarship on the *Articella* in the twelfth century and its relationship to the “school of Salerno” rests on a series of essays by P. O. Kristeller: “The School of Salerno: Its Development and its Contribution to the History of Learning,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 17 (1945): 138–94; “Nuove fonti per la medicina salernitana del secolo XII,” *Rassegna storica salernitana* 18 (1957): 61–75, trans. C. Porzer and reprinted as “Neue Quellen zur salernitaner Medizin des 12. Jahrhunderts,” in *Medizin im mittelalterlichen Abendland*, ed. G. Baader and G. Keil, Wege der Forschung 363 (Darmstadt, 1982), 191–208; “Beitrag der Schule von Salerno zur Entwicklung der scholastischen Wissenschaft des 12. Jahrhunderts,” in *Artes Liberales von der antiken Bildung zur Wissenschaft des Mittelalters*, ed. J. Koch, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 5 (Leiden, 1959), 84–90; *La scuola medica di Salerno secondo ricerche e scoperte recenti*, Quaderni del Centro di studi e documentazione della Scuola Medica Salernitana 5 (Salerno, 1980); “Bartholomaeus, Musandinus and Maurus of Salerno and Other Early Commentators of the *Articella*, with a Tentative List of Texts and Manuscripts,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 29 (1976): 57–87, translated, with additions and corrections, as “Bartolomeo, Musandino, Mauro di Salerno e altri antichi commentatori dell’*Articella*, con un elenco di testi e di manoscritti,” in *Studi sulla scuola medica salernitana* (Naples, 1986), 97–151. Building on Kristeller’s work are the studies by M. Jordan: “Medicine as Science in the Early Commentaries on ‘Johannitius,’” *Traditio* 43 (1987): 121–45, and “The Construction of a Philosophical Medicine: Exegesis and Argument in Salernitan Teaching on the Soul,” *Osiris*, 2nd ser., 6 (1990): 42–61. A fundamentally different model for the origin of the *Articella* and its commentaries is presented by Pietro Morpurgo, *Filosofia della natura nella Schola Salernitana del secolo XII* (Bologna, 1990), and in “I commenti salernitani all’*Articella*,” in *Knowledge and the Sciences in Medieval Philosophy*, Proceedings of the

Cassino monk and translator Constantine the African (d. ca. 1087) and to his main patron, archbishop Alfanus I of Salerno (d. 1085). The earliest manuscripts of this anthology date from the first half of the twelfth century,²⁸ by which time it had acquired its first complete suite of commentaries. At this initial stage, the *Articella's* component parts were the *Aphorismi* and *Prognostica* of Hippocrates (both in new Latin translations), *De pulsibus* and *De urinis* (two Byzantine tracts on diagnosis by Philaretus and Theophilus Protospatharius respectively, apparently translated for the first time), and the *Isagoge*, a condensed translation of the *Masā'īl fī ṭ-ṭibb*, a brief schematic introduction to fundamental concepts of Galenic medical theory by Hunayn ibn Ishāq, or Joannitius, the Nestorian translator and medical author, and the central figure in the translation project associated with the Bayt al-Hikma of Baghdad. The *Isagoge* was probably translated from the Arabic by Constantine the African.²⁹ It is worth remarking here that the

Eighth International Congress of Medieval Philosophy, Helsinki 24–29 August 1987, 3 vols. (Helsinki, 1990), 2:97–105. For the later medieval diffusion and study of the *Articella*, see C. O'Boyle, *The Art of Medicine: Medical Teaching at the University of Paris, 1250–1400*, Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 9 (Leiden, 1998), esp. chap. 3. On medieval *Articella* manuscripts, see idem, *Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Copies of the Ars Medicinae: A Checklist and Contents Descriptions of the Manuscripts*, *Articella Studies* 1 (Cambridge, 1998), and H. A. Diels, *Die Handschriften der antiken Ärzte* (Berlin, 1905–6), as well as R. Durling, “Corrigenda and Addenda to Diels’ Galenica,” *Traditio* 23 (1967): 461–76. For its printed diffusion, see J. Arrizabalaga, *The Articella in the Early Press c. 1476–1534*, *Articella Studies* 2 (Cambridge, 1998).

²⁸ Precise dating of twelfth-century *Articella* manuscripts is an important desideratum for future research. The following codices containing the five-text version of the anthology appear to have been written between 1100 and 1150: Auxerre, Bibliothèque municipale 240; Paris, BNF lat. 7102; Perugia, 1138; and possibly Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 32 (1060); Pommersfelden, Gräfische Schönborn'sche Bibliothek 18; Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 1215; and Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 10281. London, Wellcome Library 801A, a Benevantan codex conventionally dated to the first half of the twelfth century, has been re-assigned to the middle of the century by F. Newton: “Constantine the African and Monte Cassino: New Elements in the Text of the *Isagoge*,” in *Constantine the African and 'Ali ibn al'-Abbas al Maḡūsi: The Pantegni and Related Texts*, ed. C. Burnett and D. Jacquart, *Studies in Ancient Medicine* 10 (Leiden, 1994), 30; see also his *Scriptorium and Library at Monte Cassino, 1058–1105* (Cambridge, 1999), 264. On the dating of Paris, BNF lat. 7029, see below, n. 78.

²⁹ There are no modern editions of the *Articella* versions of the *Aphorismi*, *Prognostica*, or Theophilus. The *Articella* translation of the Latin Philaretus is transcribed from MS Auxerre, Bibl. publique 240 (s. XII) by J. A. Pithis, *Die Schriften ΠΕΡΙΣΦΥΓΜΩΝ* des Philaretos: *Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften* 46 (Husum, 1983), 195–203. The *Isagoge* has been edited from three sixteenth-century printed versions by D. Gracia and J.-L. Vidal, “La ‘Isagoge’ de Ioannitius, Introducción, edición, traducción y notas,” *Asclepio* 26–27 (1974–75): 267–382, and from twelve twelfth- and thirteenth-century MSS by Gregor Maurach, “Isagoge ad Technē Galieni,” *Sudhoffs Archiv* 43 (1978): 148–74. However, Maurach did not consult the

first four items are all Greek works (though it is possible that the new translation of the *Prognostica* was from the Arabic), and these four are all concerned with diagnosis and prognosis. This is true even in the case of the *Aphorismi*. Though exalted since antiquity as a text of almost scriptural authority, a coded summation of all medical knowledge, the contents of the *Aphorismi* relate largely to the prognostic interpretation of clinical signs and the consequent choice and timing of medical interventions.³⁰ Secondly, the fact that these works are all by Greek authors, and that the *Isagoge's* Arabic origin is disguised by a Greek title and a Hellenized form of its author's name, gives the entire *Articella* a markedly Greek character. The *Isagoge*, however, is a theoretical overview of the entire range of medical knowledge, not a work on prognosis or diagnosis. In sum, the *Articella* appears to be composed of two distinct parts: a suite of four Greek texts on the theme of diagnosis and prognosis, and a summary of the whole field of medical knowledge.

The fact that Anselm was writing in the late 1070s, some decades before the oldest surviving manuscripts of the *Articella* or its commentaries were penned, undoubtedly explains why scholars who have examined the letters to Maurice have not remarked on the pairing of the *Aphorismi* and *De pulsibus*, or connected this pairing with the *Articella*.³¹ Our aim in this essay is

earliest manuscripts of the *Isagoge*, discussed below. For a critique of both editions, see K.-D. Fischer, "Verbesserung zur *Isagoge* des Johannicius," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 67 (1983): 223–43. Francis Newton announced that he was preparing a new edition in his "Constantine the African and Monte Cassino," 16. Constantine's translation will be discussed further below. On the *De urinis* of Theophilus, see F. Wallis, "Inventing Diagnosis: Theophilus' *De urinis* in the Classroom," in *Medical Teaching and Classroom Practice in the Medieval Universities*, ed. R. French and C. O'Boyle, *Dynamis* 20 (2000): 31–73, and the literature cited therein.

³⁰ The prologue of the early medieval Latin commentary on the *Aphorismi* sometimes ascribed to Oribasius, and which we term the "Old Latin Commentary," as found in Gunter von Andernach's 1533 printed edition, explicitly states that the *Aphorismi* is about "omnium aegritudinum prognostica, vtriusque sexus, tam in infantibus, quam in pueris, iuuenibus etiam, senibus, et decrepitis" (*D. Oribasii medici clarissimi commentaria in Aphorismos Hippocrati haectenus non uisa* . . . [Venice, 1533], Prologue, fol. 4v). However, this passage does not appear in the medieval manuscripts of the Old Latin Commentary we have consulted to date, namely Monte Cassino 97, Montpellier Bibliothèque de la Faculté de médecine 185, and Glasgow University Library, Hunter 404.

³¹ For example A. Beccaria, "Sulle tracce di un antico canone latino di Ippocrate e di Galeno. II. Gli Aforismi di Ippocrate nella versione e nei commenti del primo medioevo," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 4 (1961): 1–75 at 3, argues that the closest cognate to Maurice's exemplar is Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale O.55 (s. XI), which contains the early medieval translation of the *Aphorismi*, the Old Latin Commentary (discussed below), and an encomium of Hippocrates. Beccaria does not discuss the *De pulsibus* mentioned in Anselm's letter. See also Beccaria's introduction to his *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano (secoli IX, X et XI)*, *Studi e Testi* 53 (Rome, 1956), 84. C. H. Talbot, *Medicine in Medieval England* (London, 1967), 46, mentions both the *Aphorismi* and the

to demonstrate that their reluctance to do so rests on some unexamined assumptions about what the *Articella* is, and how it was assembled. In particular, we will argue that the diagnostic-prognostic section is modeled on an early medieval configuration of texts; that this configuration was in the process of being reconstructed on the basis of improved translations of the Greek texts, made at Salerno in Anselm's day; that the leading figure in this process of reconstruction was Alfanus; and that the *Isagoge* translation was commissioned as a replacement for an earlier Latin prologue to the *Aphorismi*. This process of assembling the *Articella* took place over a number of decades, beginning probably in the 1060s, and culminating in the fusion of the diagnostic-prognostic anthology to the *Isagoge* shortly around the year 1100. Anselm's correspondence with Maurice is a witness to this process of assembly. The fact that Anselm's text of the *Aphorismi* had a noteworthy number of Greek terms identifies it as the new *Articella* translation, and his use of the term *glosae* to designate an extended commentary likewise points to a style of exposition associated with the *Articella* commentaries. Looking at Anselm's project in the light of the *Articella* suggests a plausible hypothesis for the proto-history of this anthology; it also links the theological and philosophical preoccupations of Anselm with the most progressive trends in the study of medicine in his day.

“*GRAECA AUT INUSITATA NOMINA*”: IDENTIFYING ANSELM'S TEXTS

Identifying the texts in Maurice's Canterbury exemplar is a challenge, for Anselm's lifetime coincided with a period when an older translation of the *Aphorismi* and its early medieval commentary were still in active circulation. The old Latin version of the *Aphorismi* is associated with a family of Latin translations of the main texts of the Alexandrian syllabus of medical studies, made in Ravenna in the sixth century.³² In early medieval manuscripts, it occasionally appears on its own, but it is usually accompanied by, or replaced by, one of three commentaries, each of which incorporates the full Hippocratic text. The most widely diffused of these commentaries is ascribed in some late manuscripts to Oribasius, but we shall refer to it hereafter as the Old Latin Commentary. Though often assumed to be associated with Ravenna, it is possibly from a slightly later period than the Ravenna

De pulsibus, but dismisses any suggestion that these were “Salernitan” materials. His account of Anselm's and Maurice's correspondence contains numerous errors.

³² The “Ravenna” translation has been edited by I. M. Rohlfsen, *Die lateinische ravennatische Übersetzung der Hippokratischen Aphorismen aus dem 5./6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Textkonstitution auf der Basis der Übersetzungscodices* (Hamburg, 1980).

translations.³³ The other two early medieval commentaries were less popular,³⁴ but all three continued to be copied into the twelfth century, overlapping in time with the first commentaries on the *Articella* version of *Aphorismi*.³⁵ These primitive *Articella* commentaries on the new translation of the *Aphorismi* — which form part of a suite of commentaries covering all five components of the corpus — are transmitted in two versions, designated by Paul Oskar Kristeller as the “Chartres” series (after its principal exemplar, the manuscript Chartres, Bibliothèque publique 171, destroyed in World War II) and the “Digby” group (named for Bodleian Library, Digby 108).³⁶ The Chartres and Digby commentaries are related, though it is uncertain whether Chartres is a summary of Digby or Digby an expanded form of Chartres, or even whether this is the appropriate way to describe their connection. The Digby series was in circulation no later than the 1120s, for its commentary on the *Isagoge* is quoted by William of Conches in his *De philosophia mundi*, composed 1125–30.³⁷

³³ The argument for a slightly later date has been made by Beccaria, “Sulle tracce II,” 59, and by M. E. V. Bujan, “Problemas generales de las antiguas traducciones médicas latinas,” *Studi medievali*, ser. 3, 25 (1984): 642–80 at 675–76. Beccaria edits the preface and selected extracts from the commentary in “Sulle tracce II,” 35–54. For a critical edition of the section covering *Aphorismi* 1.1–11, see J.-H. Kühn, *Die Diätlehre im frühmittelalterlichen lateinischen Kommentar zu den hippokratischen Aphorismen (II–11)* (Neustadt, 1981). On the preface attached to many manuscripts of this commentary, see below. The only complete edition remains the 1533 Guinther von Andernach text cited above in n. 30, but this text has been heavily edited to conform to that of the new Renaissance translation of the *Aphorismi*.

³⁴ See P. Kibre, *Hippocrates Latinus: Repertorium of Hippocratic Writings in the Latin Middle Ages*, rev. ed. (New York, 1985), 34–42. The one commencing “Vitam brevem artem autem prolixam dixit eo quod ars medicine multas habet artes precurentes,” is found in Bern, Burgerbibliothek 232 (s. X), and the first eleven chapters of *particula* 1 are edited by Kühn, *Die Diätlehre*, 42–48. It is also found in two twelfth-century manuscripts, Auxerre, Bibliothèque municipale 22 and London, BL Royal 12.E.XX, where it is entitled *expositio Aptalonis*. Another, whose incipit is “De arte prolixa pauca incipiam. In principio creavit deus celum et terram” is found in London, BL Arundel 166 pt. 1 (s. X in) and Paris, BNF 14935 pt. 4 (s. XI ex. or XII in.).

³⁵ Kristeller, “Bartholomaeus,” 65.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 71.

³⁷ On the Chartres and Digby commentaries in general, see articles by Jordan and Wallis cited above, nn. 27 and 29. On William of Conches’s use of the Digby commentary on the *Aphorismi*, see D. Elford, “William of Conches,” in *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy*, ed. Peter Dronke (Cambridge, 1988), 310–12, 325–26, and B. Lawn, *The Prose Salernitan Questions*, *Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* 5 (Oxford, 1979), 2–3; on the dating of the *De philosophia mundi*, see I. Ronca and M. Curr’s introduction to their translation of the *Dragmaticon: A Dialogue of Natural Philosophy* (Notre Dame, 1997), xvi. William’s use of the Constantinian corpus has been widely documented, for example by H. Schipperges, “Die Schulen von Chartres unter dem Einfluss des Arabismus,” *Sudhoffs Archiv* 40 (1956): 193–210. Édouard Jeuneau is of the opinion that William even composed commentaries

The evidence furnished by Anselm's letters to Maurice, however, strongly suggests that the version of the *Aphorismi* that Maurice was copying was the new translation, and that the commentary was related in some way to the *Articella* commentaries and was not the Old Latin Commentary. It will be recalled that Maurice was making slow progress on the *Aphorismi* text because of its unfamiliar vocabulary and Greek terminology. The new *Aphorismi* translation was made directly from the Greek (rather than through an Arabic intermediary).³⁸ Furthermore, contemporaries saw the

on Joannitius and Theophilus, both of whom are cited in the *Philosophia mundi*: "Note sur l'École de Chartres," *Studi medievali*, ser. 3, 5 (1964): 821–65 at 851. It is interesting to note that fol. 1r of the principal twelfth-century manuscript of the Digby glosses, Bodleian Library Digby 108, lists an inventory of the legacy of books of which Digby 108 once was a part; the legacy included a number of medical works, including Constantine's *Pantegni* and the *Viaticum*, but also *Compendium magistri Willelmi de Cunches*. See R. W. Hunt, "The Library of Robert Grosseteste," in *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop: Essays in Commemoration of the Seven Hundredth Anniversary of His Death*, ed. D. A. Callus (Oxford, 1955), 129.

³⁸ This new *Articella* translation is distinct from the one contained in Constantine the African's translation of Galen's commentary on the *Aphorismi*. In *Articella* MSS after ca. 1200, and in early printed editions, the *Articella* version of the text is sometimes inserted into Constantine's translation of Galen's commentary, but Galen's commentary never appears in the manuscripts of the *Articella* before the thirteenth century. Kristeller remarks that "if Constantine's Galen as found in early manuscripts does include [the *Articella*] version of the *Aphorisms*, we may assume that the early compiler of the *Articella* detached the Hippocrates text from Galen's commentary as translated by Constantine. Yet Constantine's Galen may originally have included another version, or no version at all, but merely lemmata. In that case, it may be assumed that our version of the *Aphorisms* was made independently of Constantine's version of the Galen commentary, and perhaps from the Greek, and that it was merely inserted in later manuscripts and editions of Constantine's Galen. The problem can only be solved by examining the early manuscripts of Constantine's Galen, and by collating our version of the *Aphorisms* with Constantine's Galen as well as with the Greek and Arabic texts of Hippocrates" (Kristeller, "Bartholomaeus" [n. 27 above], 67). Peter the Deacon relates that after the death of Constantine, Johannes Afflacijs, Constantine's *discipulus* and a very skilled writer and physician, "produced the *Aphorisms*, a text quite necessary for physicians." See H. Bloch, *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1986), 1:102–3, and Newton, *Scriptorium and Library*, 24 n. 36. But it is doubtful that this is the *Articella* version of the Hippocratic text. Since Constantine had already completed Galen's commentary on the *Aphorismi* and dedicated it to Atto, this likewise could not be the text intended here. Peter the Deacon may be confusing Johannes Afflacijs with Johannes Mesue (Yūhannā ibn Māsawayh), whose *Aphorismi*, often ascribed to Johannes Mansoris or John Damascene, and dedicated to Hunayn ibn Ishāq, was translated into Latin, probably in Italy, in the twelfth century, and included in some *Articella* manuscripts from the thirteenth onwards: *Le livre des axiomes médicaux (Aphorismi)*, ed. D. Jacquart and G. Troupeau (Paris, 1980), introduction, 15. There is no discussion of any aphorisms in R. Creutz, "Der Cassinense Johannes Afflacijs Saracenus, ein Arzt aus 'Hochsalerno,'" *Studien und Mitteilungen des Benediktinerordens* 48 (1930): 301–24.

new translation as distinctively Greek in character. This is emphasized by a prologue (somewhat confusingly ascribed to Oribasius), which precedes either the new translation of, or the “Digby” commentary on, the *Aphorismi* in a number of twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts. Discussing the motivations behind the *nova editio* of the *Aphorismi*, the author places particular stress on its faithfulness to readings and divisions of the text found in the “Greek codices.” The old translation, says the author, took reprehensible liberties in these matters, a fact that would be plain to even the least intelligent readers “if the *Aphorisms* are read in the language in which Hippocrates wrote them.” He closes by assuring “those who do not apply themselves to Greek eloquence” that this new version “departs not a whit, or only slightly, from Hippocrates’ footsteps.”³⁹ As we shall see, this vigorous promotion of the Greek character of the new translation is closely connected to the *Articella* project as a whole.

To argue that Anselm’s *Aphorismi* text was the new translation because it was filled with Greek terms seems to fly in the face of an established scholarly consensus that Greek terminology was more prominent in the older translation than the new one. Indeed, it is argued that the new translation was necessitated by the inability of westerners to comprehend the Greek terms found in the Ravenna *Aphorismi* and its Old Latin Commentary.⁴⁰

³⁹ “Afforismorum ypocratis huius noue editionis ea causa extitit quoniam antiqua nullum eorum que uitiosis translationibus inesse assolent culpe genus defuit, adeo ut nec translatio merito debeat appellari, sed potius ueritatis ablatio. Quippe que superflua plurima addere, et eorum que ab ypocrate posita in omnibus grecis codicibus atque expositoribus inueniuntur non nulla pretermittere. . . . Quinte siquidem particule initium in grecis codicibus est: Spasmus ex elleboro, mortale. Sexte uero tale dedit ypocras responsum: In diuturnis lienteris oxiregma superueniens prius non existens, signum bonum. Quod latini codices initium septime habent particule. Quam ultimam idem ypocras sic est exorsus: In acutis egritudinibus frigiditas extremitarum malum. Hec uero omnia ita esse ut dictum est etiam minimis intelligentibus euidetissima eruit, si in qua scripti sunt lingua ypocratis afforismi legantur. Qui uero grece eloquentie operam non dederunt, certissime nouerint nullatenus uel parum ab ypocratis uestigiis hanc discessisse editionem, et ea quam maxime uitasse uitia que antiquam supra dictum est incurrisse” (Edinburgh, National Library Adv. 18.3.13, fol. 50r [s. XII]). This “Oribasius prologue” is also found in Edinburgh, University Library 163 (s. XII); Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud 108 (s. XII); Paris, BNF lat. 7102 (s. XIII); Vatican City, BAV Ottoboni 2298 (s. XII); Admont 254 (s. XIII); Cambridge, Peterhouse 251 (s. XII); Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Sondersammlung Amplon. F. 238 (s. XIII); London, BL Harley 3140 (s. XIII); and Paris, BNF lat. 13275; see Kibre, *Hippocrates Latinus*, 40–42. A transcription of the text from Paris, BNF lat. 7102 was printed by E. Littré in *Oeuvres complètes d’Hippocrate*, 4 (Paris, 1844), 444–45. The division of *particula* 5 of the *Aphorismi* into two parts, of which the author of the prologue complains, can be observed in a number of copies of the old Latin translation. See Beccaria, “Sulle tracce II,” 30.

⁴⁰ D. Jacquart, “À l’aube de la renaissance médicale des XI^e–XII^e siècles: l’ ‘Isagoge Johanitii’ et son traducteur,” *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 144 (1986): 209–40 at 231,

However, if we compare the old Ravenna and new *Articella* translations of the *Aphorismi*, we find that the new version is both more self-consciously Greek than the Ravenna translation, and more given to technical vocabulary — the two factors that, as Anselm himself reveals, were slowing Maurice down.

The comparison presented here is, of necessity, a summary that lays out the main points of comparison, illustrated by some representative examples; the fully documented argument will appear in a forthcoming publication. The *Articella* translation of the *Aphorismi* (A) was made from the Greek, but there are clear indications that the translator worked with the Ravenna version (R) before him.⁴¹ Many of the aphorisms appear in exactly the same or very similar form in both versions, and even when there are changes of wording, the sentence structure is often identical. The differences, however, reveal the intentions and interests of the *Articella* translator. Above all, the *Articella* version seems to be concerned with (a) finding exact Latin equivalents to the Greek (even at the expense of clarity); (b) preserving, and indeed exaggerating, the Greek character of the text; and (c) foregrounding technical and specialized terminology.

The A translation, overall, is more precise and accurate in its rendering of the Greek. For example, in 7.1 and 7.26, A's *extrematum* renders the Greek ἀκρωτηρίων better than R's *articulorum*. In comparison with R, the *Articella* translator shows a marked preference for Latin terms with Greek roots,

and idem, "Les traductions du XI^e siècle et le latin médical antique," in *Le latin médical: la constitution d'un langage scientifique*, ed. G. Sabbah (Saint-Étienne, 1991), 420; Glaze, "Perforated Wall" (n. 19 above), 54–56 and chap. 3 passim.

⁴¹ The analysis that follows is based on the text of the A translation of the *Aphorismi* as found in Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 1215, fols. 31r–44v, a twelfth-century MS of the primitive five-book *Articella*. The text has been collated with two other twelfth-century *Articella* MSS: London, Wellcome Library 801A, fols. 1v–38r, and Edinburgh, University Library 163, fols. 73r–118v. Both these MSS belonged to Bury St. Edmund's in the twelfth century. For descriptions and discussion of the Wellcome MS, see S. A. J. Moorat, *Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library*, 2 vols. (London, 1973), 2:1464–67, corrected by Kristeller, "Antichi commentatori dell'*Articella*" (n. 27 above), 141; E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script*, 2nd ed., ed. V. Brown, 2 vols. (Rome, 1980), 1:337; E. P. McLachlan, *The Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmund's in the Twelfth Century* (New York, 1986), 12–13, 21; R. M. Thomson, "The Library of Bury St. Edmund's in the 11th and 12th Centuries," *Speculum* 47 (1972): 617–45 at 634; M. Jordan, "Medicine as Science" (n. 27 above), 124 n. 12. On the date of this MS, see n. 28 above. On the Edinburgh MS, see C. R. Borland, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library* (Edinburgh, 1916): 245–47; Kristeller, "Antichi commentatori dell'*Articella*," 140; and McLachlan, *Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmund's*, 320–21. The R text used is that of Rohlfsen, n. 32 above. The Greek text consulted was that of W. H. S. Jones, *Hippocrates* 4, Loeb Classical Library 150 (Cambridge, MA, 1931), 98–221.

direct transcriptions of Greek terms, or Latin phrases that are literally equivalent, in other words, *clagues*.⁴² A's predilection for transcribing Greek terminology is strikingly evident when one compares his translation of *Aphorismi* 3.5 to R's. R reads "si autem septentrionales, tussiculae faucis, uentres duri, urinae difficiles," but A, while retaining the same sentence structure, substitutes *boreas* for *septentrionales*,⁴³ *faringes* for *faucis*, and *dissurie* for *urinae difficiles*. In the Vatican Pal. lat. 1215 copy of A (fol. 34v), however, the scribe has banalized *dissurie* as *dissinteriae*, which shows that Maurice was not alone in finding the vocabulary of the *Aphorismi* challenging.⁴⁴

The Ravenna translation certainly contains transcriptions of Greek terms, but they are far less frequent and, above all, far less consistently used than in the *Articella* translation. For example, A consistently uses the term *crisis*, while R sometimes uses *crisis* (e.g., 1.19, 2.13), but more frequently *solutio* (e.g., 1.20, 2.12). A consistently prefers the term *farmacia*; R will occasionally use it (e.g., 4.17–20), but varies it with *medicamenta* (2.36–37, 4.2, 4.5, 4.11, 7.25).

⁴² A consistent exception is the term *colera*, for which the A translator substitutes *fel*; we comment on this substitution below. Some one-off exceptions: 4.81, where R reads *lipidas* ("scales," *λεπίδας*) and A reads *squamas*; 4.82 where R reads *in ueretro* (*ἐν τῇ οὐρήθρη*) and A *urinali uia*. Rarely, R will be the version that reproduces the Greek by calque: in 5.13, R reads *de pulmone ascensus nascitur* (*ἐκ τοῦ πλεύμονος ἡ ἀναγωγὴ γίνεται*) while A reads *ex pulmone eductio fit*. An interesting case is presented by 3.26 where R and A have each tried to reproduce the Greek literally, R by transcription, A by calque. R's *ad ineon quod Greci sosuisies uocant* suggests that he did not understand the original *κατὰ τὸ ἰόν εἶσω ὤσεις* "curvature (of the vertebrae) at the neck" and simply opted to transliterate it. A's translation — *spondilis secundum collum intus impulsiones* — is word for word, and literal, if not exactly illuminating: *super* = *κατὰ*, *collum* = *τὸ ἰόν*, *intus* = *εἶσω*, *impulsiones* = *ὤσεις*.

⁴³ Similar cases: 3.11, 3.12, 3.13. R on occasion uses *boreum* to mean "cold": 3.14, 3.17.

⁴⁴ Other examples of A's transcriptions are: *in paroxismissis* (1.11; R: *in accessionibus*); *discritas et eucritas* (1.12; R: *bonas et malas consummationes*); *cronicas egritudines* (2.39; R: *diuturnae aegritudines*); *obthalmias* (3.11, 3.12, 3.14, 3.16; R: *oculorum dolores*); *flegmones* (3.24; R: *tumores*; 5.57 *tumentum*, 7.17 *fervor*); *asmata, litiases . . . acrocordines* (3.26; R: *anhelitus, cauculi . . . uerrucae*); *ypocondrium* (4.64, 6.40; R: *praecordium*); *dispntia* (4.50; R: *suspirum*); *in bubonibus febres* (4.55; R: *in inguinibus febres*); *effemeris [febribus]* (4.55; R: *simplicibus*); *ulcera* (3.20, 6.4; R: *vulnera*); *maniam significat* (5.40, cf. 5.65; R: *insanire significat*); *erispila* (6.23; R: *ignis acer*); *parumia [i.e. paristhmia]* (3.26; R: *tussilae*). In 4.20, R uses the vague term *tormentum* to refer to colic, which seems to have sent the A translator back to the Greek original for clarification and to substitute *strophus* for *tormentum*. One branch of the A translation, represented by Pal. lat. 1215 (fol. 36v), demonstrates an attempt to turn this transcription into a calque by substituting *conversio* for *strophus* — a mistranslation of *στροφός* (a twisted cord; by extension, colic) as *στροφή* (rolling, turning).

The *Articella* translator's substitution of Greek transcriptions for established Latin terms sometimes borders on pedantry or snobbism. For example in 3.20, R reads *et zernae et maculae*, for which A substitutes *et licines et alphi*. A's *licines* transcribes the Greek λειχῆνες. The primary meaning is "lichen" and by extension, a skin condition producing a lichen-like eruption, such as impetigo or ringworm. A's *alphi* transcribes the Greek ἀλφοί, a term the Pal. lat. 1215 scribe (fol. 35r) found sufficiently obscure to merit the interlinear gloss *morphea* ("morphew"). But both *zernae* and *maculae* are accepted Latin medical terms, *zernae* being found, for example, in Cassius Felix.

The *Articella* translator also liked to replicate Greek words and phrases by calque. In many cases, the result is merely an awkward turn of phrase. For example, A consistently renders the Greek Ἦν ὑπὸ . . . ἐχομένῳ as a *febre habito* where R uses the idiomatic *febricanti*. But A's calques can also result in making the meaning less evident than the version found in R. For example, in 2.41, R reads *Qui deficiunt frequenter* ("Those who faint frequently"), while A prefers *Qui exsoluuntur frequenter*. *Exsoluere* is an unusual term, with no medical meaning in classical Latin, though *exsoluere* can mean "to discharge (urine, feces, etc.)." *Deficere* is the normal Latin term for "to faint." However, *exsoluere* replicates the Greek ἐκλούμενοι (literally: "those who are set free").

The *Articella* transcriptions or calques can also serve to introduce a more technical term or meaning. For example, where the R version uses everyday terms like *cibus*, A uses *dieta* (e.g., 1.4–5, 7–8). The A version also prefers the more explicitly medical *tabescere* to R's *extenuare* (2.35, 2.38). The A translation uses *uomitus* in place of R's more homely *reiectatio* (3.21, 7.10), and while both R and A use *diarria*, R varies it with *solutio ventris*. To refer to the sediments that settle out in urine, A favors *ypostasis* over R's *sedimina* (7.31–32, 7.35) not only because it is Greek, but because it is a technical term, one that is attested even in early medieval Latin uroscopy texts. The A version of the Hippocratic text also conveys a more acute understanding of the exact medical situation under discussion. For example, in 5.69, A's *pili* is better than R's *capilli*, since it is body hair, not head hair, which is being discussed.

In passing, we would draw attention to another distinctive feature of the *Articella* version of the *Aphorismi*, namely its sensitivity about matters concerned with sexuality and reproduction. For example, in 6.30 R writes *antequam in uenerem coeat*, while A takes refuge behind a Hellenism, *antequam affrodisiā*. In 5.28, A's *muliebra* replicates the Greek γυναικείων ἀγωγόν ("female disorders") but obscures the idea of menstruation behind this euphemism; R, on the other hand, reads *menstrua*. In 7.39, R's *sub pectinem* is closer to the Greek ἐς . . . τὸν κτένα than A's *sub uentrem*, which suggests

euphemism. This prudery may give us a clue about the origins and audience of the *Articella* translation, a point to which we shall return later.

In short, the new *Articella* version of the *Aphorismi* is superior to the old version in that it shows greater concern with medical precision and strives for greater consistency in the use of terminology. But it is also more literal and more self-consciously Greek than the Ravenna version, often at the expense of clarity. The very problems of which Maurice apparently complained — an abundance of unfamiliar and Greek words — are more evidently present in the new *Articella* text than in the old Ravenna translation.

The second clue to the identity of Anselm's *Aphorismi* is Anselm's use of the term *glosae* to designate a discursive commentary. The rubrics of the Chartres and Digby commentaries consistently identify them as *glosae*.⁴⁵ By contrast, the early medieval commentaries are never referred to as *glosae*. Where there is a rubric, incipit or explicit, it invariably designates the text as an *expositio* or *commentum*.⁴⁶

This usage is associated with writers of the school of Chartres and in particular William of Conches, author of numerous *glosae* on Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*, Macrobius, Priscian, Juvenal, and Plato's *Timaeus*.⁴⁷ William explains in a number of places the difference between a *commentum* and *glosae*. A commentary expounds only the ideas contained in the text, while *glosae*, without neglecting the ideas, also address the letter of the text, its structure, and the sequence in which concepts are presented, the *con-*

⁴⁵ See Kibre, *Hippocrates Latinus* (n. 34 above), 40–42. All the “Digby” commentaries in Digby 108 are called *glosae*, as are the Digby commentaries in Edinburgh, National Library Advocates 8.2.13 (*glosulae*), London, BL Harley 2399, and the Chartres commentaries on *Prognostica* in London, BL Royal 8.C.IV, fol. 157, and on Theophilus and Philaretus in Erfurt, Amplon. F. 276. The only exception we have encountered is Cambridge, Peterhouse 251, where the rubricator uses the term *commentum*. Later *Articella* commentaries such as those of Bartholomaeus of Salerno also adopt *glosae*: Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität D III 3; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz lat. qu. 255 (*glosule*); Brussels, Bibliothèque royale II 3399; Erfurt, Amplon. Q.175 (the *Tegni* commentary is called a *commentum*, but this rubric is in a later hand); Vienna, Nationalbibliothek lat. 2392 and 2447; Winchester, Winchester College 24 (cf. Kristeller, “Bartholomaeus,” 60).

⁴⁶ The Old Latin Commentary is called an *expositio* in Karlsruhe CXX (s. IX), Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 313 (s. X); Monte Cassino, V.97 (s. X); Montpellier 185 (s. XI); and Vatican City, BAV Reg. lat. 1809 (s. XII), and a *commentum* in Paris, BNF lat. 7021 (s. IX); Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale 75 (s. X); and Vatican City, BAV Barb. lat. 160 (s. XI). The *expositio Aptalionis* is also referred to as a *commentum*: Bern, Burgerbibliothek 232 (s. X), or *expositio*: Auxerre, Bibliothèque municipale 22 (s. XII); London, British Library Royal 12.E.XX (s. XII). See Kibre, *Hippocrates latinus*, 34–40.

⁴⁷ See E. Jeaneau, “Note sur l'École de Chartres,” 840–41.

tinuatio litterae.⁴⁸ William's own method of composing *glosae* reflects this definition. Each section of the text is first analysed globally and then dissected phrase by phrase.⁴⁹ This is exactly the procedure followed by the Chartres and Digby *glosae* on the *Articella* texts,⁵⁰ and contrasts with the method of the Old Latin Commentary on the *Aphorismi*, which is to expound and elaborate on the content of each aphorism, without addressing the letter of the text. In sum, Anselm's identification of the commentary on the *Aphorismi* as *glosae* points to a particular kind of exposition, one that is not represented by the pre-*Articella* commentaries on the *Aphorismi*, but that is characteristic of the new commentaries on the *Articella* version of Hippocrates' text.

Anselm's *De pulsibus* is less easy to pin down. It is almost certainly not Galen's *De pulsibus ad tirones*, for which there are no early medieval manuscripts.⁵¹ Anonymous and pseudonymous pulse tracts appear in a handful of early medieval codices,⁵² some of which (as we shall see below) also contain the *Aphorismi*. However, early medieval readers would have been much more likely to find pulse lore within a widely diffused treatise entitled *De pulsibus et urinis*, ascribed variously to Galen and Alexander of Tralles.⁵³ Since Anselm mentions only pulse, not urine, it is unlikely that this is the work Maurice was copying. But if Maurice was copying the new, *Articella* version of the *Aphorismi*, with a commentary bearing the distinctive designation *glosae*, could the *De pulsibus* in the same codex have been Philaretus's? If Anselm's manuscript was a torso of the *Articella*, this is a strong possibility.

⁴⁸ See E. Jeaneau's introduction to his edition of William's *Glosae super Platonem* (Paris, 1965), 16, and references cited in his n. 2.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵⁰ Wallis, "Inventing Diagnosis" (n. 29 above), 45–46.

⁵¹ An early medieval commentary on *De pulsibus* survives as part of the Ravenna didactic text-corpus discussed below; however, it incorporates only fragmentary lemmata, not the complete text.

⁵² St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek 751 (s. IX²) (Beccaria, *I codici* [n. 31 above], 133) includes a brief treatise entitled "Ad pulsum tangendum" within bk. 4 of a compilation entitled *Initia medicinae*; Vienna, Nationalbibliothek 9–10 (s. XI ex. or XII in.; *ibid.*, 2) and Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek (s. IX in.; *ibid.*, 69) contain unasccribed tracts.

⁵³ On Alexander, see M. Stoffregen, "Eine frühmittelalterliche lateinische Übersetzung des byzantinischen Puls- und Urintraktats des Alexandros" (PhD diss., Freie Universität Berlin, 1977). Ps.-Galen was first edited by H. Leisinger, *Die lateinischen Harnschrift pseudo-Galens*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Medizin 2 (Zürich, 1925), and again by G. Keil in his 1970 Freiburg im Breisgau *Habilitationsschrift*, "Die urognostische Praxis in vor- und frühsalernitanischer Zeit." The latter, unfortunately, has not yet been published. Our thanks to Dr. Keil for providing a photocopy of the typescript.

THE GENESIS OF THE *ARTICELLA*

The possibility that Anselm's manuscript was a proto-*Articella* must remain a hypothesis. But this possibility, at the very least, obliges us to reopen the question of the genesis of the *Articella*, and reimagine that genesis with such a manuscript in the picture. Could the anthology have existed, if only in torso form, in the mid-1070s? Not according to the received account, in which the translation of the *Isagoge* precipitates the formation of the anthology. To be sure, the earliest manuscripts of the *Isagoge* date from the 1070s–90s, but the text they contain is not that of the *Articella* vulgate, and the other elements of the *Articella* are not included; therefore the *Articella* (so this argument dictates) could not have existed in any form before about 1100 at the earliest. This *terminus a quo* is established by the earliest manuscripts of the full *Articella*, which date from the first half of the twelfth century, and the earliest commentaries on the five-text suite, such as the Digby series, which leave a literary trace from about 1125 onwards, notably in the writings of William of Conches. If Maurice and Anselm were corresponding a quarter-century before the earliest possible date for the appearance of the *Articella*, Anselm's manuscript must (according to this scenario) have contained the Ravenna *Aphorismi* translation and the Old Latin Commentary.

However, the assumption that the *Isagoge* initiated the formation of the *Articella* can be challenged. For example, were there an early medieval text-grouping that comprised at a minimum the *Aphorismi* and a pulse treatise, and optimally material on prognosis and urine as well, its existence would actually increase the likelihood of a proto-*Articella* in Anselm's day. Such a text-grouping could have furnished a template for the diagnostic-prognostic core of the new anthology. What would need to be explained would be (a) how and why this template acquired fresh contents, namely the new Hippocrates translations, Philaretus, and Theophilus, and (b) how and why this diagnostic-prognostic text-grouping came to be joined to the *Isagoge*.

In fact, early medieval text-groupings of precisely this kind do exist. A substantial percentage of all the medical texts in circulation in the West prior to the twelfth century was transmitted in the form of more or less stable text clusters.⁵⁴ The most frequently encountered text-corpora were *thematic* in character: the therapeutics anthology known as the *Aurelius-Esculapius* corpus and a pharmacy collection (the *Herbarium* corpus). There

⁵⁴ For a fuller discussion of this phenomenon, see F. Wallis, "The Experience of the Book: Manuscripts, Texts, and the Role of Epistemology in Early Medieval Medicine," in *Knowledge and the Scholarly Medical Traditions*, ed. D. G. Bates (Cambridge, 1995), 101–26.

were also *form-corpora*, notably collections of short tracts in the form of letters ascribed to Hippocrates and others.⁵⁵ Less frequently copied, but more pertinent to our present inquiry, were didactic anthologies derived from the curriculum of the late antique medical school of Alexandria. The Alexandrian syllabus comprised a sequence of works by Hippocrates and Galen designed to introduce students to basic theoretical concepts of medicine and the fundamental principles of physiology, pathology, diagnosis, and therapeutics.⁵⁶ The *Aphorismi* apparently formed part of this syllabus, and so did Galen's *De pulsibus ad tirones*. A compressed version of the Alexandrian syllabus was rendered into Latin, apparently in Ravenna, in the sixth century, and some elements were equipped with commentaries based on those current in Alexandria. This Ravenna anthology is represented by a number of early medieval codices. Milan, Ambrosiana G. 108 inf. (second half of the ninth century) contains three texts by Hippocrates — *Prognostica*; *De septimanis*; *De aere, aquis et locis* — and four commentaries on texts by Galen — *De sectis* (Galen's own choice as an introduction to his works, and the introductory text in Alexandria), *Ars medica* (the text later known as *Tegni*), *De pulsibus ad tirones*,⁵⁷ and *De methodo medendi*. The Ambrosiana tradition is also reflected in Paris, BNF lat. 7027 (s. IX med. with s. XII revisions), an anthology of Hippocratic texts that includes the Old Latin Commentary on the *Aphorismi*.⁵⁸ Two other ninth-century manuscripts containing elements of the Ravenna corpus, Karlsruhe, Landesbibliothek Reichenau CXX (originally from Verona) and Glasgow, University Library

⁵⁵ On the *Aurelius-Esculapius* corpus, see V. Rose's edition of Theodorus Priscianus's *Euporista* (Leipzig, 1894), xii–xv. On the *Herbarium*-corpus: G. Baader, "Zur Überlieferung der lateinischen medizinischen Literatur des frühen Mittelalters," *Forschung, Praxis, Fortbildung* 17 (1966): 139–41. On corpora of letter-tractates: G. Baader, "Lehrbrief und Kurztraktat in der medizinischen Wissenvermittlung des Früh- und Hochmittelalters," in N. R. Wolf, ed., *Wissenorganisierende und wissenvermittelnde Litteratur im Mittelalter*, *Wissensliteratur des Mittelalters* 1 (Wiesbaden, 1987), 253–54, and V. Scherer, "Die Epistula de ratione ventris uel uiscerum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Galenismus im frühen Mittelalter" (diss., Freie Universität Berlin, 1976). See also Beccaria, *I codici* (n. 31 above), 31–42.

⁵⁶ A. Z. Iskandar, "An Attempted Reconstruction of the Late Alexandrian Medical Curriculum," *Medical History* 20 (1976): 235–58.

⁵⁷ It should be noted that the text of Galen's *De pulsibus ad tirones* was not available in the early Middle Ages. The commentary in the Milan codex contains only lemmata, not the full text.

⁵⁸ Discussed by Beccaria, "Sulle tracce II" (n. 31 above), 4–5, and by M. E. Vázquez Buján, "La antigua traducción latina del tratado 'De natura humana' dal 'Corpus Hippocraticum,'" *Revue d'histoire des textes* 12/13 (1982–83): 387–96. For a similar Hippocratic anthology from the early tenth century, written in Beneventan script, see Glasgow, Hunter 404, which also includes the Old Latin Commentary on the *Aphorismi*.

Hunter 96 (from southern France), contain the same commentary on the *Aphorismi*, immediately followed by a tract or tracts on the pulse.⁵⁹

However, diagnostic-prognostic thematic text-corpora are also in circulation. One popular variety, a group of texts on the signs of impending death, has received considerable attention,⁶⁰ but there are others which bear closer resemblance to the *Articella* configuration of *Aphorismi*, prognosis, and diagnosis by pulse and urine. For example, in Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale O.55 (VIII) (s. XI ex.), the *Aphorismi* and the commentary are accompanied by one other text, the *Prognostica* attributed to Galen.⁶¹ This pairing is of interest, for the other Hippocratic text included in the *Articella* is Hippocrates' *Prognostica*; indeed, in Glasgow, University Library Hunter 404 (V.3.2, s. IX)⁶² the Old Latin Commentary on *Aphorismi* is actually part of an anthology that includes the Hippocratic *Prognostica*. In Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de médecine 185 (s. XI)⁶³ not only does the commentary on *Aphorismi* follow directly on the Ps.-Galen *Prognostica*,⁶⁴ but the same volume also contains Alexander of Tralles's *De pulsibus et urinis*, cognate to the texts by Philaretus and Theophilus that were chosen for the *Articella*. Vatican City, BAV Barbarini lat. 160 (s. XI) also pairs the *Aphorismi* commentary with Alexander of Tralles, as well as Ps.-Galen on urines,⁶⁵

⁵⁹ For description and discussion of both these manuscripts see Beccaria, "Sulle tracce II." The Glasgow codex contains only the prologue of *Aphorismi* commentary. The *De pulsibus* in the Karlsruhe manuscript is the one ascribed to Soranus (inc.: "Quoniam frequenter plerique nescientes"; see the edition by V. Rose, *Anecdota graeca et graecolatina*, 2 [Berlin, 1870], 275–80), and is not the same as the one in the Glasgow manuscript (inc.: "Plurimi non solum").

⁶⁰ G. Baader and G. Keil, "Mittelalterliche Diagnostik: Ein Bericht," in *Medizinische Diagnostik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. C. Habricht, F. Marguth, and J. Henning Wolf (Munich, 1978), 124–29; Paxton, "*Signa morbifera*" (n. 20 above), 638 n. 28.

⁶¹ Beccaria, *I codici*, 44. It should be noted that the text of the *Aphorismi* accompanied by a commentary, or the text of a commentary alone, can also appear in isolation. This is the case for the commentary in Bern, Burgerbibliothek 232 (s. X) (*ibid.*, 122) — see remarks above re this commentary — and Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 3701–15 (s. XI) (*ibid.*, 6), and for text with commentary in Paris, BNF lat. 7021 (s. IX med.) (*ibid.*, 27), Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale 172 (s. XI ex.) (*ibid.*, 108), and Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 3426 (Kibre, *Hippocrates latinus* [n. 34 above], 37).

⁶² Beccaria, *I codici*, 73.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁶⁴ London, BL Arundel 166, one of the two manuscripts containing the "De arte prolixa" commentary on the *Aphorismi*, also contains the Ps.-Galen *Prognostica*.

⁶⁵ Ps.-Galen, *Liber de urinis* is the fusion of two uroscopic texts of the early Middle Ages, namely the later version of the text dubbed by Keil as the "Ps.-Galenic urine treatise" and the long version of the "Ps.-Galenic urine catalogue." See Keil, "Die urognostische Praxis" (n. 53 above), 34–36.

while Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 313 (s. X ex.)⁶⁶ joins the *Aphorismi* commentary to a pseudo-Hippocratic urine text. In Monte Cassino V. 97,⁶⁷ the *Aphorismi* commentary follows the *Aurelius-Esclapius* grouping, which in turn is preceded by Alexander of Tralles on pulses and urines. And, as mentioned above, Glasgow 96 (T.4.13) and Karlsruhe CXX also pair the standard *Aphorismi* commentary with a work on pulses.

The fact that configurations of texts resembling that of the diagnostic-prognostic component of the *Articella* predate the earliest surviving manuscripts of the *Articella* sheds new light on an already vigorous debate.⁶⁸ Danielle Jacquart and Mark Jordan have argued that the *Articella* represents a revival of the Ravenna tradition of commenting on an introductory corpus of didactic texts; this revival was stimulated by the medical theory conveyed through the *Isagoge*.⁶⁹ Both Jacquart and Jordan begin from the premise that what was being revived (or what survived) was the idea of a *didactic anthology*. Since the didactic anthology is an introduction to medical theory, its revival depended on a revival of interest in theory. Theory reappears with Constantine the African's translations of the *Isagoge* and the *Pantegni*. Therefore the *Isagoge* was the catalyst for the entire *Articella* anthology. In the words of Kristeller, the *Articella* "presupposes the work of Constantine though it cannot as a whole be attributed to him."⁷⁰

The conceptual priority of the *Isagoge* seems to be confirmed by the chronological priority of its oldest manuscripts, in which the *Isagoge* appears without any of the other *Articella* components, and that predate the oldest manuscripts of any other *Articella* texts. Monte Cassino 225 is a codex that dates from Constantine's lifetime — i.e., before about 1087 — but that came to the abbey from outside or at the very least was written by a scribe trained outside the abbey.⁷¹ Apart from the *Isagoge*, this volume contains a

⁶⁶ Beccaria, *I codici* (n. 31 above), 126.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁶⁸ For a summary of the issue, see L. Garcia-Ballester's introduction to *Practical Medicine from Salerno to the Black Death*, ed. L. Garcia-Ballester, R. French, J. Arrizabalaga, and A. Cunningham (Cambridge, 1994), 13–29.

⁶⁹ Danielle Jacquart, "Aristotelian Thought in Salerno," in *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (n. 37 above), 412; M. D. Jordan, "Medicine as Science," and *idem*, "The Construction of a Philosophical Medicine" (n. 27 above).

⁷⁰ Kristeller, "Bartholomaeus" (n. 27 above), 70.

⁷¹ F. Newton, "Constantine the African" (n. 28 above), 27–29, and *Scriptorium and Library* (n. 28 above), 263, described by D. Maurus Inguanez, *Catalogus*, 3 vols. (Monte Cassino, 1928–34), 2:263–64. Glaze, "Perforated Wall" (n. 19 above), 186, draws attention to the twelfth-century catalogue of St. Angelo in Formis, which records what seems to be an isolated *Isagoge*. This is significant because St. Angelo in 1089 was granted control of St. Agatha in Aversa, the foundation Constantine himself had given to Monte Cassino on his entry into the monastic life.

strikingly old-fashioned collection of early medieval Latin medical texts, many of which are also found in older Monte Cassino manuscripts like Monte Cassino 97.⁷² Paris, BNF nouv. acq. lat. 1628 is also in Beneventan script, but not in the Monte Cassino style, and is dated by Francis Newton to 1075–95.⁷³ In both these manuscripts, the text of the *Isagoge* is incomplete. Neither manuscript copies from the other, though they are related. Both show signs of being copied from a work in progress, on which a translator and at least one assistant with a more polished Latin style collaborated. It is known that Constantine required editorial help with his Latin style.⁷⁴ Finally, the version of the *Isagoge* in these two ancient manuscripts is quite different from the “vulgate” version found in the *Articella*.⁷⁵ For these reasons, scholars have been reluctant to date the formation of the *Articella* before 1100; the *Isagoge* had to come first, and the pre-1100 manuscripts of the *Isagoge* have no *Articella* material. Kristeller summarized these conclusions thus: “The core of the group of texts later known as *Articella* was formed early in the twelfth century, but we do not know where or by whom. . . . Since the first text, Johannitius, appears separately in manuscripts before 1100 and always remained the first text in the developing [*Articella*], we may assume that the collection originated by appending the other texts to the *Isagoge*.”⁷⁶ But the fact that the *Isagoge* is always positioned as the first text in the *Articella* anthology does not mean that it was the first text to be translated, or the text that drove the compilation of the anthology. The Gospels are the first books in the New Testament, but the Pauline epistles are older. And Kristeller himself acknowledged that, apart from the *Isagoge*, none of the component texts of the *Articella* are connected to Constantine.⁷⁷

If we set aside the *Isagoge*, the *Articella* is clearly a *thematic* text-corpus, the theme being diagnosis and prognosis. However, the translations of the *Aphorismi* and *Prognostica* included in the *Articella* were new ones, and the texts of Philaretus and Theophilus were apparently unknown in the Latin West prior to the *Articella*. In short, while the template of the diagnostic-

⁷² Newton, “Constantine the African,” 28–29; on Monte Cassino 97, see Beccaria, *I codici*, 95.

⁷³ Newton, “Constantine the African,” 28; *Scriptorium and Library*, 263.

⁷⁴ Newton, “Constantine the African,” 38–39.

⁷⁵ This has been pointed out in the critiques of Maurach’s edition cited above, n. 29; see also Newton, “Constantine the African,” 33.

⁷⁶ Kristeller, “Bartholomaeus,” 66.

⁷⁷ “Thus the origin of the *Articella* still presents a number of unresolved problems, and the traditional view that links it with Constantine is subject to serious doubts and in need of much further investigation. Constantine probably translated Johannitius, but it is doubtful whether the two Hippocrates translations belong to him, and the other three pieces have nothing to do with him” (Kristeller “Bartholomaeus,” 70).

prognostic section of the *Articella* can be detected in early medieval manuscripts, its actual contents are either new or “renovated.”⁷⁸ If we add the *Isagoge* to the diagnostic-prognostic section, however, the *Articella* starts to look more like the *didactic* Ravenna anthology, for the *Isagoge* is a summary of Galen’s *Ars medica* or *Tegni*, one of the elements of the old Ravenna teaching corpus. After the mid-twelfth century, the *Tegni* was actually included in the *Articella*, possibly under the influence of Bartholomaeus of Salerno, whose suite of *Articella* commentaries included one on the *Tegni*.⁷⁹ The *Isagoge* and, a fortiori, the *Tegni* alter the character of the anthology. It now becomes a collection of texts on medical theory, and this change is reflected in the earliest suites of commentaries. The Chartres and Digby commentaries on the *Aphorismi*, for example, open by arguing that Hippocrates’ work was written to refute the Empiricists and Methodists, and proceed to give an account of their doctrines. The influence of the old Ravenna didactic anthology is palpable here, for the Ravenna syllabus prescribed Galen’s *De sectis* as the first work to be studied, to be followed by the *Tegni*.⁸⁰ But the fact remains, and has been pointed out notably by Joan Cadden, that the *Articella* is not fundamentally a theoretical collection. What orients it towards theory is, first, the addition of the *Isagoge* (and later, the *Tegni*), and second, the earliest commentaries with their pervasive Constantinian influence. What links the two, in her view, is an interest in a text-based study of medicine and a shared background in a monastic medical culture.⁸¹ We shall return to the latter point shortly.

But if we accept the conventional argument that Constantine the African’s translation of the *Isagoge* was the grain of sand around which the pearl of the *Articella* formed, we must still explain how a synopsis of Galenic theory could stimulate the creation of an anthology otherwise exclusively

⁷⁸ Only one twelfth-century *Articella* MS contains the Ravenna translation of *Aphorismi* rather than the new one, namely Paris, BNF lat. 7029. In a way this exception proves the rule: copyists initially understood the *Articella* to be a *template* rather than a particular canonized ensemble of texts. Commentators on the *Aphorismi* also frequently alluded to the readings of the older translation, and as noted above, it had certain advantages over the new translation. It should be noted that O’Boyle’s claim that the *Articella* in Paris, BNF lat. 7102 also contains the Ravenna translation is not correct, nor is his statement that the new translation gradually displaced the older one. See O’Boyle, *The Art of Medicine*, 104–5 n. 75. All twelfth-century MSS of the *Articella* apart from the Paris 7029 contain the new translation.

⁷⁹ Kristeller, “Bartholomaeus,” 72.

⁸⁰ “Volentibus legere medicinam prius oportet legere Peri ereseon et sic ad Artem uenire et ad alias actiones” (Agnellus of Ravenna, *Lectures on Galen’s De Sectis* 8, ed. Seminar Classics 609 [State University of New York at Buffalo, Dept. of Classics, 1981], 36).

⁸¹ J. Cadden, *The Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1993), 68–69.

devoted to works on diagnosis and prognosis. If, on the other hand, we posit that the new Hippocrates translations and those of Theophilus and Philaretus were made before, or apart from, the *Isagoge*, we must explain why they were made at all. In either case, the question remains why the two parts of the anthology, theory and diagnosis-prognosis, were joined.

In fact, there is evidence that the retranslation of the *Aphorismi* was undertaken before the *Isagoge* was turned into Latin. The key figure here is Alfanus, archbishop of Salerno from 1058 until his death in 1085, an energetic ecclesiastic, a translator of Greek texts, and a man deeply involved in medicine.⁸² He also composed elegant Latin poetry, including *tituli* for the new basilica at Monte Casino erected by his friend — and former patient — abbot Desiderius.⁸³ Despite an early monastic career, Alfanus was temperamentally attuned to the turbulent world of politics and churchmanship in eleventh-century Italy. He became archbishop of Salerno in 1058, and in 1062 accompanied its last reigning Lombard prince, Gisulf II, ostensibly on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but in fact on a diplomatic mission to form an alliance with the Byzantines against Robert Guiscard. On Gisulf's account, Alfanus was held hostage in Constantinople; it was possibly during this enforced sojourn that he encountered some of the materials he later translated, or caused to be translated. When the Normans took Salerno in 1076 (incidentally, about the time when Anselm was engaging Maurice to copy the Canterbury medical codex), Alfanus had already nimbly switched sides. By 1080, his new lord, Robert Guiscard, had constructed a cathedral at Salerno to house the body of St. Matthew, which had been discovered by Alfanus himself. The building was dedicated in 1085 by Pope Gregory VII, whose vision of church reform was strongly supported by both Alfanus and Desiderius. In the midst of all this activity, Alfanus was also active in pursuing medical learning. He had been trained as a doctor, and his medical interests are reflected in his poetry.⁸⁴ He is alleged to be the author of at

⁸² Alfanus's career is summarized by R. Creutz in "Erzbischof Alfanus I., ein frühsalernitanischer Arzt," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens* 16 (1929): 413–32; 17 (1930): 205–8; and idem, "Nachtrag zu Erzbischof Alfanus I," *ibid.*, 17 (1930): 205–8. See also A. Lentini, "Alfano," *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 2 (Rome, 1960), 253–57.

⁸³ Bloch, *Montecassino in the Middle Ages* (n. 38 above), 1:41, 53. Alfanus's poetry has been edited by A. Lentini and F. Avagliano, *I carmi di Alfano I arcivescovo di Salerno*, *Miscellanea cassinese* 38 (Montecassino, 1974).

⁸⁴ On evidence of Alfanus's medical training, see Creutz, "Erzbischof Alfanus," 415. Medical metaphors for religious themes can be found in his poem entitled *Oratio seu confessio* (ed. Lentini and Avagliano, *I carmi di Alfano*, 130, lines 109–17 and 131, lines 140–41), and he praises Salerno as a centre of the "medical art" in his poem addressed to Guido of Salerno (brother of Gisulf): 150, lines 21–22; see N. Acocella, "La figura e l'opera di Alfano I di Salerno," *Rassegna storia salernitana* 19 (1958): 10.

least two medical works, *De pulsibus* and *De quatuor humoribus*, neither of which survives in its original form.⁸⁵ Medieval manuscripts assign other works to him as well, notably an *Antidotarium* or *Experimenta* (Cambridge, Trinity College 1365, s. XII), a *liber de medicina* formerly in the Chapter library at Westminster,⁸⁶ and — most significant for our inquiry — a treatise entitled *De quibusdam questionibus medicalibus* that is recorded in Prior Eastry's catalogue (1284–1331) of the books at Christ Church, Canterbury.⁸⁷ But his fame largely rests on his translation of bishop Nemesius of Emesa's *De natura hominis*, a work of theological anthropology shot through with references to Galenic physiology.⁸⁸ Alfanus's Nemesius translation was a highly influential work, and its earliest manuscripts stem from northern France and England.⁸⁹ Not only was it used by the first *Articella* commentators, but it joins the Digby commentaries and the *Pantegni* as one of the

⁸⁵ P. Capparoni, *Il "De quatuor humoribus corporis humani" di Alfano I Arcivescovo di Salerno* (Rome, 1928). The *De pulsibus* has been edited twice, namely by P. Capparoni, *Il "Tractatus de pulsibus" di Alfano Io arcivescovo di Salerno, s. XI: Trascrizione del codice 1024 della biblioteca dell'Arsenale di Parigi (da carta 16v a carta 18r)* (Rome, 1936), and R. Creutz, "Der frühsalernitaner Alfanus und sein bislang unbekannter 'Liber de pulsibus,'" *Sudhoffs Archiv* 29 (1937): 57–83. Both editions are based on MS Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 1024, but Capparoni is more sanguine than Creutz that the text is substantially Alfanus's. In its present form, it is much closer to Gilles de Corbeil's famous work on pulses than to (for example) Philaretus. On Alfanus's medical output in general, see Ernest Wickersheimer, "Note sur les oeuvres médicales d'Alphane, archevêque de Salerne," *Janus* 34 (1930): 273–78; and idem, "Note sur les oeuvres médicales d'Alphane, archevêque de Salerne," in *Atti dell'VIII Congresso internazionale di Storia della medicina (Roma 1930)* (Pisa, 1931), 108–11.

⁸⁶ J. A. Robinson and M. R. James, *The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey* (Cambridge, 1909), 33.

⁸⁷ M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (n. 24 above), 59. Brian Lawn points out that if this work is authentic, and if the manuscript at Canterbury was contemporary with Alfanus, Alfanus himself could have been the channel through which the older Graeco-Latin medical questions found their way into the compilation known as the *Salernitan Questions*. See *The Salernitan Questions: An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature* (Oxford, 1963), 19 and 37 n. 3.

⁸⁸ *Nemesii episcopi Premnon physicon . . . a N. Alfano . . . in latinum translatus*, ed. C. Burkhard (Leipzig, 1917). See also C. Baeumker, "Die Übersetzung des Alfanus von Nemesius," *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 13 (1896): 1095–1102.

⁸⁹ See Burkhard's introduction, v–vii. The manuscripts in question are Paris, BNF lat. 15078 (s. XI–XII); Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale 221 (s. XII ex.); and London, BL Cotton Galba E.IV (ca. 1161–1200), from Bury St. Edmund's, and which contains, or once contained, a number of works of "Salernitan" character. See R. C. Dales, "Anonymi de elementis: From a Twelfth-Century Collection of Scientific Works in British Museum MS Cotton Galba E. IV," *Isis* 56 (1965): 174–75; idem, *Marius: On the Elements; A Critical Edition and Translation* (Berkeley, 1976), 7–10; and Rodney M. Thomson, "Liber Marii de Elementis, The Work of a Hitherto Unknown Salernitan Master?" *Viator* 3 (1972): 179–84.

sources of the medical information for William of Conches's *De philosophia mundi*.⁹⁰ It is, in fact, a foundational document in the new "theoretical" medicine.

Alfanus has long been associated with the genesis of the *Articella*, in part because of his patronage of Constantine the African, and in part because he or someone in his circle was probably responsible for the new translation of the *Aphorismi*. Kristeller was initially of the opinion that Alfanus himself was the translator, but later nuanced his view; the new translation of the *Aphorisms* was made at the beginning of the twelfth century by a student of Alfanus.⁹¹ This revision seems not to be based on textual analysis or external evidence, but on the assumption that the new translation of the *Aphorismi* could not have antedated Constantine's translation of the *Isagoge*. But were it not for this a priori assumption, Alfanus would be a very likely candidate for the translator. To begin with, there are affinities between the vocabulary of his translation of Nemesius and that of the *Articella* translation of the *Aphorismi*. Jacquart has pointed out that the Latin Nemesius (and incidentally, the *Isagoge* too, which supports the case for Alfanus's involvement in Constantine's project) consistently prefers *fel* to *colera* (red bile) and *epar* to *iecur* (liver).⁹² This is also the case for the new *Aphorismi* translation; indeed the use of *fel* stands out as a rare instance when the *Articella* version of the *Aphorismi* prefers a Latin term over a Greek word.⁹³ Moreover, Alfanus was certainly acquainted with other elements of what would become the *Articella*, such as the *Tegni* of Galen, which he mentioned in a letter to Abbot Desiderius.⁹⁴ To be sure, there is no direct evidence that he was aware of, or involved in, the translation of the *Prognostica*, Theophilus, or Philaretus. Indeed, the *Articella* version of the Hippocratic *Prognostica* was to all appearances translated from the Ara-

⁹⁰ T. Silverstein, "Guillaume de Conches and Nemesius of Emesa: On the Sources of the 'New Science' of the Twelfth Century," in *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1965), 2:719–34.

⁹¹ Kristeller, "Antichi commentatori dell'*Articella*" (n. 27 above), 148. In "Bartolomeus" (n. 27 above), 66–67, he seems to argue on circumstantial evidence that it was Alfanus himself who translated the *Aphorismi*.

⁹² Jacquart, "Les traducteurs du XI^e siècle" (n. 69 above), 422–23. Jacquart argues that this vocabulary draws on Vindicianus Afer's *Epistola ad Pentadium*, which was available at Monte Cassino (e.g., in MS 97) and even accompanies the *Isagoge* in its oldest manuscript, Monte Cassino 225.

⁹³ For *fel*, see 4.22–24, 4.28 (the Ravenna translation uses *colera*) (n. 42 above). The Latin words for "liver" — *iecur* and *epar* — are in fact derived from the same Indo-Germanic root, but *iecur* is the established Latin form, and *epar* a transliteration of the Greek which appears in late Latin. The *Articella* translator consistently prefers *epar* and the Ravenna translation *iecur* (5.57, 6.42, 7.17).

⁹⁴ Bloch, *Monte Cassino* (n. 38 above), 1:100.

bic; Bengt Alexanderson favors the hypothesis that the translator was Constantine the African.⁹⁵ The history of the text of Theophilus Protospatharius's *De urinis* and Philaretus's *De pulsibus* is even more obscure. Kristeller claimed that Theophilus was translated some time after 1100,⁹⁶ but again, this may be based on an assumption that the *Isagoge* had to be the first text in the *Articella*. No hypothesis has been advanced as to when or where Philaretus was translated, and the surviving — and much altered — version of Alfanus's *De pulsibus* shows only some vague points of similarity to Philaretus. There seems no doubt, however, that Philaretus and Theophilus were translated from the Greek, and Gerhard Baader credits Alfanus's translation of Nemesius with directly influencing the Latin vocabulary they used.⁹⁷ It should also be noted that Theophilus's *Aphorismi* commentary is cited in the Old Latin Commentary on the *Aphorismi*;⁹⁸ we must at least keep open the possibility that Alfanus not only imported Nemesius from Constantinople but also took advantage of his journey to the Greek world to procure the work of a writer known, if only at second hand, through the study of the *Aphorismi*.

To sum up, three of the four elements of the diagnostic-prognostic section of the *Articella* were translated from Greek into Latin, and one of them, the *Aphorismi*, has been associated with Alfanus. While the *Prognostica* was probably translated from Arabic, no attempt was made to draw attention to this fact by the translator; this suggests that the person or circle respon-

⁹⁵ B. Alexanderson, *Die hippokratische Schrift Prognostikon* (Stockholm, 1963), 170–73. Jordan, “Medicine as Science” (n. 27 above), 126, claims that both Hippocratic texts in the *Articella* were translated from the Arabic “perhaps by Constantine or his colleagues,” but the consensus at present is that the new *Aphorismi* translation was made from the Greek. While Kristeller accepted the Arabic origin of the *Articella* vulgate *Prognostica* text, he was less certain about Constantine's role, particularly since the translation of Galen's commentary on the *Prognostica*, possibly also by Constantine, is quite different (“Antichi commentatori dell'*Articella*,” 145–46). Kristeller points out that Kibre's *Hippocrates latinus* omits some very early, twelfth-century MSS, and that the incipits cited for the prologue and the text actually come from two different translations, one (the *Articella* vulgate) from the Arabic (“Omnis qui medicine”), and another from the Greek (“Videtur mihi ut sit”) (ibid., 146). Peter the Deacon lists the *Prognostica* amongst Constantine's works (see Bloch, *Monte Cassino*, 1:129: *Prognostica* is no. 19 on the list), and Bloch regards it as the *Articella* vulgate translation (ibid., 1:133).

⁹⁶ Kristeller, “Bartholomaeus,” 69.

⁹⁷ G. Baader, “Die Entwicklung der medizinischen Fachsprache im frühen Mittelalter,” in *Medizin im mittelalterlichen Abendland* (n. 27 above), 417–22, and “Early Medieval Latin Adaptations of Byzantine Medicine in Western Europe,” in *Symposium on Byzantine Medicine*, ed. J. Scarborough, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 38 (Washington, DC, 1984), 259. A detailed comparison of the language of the Latin Nemesius and the *Articella*'s Philaretus and Theophilus would test this interesting suggestion.

⁹⁸ Beccaria, “Sulle tracce II” (n. 31 above); 55 nn. 2–3.

sible for reconstructing the old diagnostic-prognostic corpus from newly available or freshly translated texts was intent to emphasize its Greek character. Alfanus was certainly interested in endowing medicine with intellectual support from Greek philosophical and scientific culture — and so was his protégé, Constantine.⁹⁹ The Hellenizing policy behind the *Articella* project is most clearly revealed in the *Isagoge*, which, though it was translated from the Arabic, was given a Greek title that has no connection to its original Arabic title. The choice of this title is another clue that the designers of the *Articella* wanted to refurbish a recognized early medieval model of medical literature. Jacquart proposes that the title was borrowed from a phrase in the Ravenna translation of Galen's *De sectis* — the commentator refers to *De sectis* as one of the *isagogai* of medicine — and that this supports the view that the *Articella* was designed as a revived version of the Ravenna didactic anthology.¹⁰⁰ But the Ravenna commentary did not enjoy a wide diffusion: it survives in only two Carolingian manuscripts, namely Milan Ambrosiana G 108 inf. and Karlsruhe CXX (discussed above). Jacquart also draws attention to another possible source, and a more likely one, for the title: the *Isagoge* or *Quaestiones medicinales* of Ps.-Soranus, a synopsis in question-and-answer form of basic medical concepts and vocabulary.¹⁰¹ Its early medieval diffusion was no more extensive than that of the Ravenna commentary but, unlike the commentary, it continued to be copied in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, particularly in manuscripts linked with “Salernitan” materials.¹⁰² Its content is very similar in character to the *Articella Isagoge*; indeed, Brian Lawn has remarked the Ps.-Soranus *Isagoge* shows that familiarity with theoretical dimensions of Galenism did not have to await the arrival of Constantine.¹⁰³ It is also interesting to note that the Arabic original of the *Articella Isagoge* was originally in question-and-answer format, like Ps.-Soranus.¹⁰⁴ This opens up the possibility that the translation of Hunayn's *Isagoge* was commissioned as part of the same project to recon-

⁹⁹ Ballester, *Practical Medicine* (n. 68 above), 13–14.

¹⁰⁰ Jacquart, “À l'aube” (n. 40 above), 234.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 234. Ps.-Soranus has been edited by V. Rose, *Anecdota graeca et graeco-latina* (n. 59 above), 2:243–74. See also K.-D. Fischer, “Beiträge zu den pseudosoranischen *Quaestiones medicinales*,” in *Text and Tradition: Studies in Ancient Medicine and Its Transmission Presented to Jutta Kollesch*, ed. idem, *Studies in Ancient Medicine* 18 (Leiden, 1998), 1–54, and idem, “The ‘Isagoge’ of Pseudo-Soranus: An Analysis of the Contents of a Medieval Introduction to the Art of Medicine,” *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 35 (2000): 3–30.

¹⁰² For example, London BL Cotton Galba E. IV from Bury St. Edmunds (see n. 89 above).

¹⁰³ Lawn, *Salernitan Questions* (n. 87 above), 12.

¹⁰⁴ The question and answer format of Hunayn's original text was restored in the new Latin translation made in the thirteenth century by Rufinus of Alexandria and Dominicus Marroccianus. Jordan, “Medicine as Science,” 123.

struct medical knowledge as produced the diagnosis-prognosis component of the *Articella*. The new *Isagoge*, borrowing its name from the Ps.-Soranus *Isagoge*, would, like its predecessor, supply an overview of Galenic medical theory.

The Greek pretensions of the *Isagoge* are also indicated by the hellenization of the author's name as "Joannitius." The earliest commentaries were taken in by the ruse and identified "Joannitius" with a relative of John of Alexandria, a late antique author of commentaries on the works of Hippocrates, or with John himself.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, Constantine the African habitually hid the Arabic origin of all the works he translated by effacing references to Arabic writers and cloaking the new translation in a mantle of Greek.¹⁰⁶ Though he apparently knew no Greek himself and actually used Greek terms rather sparingly, Constantine was occasionally given to self-conscious, even pretentious Hellenisms,¹⁰⁷ at least one of which was derived, significantly, from the Ps.-Soranus *Isagoge*.¹⁰⁸ This predilection strongly suggests that Constantine was writing for an audience and for patrons who were interested in validating Greek medical learning; chief amongst these was archbishop Alfanus of Salerno.¹⁰⁹

There are two final pieces of evidence that would support the view that Constantine's patron or patrons already had a proto-*Articella* in hand at the time that he was working on the *Isagoge* translation. First, Hunayn's text

¹⁰⁵ Jacquart, "À l'aube," 231–32. Gracia and Vidal, "La 'Isagoge' de Ioannitius" (n. 29 above), 301–2, continue to argue for the Greek identity of "Joannitius" and a Greek original of the *Isagoge*. This is dismissed by Jordan, "Medicine as Science," 125–26.

¹⁰⁶ Jacquart, "Le sens donné par Constantin l'Africain à son oeuvre: les chapitres introductifs en arabe et en latin," in *Constantine the African* (n. 28 above), 72–76.

¹⁰⁷ G. Strohmaier, "Constantine's Pseudo-Classical Terminology and Its Survival," in *Constantine the African*, 90–98; Jacquart, "À l'aube," 231, points out a case of Constantine "showing off" by using a Greek term when an acceptable Latin one was available, which is redolent of the style of the *Articella Aphorismi*.

¹⁰⁸ D. Jacquart, "Les antécédants gréco-latins de l'*Isagoge Iohannitii*," in *Tradición y innovación de la medicina latina de la Antigüedad y de la Alta Edad Media*, ed. M. E. Vázquez-Buján (Santiago de Compostella, 1994), 77–86, esp. 85 re the use of *zotica* as a synonym for "vital (spirit)."

¹⁰⁹ The theme of the Greek nature of the new medicine is picked up early in the following century by Adelard of Bath, who with reference to medicine urges students to abandon "the schools of Gaul (*Gallica studia*)" for those of Greece. Adelard also claims to cite a nameless "Greek philosopher who, more than anything else, could talk about the art of medicine and the nature of things" whom he had met when traveling "from Salerno to Magna Graecia" (*De eodem et diverso*, in *Adelard of Bath: Conversations with His Nephew*, ed. and trans C. Burnett, Cambridge Medieval Classics 9 [Cambridge, 1998], 70–71). The connection of Salerno to Greek learning, setting aside the question of the real existence of Adelard's "philosopher," is significant, especially since Adelard likes to vaunt the superiority of Arabic learning: J. Jolivet, "The Arabic Inheritance," in *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (n. 37 above), 134.

contained a substantial section on pulse and urine diagnosis that Constantine dropped.¹¹⁰ This omission can best be explained by assuming that Constantine's patrons already had suitable texts on these subjects, namely Philaretus and Theophilus, and that they did not wish these topics to be duplicated in the finished anthology. To put it another way, the diagnostic-prognostic anthology dictated the final shape of the *Isagoge*, not vice-versa. A second clue that Constantine and his patrons were interested in the *Isagoge* as an enhancement for an updated and upgraded diagnostic-prognostic anthology comes from a group of manuscripts in which the Old Latin Commentary to the *Aphorismi* is preceded by a prologue beginning: "Medicina partitur secundum minorem partitionem in duas partes, id est theorica et practica."¹¹¹ In form and content, this prologue closely resembles both chapter 5 of the Ravenna commentary on *De sectis* and the *Articella's Isagoge*.¹¹² Constantine himself might have known this prologue from Monte Cassino 97, and Alfanus most certainly would have known it, for it appears in Vatican City, BAV Barbarini lat. 160 (fol. 143), a manuscript given to Alfanus by Bishop Atto of Cieti.¹¹³ It describes the division of medicine into theory and practice; the division of theory into physiology, pathology and semiotics, and the division of physiology into six parts: elements, humors, natures, members, virtues, and perfections. The four elements and qualities are discussed, as are homogenous and organic members, and so on. To put it another way, the Old Latin *Aphorismi* commentary had been prefaced by a quasi-*Isagoge* for centuries. What Constantine provided for his patrons was a superior version of this theoretical introduction (the *Articella's Isagoge* is much fuller than this prologue) to preface the upgraded translation of the *Aphorismi*.¹¹⁴ It is worth noting that in the earliest manuscripts of the *Arti-*

¹¹⁰ Jacquart, "À l'aube," 214–15.

¹¹¹ See Kibre, *Hippocrates Latinus* (n. 34 above), 34–38. The manuscripts containing this prologue are: s. VIII: Bern 611; s. IX: Glasgow, Hunter 96 (T.4.13), Karlsruhe CXX, Paris, BNF 7027; s. X: Einsiedeln 313, Glasgow, Hunter 404 (V.3.2), Monte Cassino 97; s. XI: Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 3426, Vatican City, BAV Barb. lat. 160; s. XII: Escorial N.111.17, Paris, BNF lat. 7029. The prologue was edited from the Monte Cassino manuscript by S. De Renzi, *Collectio salernitana* 1 (Naples, 1852), 87–88, and by Giuseppe Flammini, "Le strutture prefatorie del commento all'antica traduzione latine degli 'Aforismi,'" in *Prefazioni, prologhi, proemi di opere tecnico-scientifiche latine*, ed. C. Santini and N. Scivoletto (Rome, 1992), 2:579–616 at 591–92, from the Karlsruhe, Paris lat. 7027, Monte Cassino, and both Glasgow manuscripts.

¹¹² Agnellus of Ravenna, *Lectures on Galen's de Sectis* (n. 80 above), 24–27; cf. Jacquart, "À l'aube" (n. 40 above), 234.

¹¹³ F. Newton, *Scriptorium and Library* (n. 28 above), 245–47; cf. Glaze, "Perforated Wall" (n. 19 above), 56 n. 82.

¹¹⁴ The parallels between the *Medicina partitur* prologue and the *Isagoge* are briefly pointed out by Jacquart, "À l'aube," 234, and idem, "Les traducteurs du XI^e siècle" (n. 40 above), 424, and by Glaze, "Perforated Wall," 54–56, but not in the context of the

cella, the *Isagoge* always precedes the *Aphorismi*.¹¹⁵ It is only after the middle of the twelfth century, when the *Tegni* was added to the anthology, that the *Aphorismi* was displaced from its position just after the *Isagoge*, and the *Isagoge* became an “introduction” to the *Tegni* instead.¹¹⁶ Even so, the process was a gradual one; older manuscripts of the expanded, six-text *Articella* place the *Tegni* at the end, and it was Bartholomaeus of Salerno’s innovation to move it up to a position just behind the *Isagoge*. Moreover, in some twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts, the *Isagoge* appears with only the *Aphorismi*¹¹⁷ or the *Aphorismi* and *Prognostica*.¹¹⁸ In sum, the *Isagoge* was clearly regarded as a prefatory piece to the *Aphorismi* by those who compiled the *Articella*, analogous to the older *Medicina partitur* prologue. The evidence strongly suggests that it was the diagnostic-prognostic anthology that “sought out” the *Isagoge*, and not the *Isagoge* that inspired the creation of the diagnostic-prognostic anthology.

Nonetheless, Jacquart and others are totally correct when they observe that the fusion of the *Isagoge* and the diagnostic-prognostic anthology determined the *Articella*’s character. Permanent association with the *Isagoge* reinvented the anthology as *semiotica*, the branch of theory dealing in signs, by furnishing the key to interpreting the signs discernible in pulse, urine, and so forth. In the early medieval diagnostic-prognostic texts, the key was either missing altogether or present only by implication. Urine and pulse diagnostics, for example, seem to be based on apparently arbitrary codifications devoid of underlying rationale, or on an implicit “connoisseurship.”¹¹⁹ By

historical circumstances of the formation of the *Articella*. See, however, Glaze’s perceptive remarks at page 172 on Constantine’s project as an acceleration of the reevaluation of medical thought and literature initiated by Gariopontus of Salerno and Alfanus.

¹¹⁵ Kristeller, “Bartholomaeus” (n. 27 above), 66.

¹¹⁶ The fact that the *Isagoge* was an introduction to the *Tegni* was certainly known to the earliest commentators, such as the Digby glossator, who remarks that Galen composed “quendam librum qui *Tegni* id est ars intitulatur composuit. Sed quia liber iste tante difficultatis erat ut penitus a scolaribus dimitteretur, Iohannicius, Iohannis Alexandrini discipulus, hac de causa inductus has *Ysagogas* id est introductiones composuit, ut ad librum Galieni facilius esset aditus” (Bodleian Library, Digby 108, fol. 4r). However, there are no Digby or Chartres commentaries on the *Tegni*.

¹¹⁷ For example, Edinburgh, National Library Advocates 18.3.13 (s. XIII) (*Summary Catalogue of the Advocates Manuscripts* [Edinburgh, 1971], 108, no. 1407, and 111, no. 1440). However, as the *Aphorismi* ends incomplete, it is possible the codex once contained other *Articella* texts. Cf. Edinburgh, University Library 163 (Bury St. Edmund’s, s. XII) which contains only the *Isagoge*, *Tegni*, and *Aphorismi*. See n. 41 above.

¹¹⁸ For example, Cambridge, Peterhouse 247 pt. 3 (s. XII–XIII). See M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1899), 300–302.

¹¹⁹ For a fuller discussion, see F. Wallis, “Signs and Senses: Diagnosis and Prognosis in Early Medieval Pulse and Urine Texts,” in *The Year 1000: Medical Practice at the End of*

contrast, the physiological and pathological schemata set forth in the *Isagoge* provide a different kind of the conceptual key to the diagnostic-prognostic anthology of the *Articella*, one that emphasizes the logical coherence of the body's systems and the relationship of the body's outwardly perceptible signs to its inner workings.¹²⁰

When set in the context of the *Articella* as a whole, it therefore seems probable that the *Isagoge* was the last element of the *Articella* to be completed, and not the first. However, internal and external evidence suggests that it was completed, at least in draft form, at a fairly early stage in Constantine's career, when he was still in Salerno and working under the patronage of Alfanus.¹²¹ As Alfanus died in 1085, Anselm could well have commissioned the copying of an *Articella*-in-progress in the late 1070s.

FROM ITALY TO ENGLAND: PATHS OF TRANSMISSION OF MEDICAL LEARNING IN THE LATE ELEVENTH CENTURY

If the manuscript Maurice was copying was a proto-*Articella*, either it or (depending on one's reading of *ignota inusitataque scriptura*) its exemplar at some remove came northwards to Canterbury from the region of Monte Cassino and Salerno. When and how might it have reached Canterbury? Negative evidence points to the post-Conquest period, if only because Alfanus's activities largely postdate 1066. Moreover, the only pre-Conquest manuscript from Christ Church containing medical material — Cotton Vitellius C iii, a classic *Herbarium*-corpus comprising Antonius Musa, Ps.-Apuleius, Ps.-Dioscorides's *Medicina ex herbis femininis*, and Sextus Placitus's *Medicina ex quadrupedibus* — is fairly conservative in character. These texts had been known in England for some time; Ps.-Apuleius and the *Medicina ex quadrupedibus* had been translated into Old English, the latter as many as four times.¹²² Though text-ensembles of this type are represented in contemporary Monte Cassino manuscripts — notably in the earliest manuscripts of

the First Millennium, ed. P. Horden and E. Savage-Smith, *Social History of Medicine* 13 (2000): 265–78.

¹²⁰ See Wallis, "Inventing Diagnosis" (n. 29 above), *passim*. As *semiotica*, one of the three branches of medical theory set forth in Galen's *Tegni* — body, sign, and cause — the *Articella* becomes an element in a potentially integrated program of medical knowledge. It is possible that early Salernitan anatomy, along with the *theorica* of the *Pantegni*, was designed to supply the element of "body."

¹²¹ F. Newton, "Constantine the African" (n. 28 above), 39; Jacquart, "À l'aube," 235; *idem*, "Les traductions du XI^e siècle," 419.

¹²² M. L. Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine* (Cambridge, 1993), chaps. 8 and 11; *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de Quadrupedibus*, ed. H. J. de Vriend, EETS 286 (Oxford, 1984).

the *Isagoge*, Monte Cassino 225 — they belong to a tradition of medical learning that is older than, and quite distinct from, the *Articella*.

Assuming that Maurice's manuscript arrived in Canterbury in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest, we are still left with few clues concerning the route it took. Sweeping assertions, such as C. H. Talbot's claim that "at the Conquest in 1066 William brought in his train a group of distinguished physicians whose interests were predominantly medical, and it is to them that any change in outlook and any enrichment of medical literature must be attributed,"¹²³ are not especially helpful, as the actual evidence for the chronology of their arrival and mechanisms through which new medical texts allegedly reached England is limited. Amongst those of "William's train," according to Talbot, was Baldwin of Bury St. Edmund's. In fact, Baldwin was not brought over by William but appointed abbot of Bury in 1065 by Edward the Confessor. Something about his career as a practitioner is known — he was physician to William I and William II, and he treated bishop Herfast of Norwich and Lanfranc of Canterbury — but nothing about his medical knowledge.¹²⁴ Faricius of Arrezo presents a similar case. As abbot of Abingdon he had, as Talbot notes, *multos libros de physica* copied out. However, Faricius was not made abbot until 1100, having previously been a monk at Malmesbury.¹²⁵ The copying of medical texts at Abingdon is dated therefore after 1100 and does not help in identifying an immediately post-Conquest appearance for medical texts.

A more fruitful approach to the problem would be to study the importation of medical texts within the broader context of the effect of the Conquest on English library holdings and book production. It is by no means necessary to assume, as Talbot does, that only a "physician" — i.e., a practitioner in the restrictive sense — could have brought such a book to Canterbury. An interest in medical knowledge is surely related to interest in its application, but the parameters of that relationship are not entirely clear,

¹²³ Talbot, *Medicine in Medieval England* (n. 31 above), 46. For a similar assessment, see A. F. Dawtry, "The *Modus medendi* and the Benedictine Order in Anglo-Norman England," in *The Church and Healing*, ed. W. J. Sheils (Oxford, 1982), 25–37.

¹²⁴ A. Gransden, "Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, 1065–1097," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 4 (1981): 65–76 at 65–66; Hermann the Archdeacon, *De miraculis sancti Eadmundi*, in *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, 3 vols., Rolls Series 96 (London, 1890–96), 1:26–92, especially 62–64; Lanfranc, Letter 44, *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. and trans. H. V. Clover and M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1979). The Bury medical manuscripts mentioned above all date from the later twelfth century.

¹²⁵ Talbot, *Medicine in Medieval England*, 46. On Faricius see *Chronicon monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, 2 vols., Rolls Series 2 (London, 1858), 1:44–47, and on the books copied for Abingdon, Appendix II, *De abbatibus Abendonae*, *ibid.*, 289. See also William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, 3.88 (n. 17 above), 192.

especially in eleventh-century monastic circles. More progress might be made by treating the medical texts copied by Maurice in the context of the movement of other texts within the post-Conquest monastic milieu.

Richard Gameson's recent account of Anglo-Norman manuscript production and acquisition in the period after the Conquest characterizes libraries as consisting of core collections of similar texts surrounded by collections of rarer and more unusual works. As well, texts were collected in a disordered manner, based on what exemplars collectors could get their hands on.¹²⁶ Outside the desire for a core collection of, for example, certain patristic works, Bede, and a few more modern authors, collections varied considerably. "English book collections," writes Gameson, "were undoubtedly increasing in size, in some cases rapidly; but apart from in the best connected and most energetic houses, they were doing so on a fairly ad hoc basis."¹²⁷ The main rise in book acquisition and production comes at the turn of the eleventh century and the early twelfth century. The period ca. 1066–ca. 1080, with which we are concerned, is one of more limited growth, and, at Christ Church, Canterbury, of piecemeal collection.¹²⁸

It should be emphasized that an increase in book collections in post-Conquest England does not necessarily imply the superiority of Norman collections to those of the Anglo-Saxons. In fact, as the case of Anselm and the library at Bec shows, Norman collections were being built up at the same time.¹²⁹ Gameson's characterization of English libraries — a core collection surrounded by less familiar works — is one that works for the library at Fécamp, the only Norman library with an eleventh-century catalogue, and perhaps too at Bec.¹³⁰ The twelfth-century catalogue for Bec does include some real rarities such as the *Shepherd* of Hermas.¹³¹ Anselm's anxiety to find exemplars for copying and recopying fits the characterization as well, as does his desire to acquire new and unusual works. What is interesting is that the unusual works Anselm wanted were, in this case, medical; secondly, he found them in Canterbury; and thirdly, they arrived at Canterbury fairly quickly from their place of origin in southern Italy.

¹²⁶ Gameson, *Manuscripts of Early Norman England* (n. 16 above), 39–41.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 40.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 5–6, 16.

¹²⁹ Webber, "Patristic Content" (n. 16 above), *passim*.

¹³⁰ H. Omont, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, Tome I: *Rouen* (Paris, 1886), xxiii–xxv; B. Branch, "Inventories of the Library of Fécamp from the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Manuscripta* 23 (1979): 159–72.

¹³¹ Omont, *Catalogue Général . . .*, Tome II: *Rouen* (Paris, 1888), 379–99, entry 153 at 393.

Anselm, of course, had his own connections with south Italy. He was resident in the region during his first exile from Canterbury in the latter half of 1098, and stayed at a dependent house of the abbey of Telese in the diocese of Benevento as the guest of its abbot, John, a former monk of Bec. John's potential as a contact with the south of Italy as far as the texts at Canterbury are concerned is doubtful, however, since he had come to France, according to Eadmer, "attracted by the fame of Anselm, who was then abbot of Bec," that is, after 1078 and the correspondence with Maurice.¹³²

On the other hand, contact between Canterbury and the south of Italy did exist before the Norman Conquest. Eadmer's record of the journey he made as Anselm's companion to Rome and Bari, 1098–99, provides a good example. At a council in Bari, Anselm was called upon to defend the Latin position on the procession of the Holy Spirit against representatives of the Greek church. Eadmer's account of this episode is the only one we have, apart from the treatise written by Anselm later, based on the defense he had offered. More than half of Eadmer's account is devoted to the cope worn by the bishop of Benevento, Roffridus.¹³³ Eadmer identified the cope as of English manufacture and as originating from Canterbury. As it transpired, Queen Emma, wife first of Ethelred *Unraed* (978–1016) and then Cnut (1016–35), secured from the then bishop of Benevento, when he visited Canterbury, a relic of St. Bartholomew; the bishop in return received from the archbishop of Canterbury the cope and other gifts. Eadmer remembered being told the story of the exchange of gifts, which occurred some time in Cnut's reign, by elderly members of Canterbury who remembered it from their youth.

Contacts continued after the Norman Conquest. Aethelwine, a monk of Christ Church, went on pilgrimage to the Holy Land just before the First Crusade, in 1095, and traveled by way of Apulia.¹³⁴ Of even greater interest for the present discussion is the presence at Monte Cassino, during the abbacy of Desiderius, of an English goldsmith, and there are indications too that English book illumination was well known and influential at this south Italian house.¹³⁵ Artistic connections then existed between the south of Italy

¹³² Eadmer, *Historia novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, Rolls Series 81 (London, 1884), 96. For a biography of John see the note by R. W. Southern in his edition and translation of Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, 106 n. 1.

¹³³ Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, 107–10. The account of the council occupies pp. 104–10. For the identification of the bishop as Roffridus see Falco of Benevento, *Chronicon*, ed. L. A. Muratori, RIS 5 (Milan, 1724) (s.a. 1107 – death of Roffridus, Archbishop of Benevento for thirty-one years).

¹³⁴ V. Ortenberg, *The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Cultural, Spiritual and Artistic Exchanges* (Oxford, 1992), 104–5.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 104, 122–25.

and England, and particularly Canterbury. It is in this context reasonable to suggest that intellectual contact might have occurred as well.

A link between England and the south of Italy could have been forged by the presence of Norman families in both regions, bent on the same purpose: conquest, domination, and settlement. The Normans had appeared in south Italy in the early eleventh century and had begun to settle from the 1030s. Serious conquest got under way from the 1040s — the city of Bari, the Byzantine regional capital, falling in 1071. Sicily was also invested, with Noto, the last fortress under Muslim control, capitulating in 1091. In all cases Norman control was never absolute and the conquest remained, as Graham Loud has pointed out, incomplete.¹³⁶ Connections also remained between Normandy and the Normans of south Italy, some of which can be used to trace possible lines of contact to monastic houses and individuals of interest to the present purpose. Orderic Vitalis records the establishment of monks from his monastery of St. Evroul at La Trinita, Venosa, by Robert Guiscard in or around 1063.¹³⁷

Furthermore, connections between Lanfranc and Italy are also well documented. Lanfranc's fame as a teacher drew many to Bec in the mid-eleventh century. A tradition existed by the twelfth century that Pope Alexander II (1061–73) had been educated at Bec.¹³⁸ The truth of this is impossible to ascertain; Gibson notes that nothing is known of Alexander's life before he became bishop of Lucca in 1057, but that it was possible that he visited Bec in 1050–55.¹³⁹ But it does appear that various relations of Alexander, including his nephew, were sent to Lanfranc at Caen, as Nicholas II (1058–61) had sent his chaplains to Bec.¹⁴⁰ If Lanfranc's own relations with the papacy grew colder under Gregory VII (1073–85), this did not prevent regular contact between the English Church and Rome.¹⁴¹ One of the messengers Lanfranc sent to Rome was Henry, formerly monk of Bec and future prior of Canterbury. Some time in the 1070s Anselm wrote to Henry gently chastizing him for not visiting Bec on one such journey.¹⁴²

¹³⁶ G. Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard* (London, 2000), passim, quotation from 145.

¹³⁷ Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History* (n. 17 above), 2:100.

¹³⁸ Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, 11; Milo Crispin, *Vita Lanfranci*, 11, ed. M. T. Gibson, in *Lanfranco di Pavia e l'Europa del secolo XI, nel IX centenario della morte (1089–1989)*, ed. G. d'Onofrio (Rome, 1993), 697.

¹³⁹ Gibson, *Lanfranc* (n. 9 above), 197.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 103 and Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, 19–20.

¹⁴¹ On Lanfranc and Gregory VII see H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Lanfranc, the Papacy and the See of Canterbury," in *Lanfranco di Pavia*, 439–500, summarized and revised in Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, 197–205.

¹⁴² Anselm, Letter 24 (3:131). Anselm of course had his own links with Rome, notably through his nephew, also named Anselm, who was abbot of the Greek-Latin monastery of St. Saba in Rome, and who later, as abbot of Bury St. Edmund's, was a keen promoter of

These various contacts suggest that connections with south Italy existed both between the old community at Christ Church, Canterbury and the new community represented by Lanfranc and those that he brought with him to England — and that these channels could bypass Bec. Anselm's letter to Maurice, in which he first mentions the *Aphorismi*, complains about being "out of the loop": "even as many Normans cross over to England there are few who do so to my knowledge; among these very few there is scarcely anyone to whom I would entrust our commission and who would carry it out conscientiously and without delay."¹⁴³

Though Maurice, as Anselm put it, was living among unknown and foreign people (*inter ignotes et alienigenas*) in Canterbury, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that Canterbury was better positioned to acquire new and unusual texts from Italy than was Bec.

COULD ANSELM HAVE READ THE *ARTICELLA*?

Anselm's correspondence sheds a faint but suggestive light on the formation of one of the most influential forms of medical literature in the Middle Ages. But we can also turn the equation around: if it is possible that Anselm's manuscript was an *Articella*, is there any evidence that he could have desired, and used, such a book? Here we can only set out some possible lines of inquiry for future research.

Anselm's theological writings are noteworthy for their drive to discover and elaborate the reasons behind the dogmas of faith. The new medicine of the *Articella* and Constantine the African was associated with broader philosophical concerns, manifested most notably in the school of Chartres, to furnish reasons (*reddere rationes*) for the natural world. This emphasis on articulating fully intellectualized principles governing phenomena, and of elucidating their coherence and integrity, is one important reason why medicine won a place in the curriculum of the schools; it was not merely an art of healing, but also, indeed primarily, a study of the elements as they are composed in human bodies.¹⁴⁴ The new *Articella* commentaries on the *Aphorismi* reflect this shift in orientation. While the Old Latin Commentary

Greek observances such as the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. Though he was active in building Bury's library, it should be noted that Newton's redating of MS Wellcome 801A to the mid-twelfth century (see n. 28 above) eliminates the possibility that the younger Anselm imported this Beneventan *Articella* into England, as suggested by McLachlan, *The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmund's* (n. 41 above), 12–13.

¹⁴³ Anselm, Letter 43 (3:154–56).

¹⁴⁴ See Peter Dronke's introduction to *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (n. 37 above), 2, and W. Wetherbee, "Philosophy, Cosmology and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance," *ibid.*, 25–27; C. Burnett, "Scientific Speculations," *ibid.*, 167–70; J. Bylebyl,

is practical and colloquial, the Digby commentaries, for example, place the accent on identifying fundamental principles and articulating abstract theoretical concepts. An excellent illustration is the different treatment of *Aphorismi* 1.17: "To some, food should be given once, to others, twice; in greater quantity or in less quantity; a little at a time. Something too must be conceded to season, district, habit, and age."¹⁴⁵ The Old Latin Commentary understood Hippocrates to be advising the *medicus* to acquaint himself with his patient's eating habits. Does he prefer to dine in the morning or the evening? How many meals does he consume each day? In cases of *causon* or ardent fever, the doctor is faced with a dilemma: if he gives food, he might aggravate the illness; if he withholds food, he might weaken the patient. The solution is to find out when the patient is accustomed to eat, and to feed him at that time, for nature likes a consistent routine. Thus habit, together with the patient's age, habitat, and the season of the year, must guide the doctor's therapeutic choices.¹⁴⁶

By contrast, the Digby *glosae*, instead of observing and then accommodating the individual patient's eating habits, analyses physiological principles using a conceptual grid whose coordinates are *virtus* and *corpus*: the digestive *virtus* may be strong or weak, while the body's appetites may be strong or weak, in varying combinations. For example, if someone has a good appetite and the *virtus digestiva* is strong, then by all means feed him up. But if he has a good appetite, yet digests poorly, give him small amounts of food frequently, and so forth. These principles need to be accommodated not to the patient's habitual preferences, but to the com-

"The Medical Meaning of *Physica*," in *Renaissance Medical Learning: Evolution of a Tradition*, ed. M. McVaugh and N. Siraisi, *Osiris*, 2nd ser., 6 (1990), 16–41.

¹⁴⁵ Jones, "Aphorisms," in *Hippocrates* 4 (n. 41 above), 107.

¹⁴⁶ "Vult Yppocras requirere consuetudinem comesationis sanorum atque languentium ut possit congruam offerre dietam. Et dicit quod semel et iterum. Verbi gratia ut si quis quis solitus est comedere mane et sero, alius vero quater, alius uero sexies, alius uero decies, quomodo rustici. Multum aut minus, quod intelligitur quattuor modis, multum et rarius, multum et sepius, modicum et rarius, modicum et sepius, seruatis consuetis horis, diminutata tamen quantitate ciborum. Ecce pone aliquem laborantem causon aut synochum, qui non habens declinationem, isti si uolumus dare cibos, egritudinem addimus, et si non damus, virtutem minuimus. Et quid faciemus? Interrogemus quibus horis solitus est refici, et ipsis horis illum reficiamus subtilibus cibus, quia natura cum operationibus suis requirit consuetudinem et conseruatur. Et quidem quinque res querende sunt in comesationibus, consuetudo, uirtus, digestio, copia ciborum, et modus comesationis. Vt uerbotenus, poma qui habet ad prandium comedi, non ante, sed post omnes cibos. Et quare ad cenam in primis comeduntur, ut acredinem preteritam temperent. Sic idem require tempus quo sit egritudo, estas aut hiems, regionem, calida aut frigida. etate, iuuenis an senex. Consuetudinem, ut diximus, quibus horis solitus erat refici. quia consuetudo secunda est natura. et natura obseruat consuetudinem" (Monte Cassino MS 97, p. 271b).

plexio of the stomach, i.e., whether it is hot and moist, hot and dry, etc.¹⁴⁷ In sum, the accent in the Digby commentary is on the physician's knowledge of physiological principles, not his particular and empirical knowledge of the patient. "Nature" here is an abstract "natural order" understood rationally, not the individual "nature" of a particular patient known intuitively. The Old Commentary focuses on the doctor's knowledge of the patient and of diseases; the Digby *glosae* on his knowledge of *physica*.

This intellectualist approach to medicine also resonated with Anselm's historical situation as a monk living through the eleventh-century reform of the church, and may have shaped his orientation towards the new medicine. Alexander Murray has remarked that in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, the character of the medical books in monastic libraries shifted from the early medieval style of monastic medicine, overwhelmingly practical in orientation, to the new, theoretical, Constantinian medicine, with its scholarly and philosophical agenda. Murray relates this shift to the Gregorian reform's concern to distance monks and clergy from worldly involvements. Medicine posed a special challenge, for it brought the monk dangerously close to the world in a number of ways, not least of which is the close relationship between practical medicine, with its recipes, prayers, and Christian charms, and less respectable forms of "magic." Indeed the solidly practical Anglo-Saxon medical manuscripts at Canterbury contained recipes and prayers that, to a reformer's eye, hovered close to "magic." The *Articella's* origins in reformist and monastic circles of southern Italy may reflect this intention to purify monastic medicine; it may also be reflected in the strain of sexual prudery that we have detected in the new translation of the *Aphorismi*. Compared with the Old Latin Commentary, the Chartres and Digby commentaries on the *Aphorismi* also display a concern to remove the study of the *Aphorismi* from any consideration of practice that might entail

¹⁴⁷ "In hoc modo dietandi, Ilo considerantur uirtus fortis uel debilis, corpus suscipiens id est bene uel male appetens. Que sic coniunguntur uirtus fortis et suscipiens corpus; uirtus fortis et corpus non suscipiens; uirtus debilis et corpus suscipiens; uirtus debilis et corpus non suscipiens. Propter uirtutem fortem uel debilem paruum uel multum est dandum corpori suscipienti uel non, frequenter uel tardius. Si ergo aliquis bene appetat et bene digerat id est haberat uirtutem digestiuam scilicet fortem et corpus suscipiens multum et frequenter detur, propter bonum appetitum frequenter, propter uirtutis fortitudinem multum. Si aliquis bene appetat et male digerat sepe et paruus, scilicet propter uirtutem debilem et corpus suscipiens. Si quis male appetat et bene digerat, id est haberat uirtutem fortem et corpus non suscipiens tarde et multum. Si quis male appetat et male digerat id est haberat uirtutem debilem et corpus non suscipiens, tarde et paruum. Hec ita diuersificantur ex diuersitate complexionis stomachi. Si enim fuerit calidus stomachus et humidus bene appetit et bene digerit. Si calidus et siccus male appetit et bene digerit. Si frigidus et siccus bene appetit et male digerit. Si frigidus et humidus male appetit et male digerit" (Digby 108, fol. 31v).

contact with women. For example, the Old Latin Commentary on 1.14 contains a little tract on “generation,” complete with detailed anatomical description of female sexual organs; but though the Chartres and Digby *glosae* show numerous borrowings from the Old Latin Commentary, the material on generation is not included.¹⁴⁸ The shift in interest to “theoretical” medicine may also represent an attempt to restrict monastic involvement in administering health services to outsiders, especially at a time when lay practitioners and a commercialized medical marketplace were becoming more visible.¹⁴⁹ In short, the impulse to reframe medical study around theoretical issues and cognitive problems like diagnosis (rather than therapeutics) that drove the creation of the *Articella* have at least some of their intellectual roots in the reform movement that dominated Anselm’s age.¹⁵⁰

In assessing Anselm’s medical interests, we should also bear in mind that the promoters of the new medicine in late-eleventh-century southern Italy, monks with close links to reformist circles, were interested in medicine as part of a larger theological and ethical reflection, and not primarily or exclusively in its practical applications. A theological impulse surely motivated the patrons and planners of the cathedral of Anagni to adorn the crypt with a representation of Galen and Hippocrates in conversation, and man the microcosm.¹⁵¹ The new medicine, like the new “science,” was appreciated in the first instance as an adjunct to religious learning; after all, the

¹⁴⁸ Digby commentary: Digby 108, fol. 31r; Chartres commentary: Erfurt, Amplon. F276, fol. 20v^a.

¹⁴⁹ The danger that the profits to be gained from medical practice might infect medical education are underscored by the commentaries on *Aphorismi* 1.1 by Bartholomaeus of Salerno. Did not Hippocrates risk discouraging students by stating that “the art is long”? Bartholomaeus explains: “Ad quod dicimus quosdam ab arte profugos reddit, quorum scilicet intencio ad lucrum festinat, eos uero qui artem expetunt, non tantum propter aliud, quantum propter se studiosos ad artis longitudinem comprehendendam, et attentos reddit” (Winchester, Winchester College Library 24, fol. 109r^a). This was a matter of broad concern in the twelfth century. See J. Bylebyl, “The Medical Meaning of *Physica*,” 39–40.

¹⁵⁰ A. Murray, “Missionaries and Magic in Dark Age Europe,” in *Debating the Middle Ages*, ed. L. K. Little and B. H. Rosenwein (Oxford, 1998), 92–104, esp. 99.

¹⁵¹ L. Pressouyre, “Le cosmos platonicien de la cathédrale d’Anagni,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’École française de Rome* 78 (1966): 551–93; M. Q. Smith, “Anagni: An Example of Medieval Typological Decoration,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 33 (1965): 1–47. The iconography at Anagni may be based on the chapter of Nemesius that deals with the elements, and that circulated separately in an anonymous translation as *De elementis Galieni secundum Hippocratem*. It is preserved in the twelfth-century Bury St. Edmund’s codex British Library, Cotton Galba E. IV: R. C. Dales, “An Unnoticed Translation of the Chapter *De elementis* from Nemesius’ *De natura hominis*,” *Mediaevalia et humanistica*, o.s., 17 (1966): 13–19. However, in Anagni the material has been recast into hexameters. See remarks by V. Nutton, “God, Galen and the Depaganization of Ancient Medicine,” in *Religion and Medicine*, ed. P. Biller and J. Ziegler, York Studies in Medieval Theology 3 (York, 2001), 18.

Latin translations of Aristotle's *libri naturales* were used in the theological works of Robert of Torigny, abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, and of Richard Bishop, archdeacon of Coutances, in ca. 1160, well before their first appearance in a medical context in the commentaries of Bartholomaeus and Maurus of Salerno, usually cited as the vanguard of Aristotelian science.¹⁵² It would be safe to assume that Anselm the theologian, like William of Conches the philosopher, could have been attracted to the new medicine for speculative reasons. William's use of the Constantinian corpus, and of Alfanus of Salerno's translation of Nemesius, is a case in point. Nemesius's treatise is a work of *theological anthropology and moral psychology as well as a vehicle of physiological and medical knowledge*. Indeed, Alfanus of Salerno altered Nemesius's text to emphasize moral issues. But the way in which he did so also served to orient Nemesius towards the diagnostic issues that underpin the *Articella*.

De natura hominis examines the relationship to the body, composed of the elements, to the soul as a psycho-physiological continuum. The rational part of the soul is explored through its cognitive and sense faculties, while the irrational part of the soul is considered under two aspects. First, the "irrational obedient to reason" comprises emotional responses of irascibility and concupiscence, while "the irrational not obedient to reason" encompasses those faculties through which the body fulfills its essential need for food (*nutribile*), air (respiration, the operation of the heart and arteries as well, the *pulsativum*), and reproduction (*generativum*).¹⁵³ The operations of this autonomic "biological" soul, ascertained through examining the products of nutrition (*excreta*, especially urine) and respiration (the pulse of the arteries), are the context for the diagnostic character of the *Articella* in general, and the prominent role given to the urine tract of Theophilus and the pulse treatise of Philaretus in particular. There is evidence that Alfanus appreciated that context. In the Greek original, Nemesius proceeds to discuss nutrition, pulse, generation, and respiration. Alfanus's translation, however, displaces these chapters to the end of the book, so that Nemesius's closing reflections on intentionality and free will, and the frontier between the voluntary and the involuntary, are situated in the middle of the discussion of "the irrational not obedient to reason." Alfanus also reorganizes the final chapters — those displaced by his interpolation of the discussion of free will — so that the chapters on nutrition (including a detailed description of the formation of urine) and pulse end the book.¹⁵⁴ In making these changes, Alfanus

¹⁵² L. Minuo-Paluello, "Jacobus Veneticus Grecus: Canonist and Translator of Aristotle," *Traditio* 8 (1952): 292–94.

¹⁵³ Nemesius, *Premnon physicon*, chap. 22, ed. Burkhard (n. 88 above), 106.

¹⁵⁴ Alfanus's closing chapter on pulse (chap. 27, ed. Burkhard, 146–47) presents the interconnectedness of brain/nerves, liver/veins, and heart/arteries as a corporeal trinity, perhaps even a corporeal "three orders," in which each sustains and is sustained by the

has literally wedged the problem of moral intention into the body's physiology and reconfigured physiology to focus on urine and pulse, the keys to medical diagnosis. Throughout his treatise, Nemesius struggles to unravel the relationship between sin, "nature," and "nurture," and to accent his convergence of medical intervention with moral education:

*The evil passions arise in the soul in these three ways: from a bad upbringing, from perversity, or through a poor constitution. Those not brought up well from childhood, and taught to govern their passions, end by indulging them without restraint. From perversity, again, false judgements arise in the soul's reasoning faculty, so that bad things are taken to be good, and good for bad. Certain passions follow, also, from a poor bodily constitution. For choleric people are testy, and those suffering from a hot, moist temperament. But an evil tendency must be cured by acquiring good ways. Perversity must be cured by schooling and knowledge. But a poor physical constitution must be treated medically, and won over, as far as is possible, to normal temperament, by suitable diet, by exercise, and, should these be necessary, by the use of drugs.*¹⁵⁵

Alfanus's reordering of the text reinforces this interconnection of medical and moral therapies for the soul and orients them to precisely those diagnostic issues that are foregrounded in the *Articella*. Moral therapy also provides a justification for medical intervention that is congruent with monastic values.

others. The pulse of the artery is given a special prominence, however, because it is active. Directed by "a certain harmony and measure which takes its motion from the heart," the expanding pulse wrests blood *cum violentia* from the veins which it vaporizes to feed the vital spirit. When it contracts, the artery expels the fumes of this combustion, moving it through the invisible pores of the body until it is expired through the mouth and nostrils. Alfanus, as we mentioned earlier, had a special interest in the pulse and wrote a treatise on the subject. It should also be noted in passing that Alfanus omits chaps. 35–38 in the Greek original, which deal with fate and providence.

¹⁵⁵ "Innascuntur autem malae passiones animae per tria haec: per malam educationem, per indisciplinationem, per malam habitudinem. Non enim bene educati a puero, ut possent abstinere a passionibus, ad immoderationem earum ceciderunt. Per indisciplinationem vero malae discretionem rationali parti animae innascuntur, ut existimentur mala bona esse et bona mala. Fiunt autem quaedam passiones etiam a mala corporis habitudine. Irascibiles namque sunt amaram habentes choleram et sufferentes calidi et humidi temperiem. Curandum est autem malum usum usu bono, indisciplinationem disciplina et studio. Malam vero habitudinem medicandum corporaliter permutantes eam, ut notum est, ad mediam temperiem congrua diaeta et exercitiis et pharmacis, si opus his habuerit" (Nemesius, *Premnon physicon*, chap. 17, ed. Burkhard [n. 88 above], 96–97). The translation is by William Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* (London, 1954), 351, with modifications to reflect Alfanus's Latin. It is interesting to note that Alfanus's translation quietly censors Nemesius's text of any reference to sexuality by effacing its observation that those with hot moist temperaments are lecherous. A passage similar to this one occurs in chap. 40 (ed. Burkhard, 130).

Anselm's interest in medicine, as documented in his letters, lay precisely at this intersection of medical and moral care. A Benedictine abbot is enjoined by the Rule to "treat" spiritual ills like a physician, diagnosing the true nature of the disorder and applying suitable remedies, milder or harsher, as need dictates. But in the Rule, medicine is a metaphor; moral difficulties are ultimately of spiritual origin. Nemesius's text opened up the possibility that some moral problems might be caused by physical constitution, or "the part of the soul not subject to reason," and therefore best treated, at least in the first instance, by medicine in the literal sense. A study of medicine grounded in medical theory, as distinct from mere therapeutic know-how, would therefore complement theological reflection on free will and moral responsibility. Medical knowledge would be particularly pertinent for an abbot, who is responsible for the health of the souls under his authority.

Whether Anselm himself had access to, or actually read, Alfanus's translation of Nemesius is an issue that will have to be explored in a separate study. Suffice it to say that Alfanus's monastic background and close links to Monte Cassino, and the diagnostic character of the *Articella* that he may have played a key role in assembling, are strikingly congruent with the central themes in the work of Nemesius that he translated. Anselm's own monastic situation might, for very similar reasons, have led him to the study of diagnostics and pulse, and to commission a manuscript on these subjects.

CONCLUSIONS

Anselm's correspondence with Maurice furnishes important and hitherto overlooked evidence for the early stages of the formation of the *Articella*. If our reading of the evidence is correct, by the 1070s the new "Salerno" translation of the *Aphorismi*, accompanied by what was probably a fresh commentary, was circulating in the company of a treatise on pulse lore. Anselm's letters suggest that these materials were unusual and desirable, albeit challenging for the copyist because of their technical terms and (perhaps) distinctive script. There are many routes by which such a manuscript from the Beneventan region could have reached Christ Church, Canterbury, and the early history of the diffusion of the *Articella* and its commentaries indicates that England, rather than Normandy, was the premier western center for the acquisition and production of manuscripts. Both the success of this new literature, and Anselm's eagerness to acquire it, must be evaluated in the context not only of scientific and medical developments in the eleventh century, but also of monastic culture and ecclesiastical reform.

University of Durham

McGill University, Montréal