

THE PREFACES TO THE FIRST HUMANIST MEDICAL TRANSLATIONS

By STEFANIA FORTUNA

A large part of the literary production of humanist physicians consists of Latin translations of Greek medical texts.¹ They considered these translations the first and necessary approach to ancient Greek medicine, which in turn was viewed as having ensured scientific and therapeutical progress against the barbarisms of dominant Arabic medical culture. In a passage from a work entitled *De Plinii et plurium aliorum medicorum in medicina erroribus*, the humanist physician Nicolò Leonicensino (1428–1524), who taught for sixty years at the University of Ferrara, attacks Avicenna's doctrine as chaotic, obscure, and dangerous to life. He then presents his own medical program, which is first of all based on translations: "Nos sane ad hanc amovendam atque extirpandam et nostrae aetatis hominibus lucem aliquam veritatis aperendam, partim librorum Galeni medicorum principis translationibus, partim in eosdem commentationibus, die noctuque laboramus."² Leonicensino was actually a prolific translator of Galen.

Before 1480 only few medical texts had new humanist translations. The Hippocratic works entitled *On Diseases* and *On Breaths* were translated by

¹ The humanist translations of Greek physicians have, for the most part, been catalogued: Dioscorides by John M. Riddle, and Paulus Aegineta by Eugene F. Rice, in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, ed. Ferdinand Edward Cranz and Paul Oskar Kristeller, vol. 4 (Washington, 1980), 1–191; Hippocrates by Pearl Kibre, *Hippocrates Latinus: Repertorium of Hippocratic Writings in the Latin Middle Ages*, rev. ed. (New York, 1985); and Gilles Maloney and Raymond Savoie, *Cinq cent ans de bibliographie hippocratique: 1473–1982* (St-Jean-Chrysostome, Québec, 1982); Galen by Richard J. Durling, "A Chronological Census of Renaissance Editions and Translations of Galen," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 24 (1961): 230–305, who also provides the best introduction to this subject.

I wish to thank Thomas Rütten for his valuable suggestions, which allowed me to improve this article.

² *Nicolai Leonicensini De Plinii et plurium aliorum medicorum in medicina erroribus* (Ferrara, 1509), fol. 74r (Leonicensino's letter to Francesco Totti). On Leonicensino, see Daniela Mugnai Carrara, *La biblioteca di Nicolò Leonicensino: Tra Aristotele e Galeno; cultura e libri di un medico umanista* (Florence, 1991). Janus Cornarius's dedicatory letter regarding his translation of Paulus Aegineta addresses the same topic; Cornarius explains his academic education in Arabic medicine and his gradual conversion to the Greek. This preface is published by Rice, *Paulus Aegineta*, 173–75; it is analyzed by Brigitte Mondrain, "Éditer et traduire les médecins grecs au XVI^e siècle: L'exemple de Janus Cornarius," *Les voies de la science grecque: Études sur la transmission des textes de l'Antiquité au dix-neuvième siècle*, ed. Danielle Jacquart (Geneva, 1997), 391–417.

Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) about 1444, and *On Breaths* was probably translated again some years later by Janus Lascaris (1445–1535).³ Hippocrates' *Letters* were translated by Giovanni Aurispa (ca. 1370–ca. 1459), then by Rinuccio d'Arezzo (1395–1456), who revised his own work several times, between 1434 and 1450, and who worked from the Greek manuscript containing a collection of epistles, which he had acquired during his travels to Constantinople in 1423.⁴ The Hippocratic *Oath* was translated by Nicolò Perotti (1429/30–1480) in 1454/55.⁵ In most of these cases, however, the texts in question are not very Hippocratic and, above all, not very medical.

Between 1479 and 1480, Andrea Brenta (1454–1484) translated a number of Hippocratic texts: *On Dreams*, *On the Nature of Man*, *Law*, *Oath*, and the beginning of *On Art*, the latter being presented subsequently as two different short works: one entitled *Demonstratio quod artes sunt* (*On Art* 2–3: 225, 9–226, 11 J.), and the other entitled *Invectiva in obtreclatores medicinae* (*On Art* 1: 224, 1–225, 8 J.).⁶ In 1490, Leoniceno finished at least a first version of his translation of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*.⁷ In a letter of the same year, Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) mentions his own translation of the same text by Galen, which has not been preserved.⁸ In 1481, Ermolao Barbaro (1453/54–1493) completed his translation of Dioscorides and added his own commentary, which he called *Corollarium*, in about 1489.⁹

³ See *Hippocrates: Des vents – De l'art*, ed. Jacques Jouanna, Collection des Universités de France, vol. 5, pt. 1 (Paris, 1988), 70–72.

⁴ See Thomas Rütten, "Zur Anverwandlungsgeschichte eines Textes aus dem Corpus Hippocraticum in der Renaissance," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 1 (1994): 75–91, at 79–85. The Greek manuscript used by Rinuccio has been identified by Remigio Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, vol. 1 (Florence, 1914; repr. 1967, 1996), 49.

⁵ See Thomas Rütten, "Receptions of the Hippocratic Oath in the Renaissance," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 51 (1996): 456–83, at 461–62 and 479.

⁶ On Brenta, see Massimo Miglio, "Andrea Brenta," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 14 (Rome, 1972), 149–51; Rütten, "Receptions," 463–64. On his translation of *On Art*, see *Des vents*, ed. Jouanna, 211–12.

⁷ This information derives from a dated letter by Poliziano addressed to Leoniceno, which is printed in *Angeli Politiani Omnia opera* (Venice, 1489), fol. B 6v (*Ep.* 2.3). See S. Fortuna, "Le prime traduzioni umanistiche degli Aforismi di Ippocrate," *Aspetti della terapia nel Corpus Hippocraticum: Atti del IX^e Colloquio International Hippocratique* (Pisa, 25–29 settembre 1996), ed. Ivan Garofalo, Alessandro Lami, Daniela Manetti, and Amneris Roselli (Florence, 1999), 485–98, at 491.

⁸ Poliziano addressed the letter to Lorenzo il Magnifico and asked him to encourage the physician Pierleone of Spoleto in the matter of a revision of his translation of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*; this letter is published in *Angelo Poliziano: Prose volgari inedite e poesie latine e greche edite e inedite di Angelo Ambrogini Poliziano*, ed. Isidoro Del Lungo (Florence, 1867; repr., Hildesheim, 1976), 77.

⁹ See Riddle, *Dioscorides*, 27–29 and 46–48.

Immediately afterwards, Dioscorides' text became the subject of a long and lively debate on Plinius's authority, and on Latin and Greek botany and science; among others, Barbaro himself, Leoniceno, and Poliziano took an active part in it.¹⁰ This wide interest in Dioscorides probably motivated Aldo Manuzio to publish the first Greek edition of Dioscorides in 1499. At the same time, Aldo began planning editions of other Greek physicians, as his prefaces to editions of Aristotle (1495) and Aristophanes (1498) attest.¹¹ He began preparing them himself, but they were completed and published by his successors many years later: Galen in 1525, Hippocrates in 1526, and Paulus Aegineta in 1528.¹² Publication of the first Greek editions constitutes a landmark in the history of new translations. The printed texts were easily available and became the standard reference for all subsequent translators, who henceforth rarely consulted manuscripts.

The first humanists, who worked only on manuscripts, concentrated mainly on translating Galen among the Greek physicians.¹³ In fact, they trusted Galen's own pronouncements on his work, namely his statements that he had collected the whole of previous medical knowledge and had added what was necessary, and that therefore his work was fully compre-

¹⁰ See Alain Touwaide, "‘Loquantur ipsi ut velint . . . modo quis serpens sit tirus . . . non ignorent’: Leoniceno's Contribution to Renaissance Epistemological Approach to Scientific Lexicology," *Medical Latin from the Late Middle Ages to the Eighteenth Century: Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop in the Humanities (Brussels, 3–4 September 1999)*, ed. Wouter Bracke and Herwig Deumens (Brussels, 2000), 151–73, at 171–72.

¹¹ Beriah Botfield, *Praefationes et epistolae editionibus principibus auctorum veterum praepositae* (Cambridge, 1861), 200, 218; and Aldo Manuzio *editore: dediche, prefazioni, note ai testi*, ed. and trans. Giovanni Orlandi, intro. Carlo Dionisotti (Milan, 1975), 17 and 24.

¹² On the Aldine editions of the Greek physicians, see S. Fortuna, "Nicolò Leoniceno e le edizioni Aldine dei medici greci (con un'appendice sulle sue traduzioni latine)," *Ecdotica e ricezione dei testi medici greci: Atti del V Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 1–2 ottobre 2004)*, ed. Véronique Boudon-Millot, Antonio Garzya, Jacques Jouanna, and Amneris Roselli (Naples, 2006), 443–64. On the Aldine edition of Galen, see Nikolaus Mani, "Die griechische Editio princeps des Galenos (1525): Ihre Entstehung und ihre Wirkung," *Gesnerus* 15 (1956): 29–52; Vivian Nutton, *John Caius and the Manuscripts of Galen* (Cambridge, 1987), 38–43; Jean Irigoien, "Autour des sources manuscrites de l'editio princeps de Galien," *Storia e ecdotica dei testi medici greci: Atti del II Convegno Internazionale (Parigi, 24–26 maggio 1994)*, ed. Antonio Garzya and Jacques Jouanna (Naples, 1996), 207–16; on the Aldine edition of Hippocrates, see Vivian Nutton, "Hippocrates in the Renaissance," *Die hippokratischen Epidemien, Theorie-Praxis-Tradition: Verhandlungen des V^e Colloque International Hippocratique (Berlin, 10.–15. September 1984)*, ed. Gerhard Baader and Rolf Winau, *Sudhoffs Archiv, Beiheft 27* (Stuttgart, 1989), 420–39, at 426; Paul Potter, "The *editiones principes* of Galen and Hippocrates and Their Relationship," *Text and Transmission: Studies in Ancient Medicine and Its Transmission Presented to Jutta Kollesch*, ed. Klaus-Dietrich Fischer, Diethard Nickel, and Paul Potter (Leiden, 1998), 243–61.

¹³ On the first humanist translators of Galen, see Nutton, *John Caius*, 25–28.

hensive and complete. Leonicensino prepared eleven translations of Galen over the course of his long life.¹⁴ At about the same time, two other Italian humanists worked on Galen: Giorgio Valla (d. 1499), who was first and foremost a collector of Greek manuscripts, translated five works by Galen and one erroneously ascribed to Galen;¹⁵ Lorenzo Lorenzi (1459/60–1502), who was professor of medicine at the University of Pisa, translated five Galenic works.¹⁶ A few years later, the Basel physician Wilhelm Kopp (ca. 1460–1532), who lived and taught at Paris, translated a number of Galenic treatises on diagnosis and pathology: *On Affected Parts*, and the works on diseases and symptoms.¹⁷ Another significant contribution was made by the English physician Thomas Linacre (ca. 1460–1524), who translated eight works by Galen, among them the *Method of Healing* and *On the Preservation of Health*.¹⁸

Not much work was done on Hippocrates after Brenta's translations and before the complete Latin edition of Marco Fabio Calvo (d. 1529); the latter was published in Rome in 1525, though it had been prepared mainly on the

¹⁴ On translations of Galen by Leonicensino, see Fortuna, "Nicolò Leonicensino e le edizioni Aldine," 491–98.

¹⁵ On Valla and his manuscripts, see Johan Ludvig Heiberg, "Beiträge zur Geschichte Georg Valla's und seiner Bibliothek," *Beiheft zum Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 16 (1896): 353–481; "Nachträgliches über Georg Valla," *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 15 (1898): 189–97; Paola Di Pietro Lombardi, "I codici greci e orientali di Alberto II Pio," *Alberto III e Rodolfo Pio da Carpi collezionisti e mecenati: Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Studi (Carpi, 22–23 novembre 2002)*, ed. Manuela Rossi (Tavagnacco, 2004), 189–97. On Valla's translation of Galen's extract entitled *De praenotione*, see *Galeno: A Patrofilo sulla costituzione della medicina*, ed. S. Fortuna, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* 5, 1, 3 (Berlin, 1997), 34–35.

¹⁶ See Francesco Piovan, "Un umanista trascurato. Ricerche su Lorenzo Lorenzi e sulla sua biblioteca," *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 142 (1983/84): 191–216, who also discusses the problem raised by the nine Greek manuscripts attributed to Lorenzi; this question has been settled by Fabio Vendruscolo, "Lorenzo Loredan/Λουρέντιος Λουρέντιανος copista e possessore di codici greci," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 38 (1995): 337–63, who conclusively attributes the manuscripts to Lorenzo Loredan, an obscure Venetian aristocrat. On Galen translations by Lorenzi, see Fortuna, "Le prime traduzioni" (n. 7 above), 487–91; and Fortuna, "Les traductions du Prognostic d'Hippocrate par les Humanistes," *Le normal et le pathologique dans la Collection hippocratique. Actes du X^{ème} Colloque International Hippocratique (Nice, 6–8 ottobre 1999)*, ed. Antoine Thivel and Arnaud Zucker, vol. 2 (Nice, 2002), 793–813.

¹⁷ On Kopp, see Ernest Wickersheimer, *Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au moyen âge*, 1 (Paris, 1936; repr., Geneva, 1979), 235–38; Marie-Louise Portmann, "Der Basler Humanisten-Arzt Wilhelm Copp (um 1460–1532)," *Gesnerus* 15 (1958): 106–19. On his translation of Galen's *On Affected Parts*, see S. Fortuna, "Edizioni e traduzioni del *De locis affectis* di Galeno tra Cinquecento e Seicento," *Bollettino dei Classici* s. 3, 14 (1993): 3–30, at 8–13.

¹⁸ On Linacre and his translations of Galen, see Richard J. Durling, "Linacre and Medical Humanism," *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460–1524*, ed. Francis Maddison, Margaret Pelling, and Charles Webster (Oxford, 1977), 76–106.

basis of manuscript Vat. gr. 278 between 1510 and 1515 and must first have been printed in 1519.¹⁹ Some Hippocratic texts were available in translation, though only in conjunction with Galen's commentaries: the *Aphorisms* were translated by Leonicensino and Lorenzi, and the *Prognostic* by Lorenzi. In 1511, Kopp translated two Hippocratic texts, the *Prognostic* and the *Diet in Acute Diseases*, which were commented on by Galen and formed part of the *Articella* collection.²⁰ In the same years, the Florence physician Manente Leontini translated another text of Hippocrates, the *Epidemics*, which was similarly commented on by Galen and included in the *Articella* collection.²¹

The late-ancient and Byzantine physicians were almost completely ignored by the first humanists. For example, the first translation of Aetius Amidenus was undertaken by Giovanni Battista da Monte (1498–1551) and published in 1534.²² *On the Diet of Man*, however, which was ascribed to Michael Psellus, was translated by Valla, published in Venice in 1498, and reprinted in Erfurt in 1499.²³ Paulus Aegineta also received some measure of attention; his text was partially translated by Valla (II, 13), Kopp (I), and Linacre (II, 6–11).²⁴

¹⁹ On Calvo, see Riccardo Gualdo, "Marco Fabio Calvo," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 43 (Rome, 1993), 723–27; and the same entry by Danilo Aguzzi-Barbagli in *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, 1, ed. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher (Toronto, 1985), 246–47; the bibliography quoted by Rütten, "Zur Anverwandlungsgeschichte" (n. 4 above), 85 n. 49. The publication history of Calvo's Hippocratic edition is reconstructed by Augusto Campana, "Manente Leontini fiorentino, medico e traduttore di medici greci," *La Rinascita* 20 (1941): 499–515.

²⁰ The first edition of the two Hippocratic translations by Kopp is undated, but the dedicatory letter to the French chancellor Jean de Ganay is dated 1511. On these translations see Fortuna, "Les traductions du Prognostic," 803–10; and Fortuna, "Wilhelm Kopp possessore dei Par. gr. 2254 e 2255? Ricerche sulla sua traduzione del *De victus ratione in morbis acutis* di Ippocrate," *Medicina nei Secoli* 13 (2001): 47–57.

²¹ On Manente and his translation, see Campana, "Manente Leontini"; and Innocenzo Mazzini, "Manente Leontini: Übersetzer der hippokratischen Epidemien," in *Die hippokratischen Epidemien, Theorie-Praxis-Tradition: Verhandlungen des V^e Colloque International Hippocratique (Berlin, 10.–15. September 1984)*, ed. Gerhard Baader and Rolf Winau, Sudhoffs Archiv, Beiheft 27 (Stuttgart, 1989), 312–30.

²² On Montano's Latin edition of Aetius Amidenus and the printing of the translation by Cornarius for books 8–13, see Luigi Tartaglia, "Intorno alla traduzione latina di Aezio curata da Ianus Cornarius," *Storia e ecdotica dei testi medici greci: Atti del II Convegno Internazionale (Parigi, 24–26 maggio 1994)*, ed. Antonio Garzya and Jacques Jouanna (Naples, 1996), 427–38, at 429.

²³ See Vivian Nutton, "Hellenism Postponed: Some Aspects of Renaissance Medicine, 1490–1530," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 81 (1997): 158–70, at 166. The author of the work originally ascribed to Psellus is Theophanes Chrysobalantes, as has been proved by Joseph A. M. Sonderkamp, "Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Theophanes Chrysobalantes," *Poikila Byzantina* 7 (Bonn, 1987), 1–6.

²⁴ See Rice, *Paulus Aegineta* (n. 1 above), 151–57.

The most successful and most frequently reprinted humanist translations were the ones by Linacre, Kopp, Leonicensio, and Brenta. Scholars such as Erasmus praised Leonicensio, Kopp, and Linacre for their contribution to renaissance medicine by making it *purgatior ac sincerior*.²⁵ This contribution was considered extraordinary and was hence overrated in some respects.²⁶ In fact, humanist translation efforts did not involve a great number of texts. The same texts by Galen and Hippocrates received several translations more or less simultaneously: *On Anomalous Distemper* was translated by Valla, Leonicensio, and Linacre; the *Art of Medicine*, the commentary on *Aphorisms*, *On the Different Kinds of Fevers*, *On the Temporal Stages of Diseases* were translated by Lorenzi and Leonicensio; *On the Natural Faculties* was translated by both Leonicensio and Linacre; *On the Different Kinds of Diseases* and *On the Causes of Diseases* were translated by Leonicensio and Kopp; *On the Different Kinds of Symptoms* and *On the Causes of Symptoms* were translated by Kopp and Linacre; the *Prognostic* was translated by Lorenzi and Kopp. Moreover, these texts were already available in translation, often as Latin translations from Greek based on a better manuscript tradition.²⁷

The first humanists usually did not pay much attention to ancient medical texts, such as Galen's anatomical treatises, that had been unknown to their predecessors and that would have had significant consequences for the history of medicine. Indeed, Demetrius Chalcondylas (1423–1511) translated Galen's *Anatomical Procedures*, but his translation was ignored until 1529, when it was revised and published by Berengario da Carpi.²⁸ Immediately afterwards, however, it was superseded by a new translation published in 1531, made by Guinther of Andernach (1505–1574), Galen's most prolific translator, who forcefully attacked Chalcondylas in his preface.²⁹

The first new medical translations were not always meant to appear in print. As with the *Anatomical Procedures* by Chalcondylas, translations were

²⁵ Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami*, ed. Percy S. Allen, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1910), 489 (*Ep.* 549). In his preface to Galen's Greek edition of 1525, Andrea Asolano expresses a similar opinion on the first humanistic translators; see Botfield, *Praefationes* (n. 11 above), 362.

²⁶ See Durling, "Linacre," 82–84; and Durling, "Chronological Census" (n. 1 above), 238–40, who points out some of the limitations of the humanist translations without, however, disregarding their innovative impetus and contribution to medical progress in the sixteenth century.

²⁷ On medieval translations of Galen, see Durling, "Chronological Census," 232–36.

²⁸ On Chalcondylas, see Giuseppe Cammelli, *Demetrio Calcondila* (Florence, 1954); Armando Petrucci, "Demetrio Calcondila," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 16 (Rome, 1973), 542–47. On his translation of Galen's *Anatomical Procedures*, see S. Fortuna, "I Procedimenti anatomici di Galeno e la traduzione latina di Demetrio Calcondila," *Medicina nei Secoli* 11 (1999): 9–28.

²⁹ This preface is discussed by Durling, "Chronological Census," 239.

often printed posthumously or at least many years after having been completed: all of Lorenzi's translations appeared posthumously, except the one of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*, which was printed in 1494; Leoniceno's 1490 translation of the same text was printed in 1509; the translation of Dioscorides, completed by Barbaro in 1481, appeared posthumously in 1516; Leoniceno's translation of Galen's *On Elements* was similarly printed posthumously in 1541, in the first Giuntine edition of the new series; finally, the translation of Galen's *Art of Medicine*, which Leoniceno completed in 1503, was printed in 1508.³⁰

There are many different reasons why the humanist translations were slow to reach publication stage; what is certain is that they had difficulty in finding a market. At the time, the print-market was dominated by medieval translations from Arabic or Greek, and it was these that were regularly commented upon and used in the academic teaching of medicine. Hence no humanist translation is included in the fifteenth-century *Articella* editions or indeed in the first Latin Galen edition, published by Diomede Bonardo in 1490 with the expressly humanist intent of presenting Galen *ex fonte*.³¹ Later on, when the new translations did begin to appear in print in *Articella* editions or in complete editions of Galen, they still did not immediately replace previous translations but were rather printed alongside them.³²

The translator's preface was a regular feature only in printed editions. Since the first humanist translations were not conceived for publication, it does not come as a surprise that some of them appear without a preface. The editions without translator's prefaces are generally posthumous ones or were simply not published by the translator himself. For example, the edition of Leoniceno's translation of Galen's *On the Movement of Muscles* contains a preface written by his 1522 publisher Linacre. There are also unauthorized editions without any prefaces, such as the 1514 edition of Leoniceno's translations.³³

The translator's prefaces that do exist are dedicatory letters and/or letters to the reader(s). The latter are generally brief and contain technical remarks or references to other works that pertain to the translation at hand. An

³⁰ This information derives from a dated letter by Gerolamo Menochi to Leoniceno, printed in *Nicolai Leoniceni De Plinii . . . erroribus* (n. 2 above), fol. 84r; see Daniela Mugnai Carrara, "La polemica 'De cane rabido' di Nicolò Leoniceno, Nicolò Zocca e Scipione Carteromaco: un episodio di filologia medico-umanistica," *Interpres* 9 (1989): 196–236, at 200.

³¹ On Bonardo's edition of Galen, see Mani, "Die griechische Editio" (n. 12 above), 32–33; Nutton, *John Caius* (n. 12 above), 21, 29; and Fortuna, "Nicolò Leoniceno e le edizioni Aldine" (n. 12 above), 472–73.

³² See Fortuna, "Nicolò Leoniceno e le edizioni Aldine."

³³ See Durling, "Linacre," 81.

example is Leoniceno's preface to his edition of 1524, in which he refers the reader to the *Apologia* for a broader discussion of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*.³⁴ The dedicatory letters are addressed to politicians or clergymen who had commissioned the translation or who acted or were supposed to act as benefactors to the translator. Other addressees include colleagues or young men hoping to become physicians.

The dedicatory letters vary widely in terms of both length and content. Some develop intricately woven arguments, while others, like Valla's, are brief and to the point. However, they all display the same characteristics of style and composition as other humanist prefaces, which were closely modeled on ancient Latin predecessors: praise of the dedicatee, especially if he is a powerful man to whom the translator stands in a relationship of *observantia*, expressions of modesty regarding the activity of translation, evaluation of the translated work, and quotation of ancient authors such as Cicero and Lucretius as well as of other historical characters like Alexander the Great, the Roman kings, Caesar, and Maecenas.³⁵ In addition, the prefatory letters give information about topics that are of interest in the context of the history of both translation and medicine. Over the following pages, I will briefly survey the issues raised in these prefaces.

TIME AND MILIEU

The translator may speak about the circumstances in which his work was undertaken. For example, in the preface to his translation of Hippocrates' *On the Nature of Man*, Brenta writes that he lodged at Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's in Naples to avoid the plague, which in 1482 was raging in Rome

³⁴ *Galenii in Aphorismos Hippocratis, ab ipso Nicolao Leoniceno Vicentino interprete diligentius emendati* (Venice, 1524), fol. A1v.

³⁵ The characteristics of style and composition of prefaces to humanist translations are studied by Lucia Gualdo Rosa, "Le lettere di dedica nelle traduzioni dal greco nel '400: Appunti per un'analisi stilistica," *Vichiana* n. s. 2 (1973): 68–85, who bases her research on the conclusions regarding ancient Latin prefaces drawn by Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 13 (Stockholm, 1964); see also *Prefazioni, prologhi, proemi di opere scientifiche latine*, ed. Carlo Santini, Nino Scivoletto, and Loriano Zurli, 3 vols. (Rome, 1990–98). The prefaces to humanist medical translations are used and quoted in various essays, but only Linacre's prefaces to his translations of Galen have been thoroughly analyzed by Durling, "Linacre." The prefaces to the humanist translations of Dioscorides and Paulus are printed in *Catalogus translationum* (n. 1 above). Research on prefaces to French editions of classics in the sixteenth century has been conducted by Peter Sharratt, "The Role of the Writer and the Uses of Literature: Critical Theory in the Prefaces to the Editions of the Classics in Sixteenth-Century France," *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Turonensis: III^e Congrès international d'études néo-latines (Tours, 6–10 Septembre 1976)*, ed. Jean-Claude Margolin, vol. 2 (Paris, 1980), 1249–56.

(the plague did eventually claim his life in 1484).³⁶ In his preface to his 1513 edition, Kopp states that he translated Galen's *On Affected Parts* while accompanying the French King Louis XII in military campaigns against the English.³⁷ This kind of information is particularly interesting where it is otherwise difficult to date a translation, as is the case with Lorenzi's rendering of Galen's *On the Temporal Stages of Diseases*. It was published posthumously in 1522, but was undertaken "eo tempore, quo civitas nostra Pisanorum defectione maxime exagitabatur," i.e., after November 1494, as Lorenzi informs the reader in his dedicatory letter.³⁸

The translator may also give information on the environment in which he undertook his work, as well as on friends, teachers, or colleagues who assisted him in his efforts. In the dedicatory letter to Pope Sixtus IV, which introduces Brenta's translation of Hippocrates' *On Dreams*, the translator praises the Vatican Library, which he visited on a daily basis: "in quam a curis tanquam in portum me conferre saepius, et totos denique dies partim legendo partim scribendo consumere soleo."³⁹ Then, in a letter to the physician Nicola Gupalatino which functions as a postscript to the aforementioned translation, Brenta complains that he was not always helped by his teacher Chalcondylas, who should have corrected all the mistakes: "si quid fortasse claudicare videbitur, id tribue Demetrii Calcondilis Atheniensis praeceptoris nostri absentiae, quod eius acri et diligenti iudicio Graecis in litteris propter locorum intervallum uti nequeo."⁴⁰ Brenta praises Chalcondylas again and also mentions Theodore Gaza's positive assessment of his pupil Chalcondylas, whom he had called "another Demosthenes."⁴¹ Another pronouncement of Gaza's is cited by Brenta in the letter to Zaccaria Barbaro, which stands at the beginning of the edition. It concerns the young Ermolao, the future translator of Dioscorides, who was Zaccaria's son and Gaza's pupil.⁴²

³⁶ *Hippocratis De natura hominis* (Rome, 1482), fol. 1r. This edition (I.G.I. 4785) has no page numbers; I follow the numbering added to the copy preserved in the National Library of Florence.

³⁷ *Galenī De affectorum locorum notitia libri sex, Guilielmo Copo Basileiensi interprete* (Paris, 1513), fol. AIIIv.

³⁸ *Galenī libri tres de crisi, idest, de iudicationibus, interprete Laurentiano medico Florentino* (Bologna, 1522), fol. BIIr. This passage has been commented on by Piovan, "Un umanista trascurato" (n. 16 above), 197 n. 30, who tries to establish the chronology of Lorenzi's translations.

³⁹ *Hippocrates: De insomniis* (Rome, ca. 1481), 10; the edition has no page numbers. I have numbered the pages from the beginning.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*, 3.

Chalcondylas and Gaza, who had a close relationship, occupied important, yet different places in the field of medical translation. Chalcondylas, who translated Galen's *Anatomical Procedures*, as has been mentioned above, was a collector of medical manuscripts, the teacher not only of Brenta in Padua, but also of Linacre and Lorenzi in Florence, and a friend of Marcello Virgilio Adriano, himself a translator of Dioscorides.⁴³ It is thus hardly surprising that Lorenzi should thank both Chalcondylas and Gaza in the preface to his translation of Galen's commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*.⁴⁴

Regarding Gaza, there are doubts about the translation of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*, which has been attributed both to him and to Lorenzi.⁴⁵ But in any case, Gaza's most important contributions to medicine were his translations of Aristotle's zoological works and Theophrastus's botanical works. These met with great success, not least among Aristotelian translators and commentators; Aldo even suggested one ought to study them in order to learn Greek.⁴⁶ It also seems that they became a model for the emerging new tradition of medical translations. In fact, Kopp expresses his desire to emulate Gaza in the preface to his translation of Paulus Aegineta.⁴⁷ Both Lorenzi and Leonicensino refer to Gaza in the prefaces to their translations (on which more below): Lorenzi mentions Gaza as a model of scientific terminology, while Leonicensino praises his methods of textual emendation.

What emerges from the prefaces is a livelier and richer picture of humanist medical translation activity than might otherwise be inferred. The prefaces give us information about both unknown translators and lost translations. For example, in the dedicatory letter to Francesco Pandolfini, which introduces his translation of Galen's *Art of Medicine*, Lorenzi refers to an otherwise unknown translation by Pandolfini of Galen's *Medical Definitions*.⁴⁸ In his letter to Lorenzi, which introduces Lorenzi's translation of

⁴³ On Chalcondylas, see n. 28 above; on his Greek manuscripts, see Fortuna, "I Procedimenti anatomici" (n. 28 above), 14–18.

⁴⁴ *Hippocratis medici Sententiarum particulae VII: Galeni In Sententias Hippocratis libri VII, interprete Laurentio Laurentiano Florentino* (Florence, 1494), fol. BIVv.

⁴⁵ On Gaza, see Charles B. Schmitt, "Theodorus Gaza," *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, ed. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, 2 (Toronto, 1985), 81. On the translation of Hippocrates' *Aphorisms* attributed to Gaza, see Fortuna, "Le prime traduzioni" (n. 7 above), 487–91.

⁴⁶ On Gaza's translation of Aristotle's *On Animals* and its fortune, see Stefano Perfetti, "'Cultius atque integrius': Teodoro Gaza, traduttore umanistico del *De partibus animalium*," *Rinascimento* 25 (1995): 253–60; and Perfetti, *Aristotle's Zoology and Its Renaissance Commentators (1521–1601)* (Leuven, 2000), 11–28.

⁴⁷ Rice, *Paulus Aegineta* (n. 1 above), 155.

⁴⁸ Lorenzi's preface and translation of Galen's *Art of Medicine* were published for the first time in 1502, in the edition of Galen's *Opera omnia* by Hieronymus Surianus. I quote from the preface printed in the Giuntine edition of 1522, vol. 2, fol. CCLXXXIr. On Fran-

Galen's *On the Different Kinds of Fevers*, Cesare Ottato of Naples, who was a colleague of Lorenzi at the University of Pisa, writes of a scholarly community interested in new humanist translations: "Nos vero te duce qui utraque lingua es absolutissimus planiora ac molliora sectabimur, cuius etiam stomachi est Franciscus Iacetus Florentinus Platonicus amicissimus noster. Nobiscum etiam sentit Nicolaus Leonicensis vir litteratissimus et in medicina Hercules."⁴⁹

SOURCES

In the prefaces the translators speak about their sources. In the above-mentioned letter to Sixtus IV, Brenta informs us that the manuscript he used for his translation of Hippocrates' *On Dreams* came from the Vatican Library: "e bibliotheca excerptum."⁵⁰ The Vatican Library's first lending-register attests to the fact that Brenta did borrow a Greek Hippocratic manuscript for one year, from 21 June 1479 to 10 June 1480.⁵¹ This manuscript has probably been lost. The Library currently holds two manuscripts of the ancient collection containing the whole Hippocratic treatise *On Regimen*, of which *On Dreams* is book 4; both of these, however, were added to the collection only after Calvo's death in 1529.⁵² In any case, Brenta's translation, like the Greek text contained in some manuscripts, among them the fourteenth-century Vat. gr. 277, begins with chapter eighty-eight.⁵³

cesco Pandolfini, see Concetta Bianca, "I possessori," *Lorenzo Valla: Orazione per l'inaugurazione dell'anno accademico 1455-1456: Atti di un Seminario di Filologia Umanistica*, ed. Silvia Rizzo (Rome, 1994), 151-74, at 166; the catalogue of his library has been published by Teresa De Robertis, "Breve storia del 'Fondo Pandolfini' della Colombaria e della dispersione di una libreria privata fiorentina," *Le raccolte della "Colombaria," I. Incunabuli*, ed. Enrico Spagnesi (Florence, 1993), 77-285, and by Annaclara Cataldi Palau, "La biblioteca Pandolfini: Storia della sua formazione e successiva dispersione; identificazione di alcuni manoscritti," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 31 (1988): 259-395; see also Concetta Bianca, "Un 'nuovo' codice Pandolfini," *Rinascimento* 24 (1994): 153-55.

⁴⁹ *Nicolai Leonicensi In libros Galeni e Greca in Latinam linguam a se translato prefatio communis* (Venice, 1508), fol. 25r.

⁵⁰ *Hippocrates: De insomniis* (n. 39 above), 10.

⁵¹ Maria Bertola, *I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: Codici vaticani latini 3964, 3966, pubblicati in fototipia e in trascrizione con note e indici* (Vatican City, 1942), 18.

⁵² See Campana, "Manente Leontini" (n. 19 above), 50.

⁵³ The relation between Brenta's translation and the Vat. gr. 277 should be investigated further. In the edition of *On regimen* (Hippocrate, *Du régime*, ed. Robert Joly and Simon Byl, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* 1, 2, 4 [Berlin, 1984], 22-23) the manuscripts cited as containing the heading of *On Dreams*, at the beginning of ch. 88, are three copies of Marc. gr. 269 (Par. gr. 2142; Ambr. gr. 187 = C 85 sup.; Haun. ant. fund. reg. 224), and two other late copies containing only the excerpt (Vind. phil. 192; and Marc. app. cl. V 14);

In the dedicatory letter that introduces his translations of Hippocrates' *Prognostic* and *Diet in Acute Diseases*, Kopp expresses his gratitude to the French chancellor Jean de Ganay, "quod superioribus annis Galeni commentarios Graece scriptos, gravissimis impensis, ab Italis ad nos traducere conatus es."⁵⁴ It is not known whether Kopp actually received the manuscript of Galen from Jean de Ganay, and whether this manuscript contained the Hippocratic text that he then translated alongside those commented on by Galen. In any case, it is certain that Kopp used a Greek manuscript of the Hippocratic tradition for his translations, although we cannot rule out the possibility that he also consulted another manuscript of the Galenic tradition with regard to some of the more obscure passages.⁵⁵

In the preface to his translation of Galen's *On the Preservation of Health*, Linacre writes that he had access to only one Greek manuscript.⁵⁶ This is probably true. Konrad Koch, the modern editor of the text, shows that Linacre used a now lost manuscript similar to Leipzig 50.⁵⁷ By contrast, Leoniceno's assertion (in the preface to the 1524 edition of his translations) that he had access to only one manuscript for the first edition of his translation of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms* has been shown to have no basis in fact.⁵⁸ It must be considered as a device to protect himself against the harsh criticism his translation received, particularly from Giovanni Mainardi, which compelled him to respond in the *Apologia*. In fact, a philological examination shows that Leoniceno used at least one Greek Hippocratic manuscript and two Greek Galenic manuscripts. One of the latter is Par. gr. 2161, which, as I have shown elsewhere, contains corrections in Leoniceno's hand.⁵⁹ This manuscript was written by Alphonso of Athens, corrected by the Anonymous Harvardianus, and used as printer's copy for the Aldine edition.⁶⁰

erroneously, the Vat. gr. 277 is not mentioned; see Giovanni Mercati and Pio Franchi De' Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, 1: *Codices 1–329* (Rome, 1923), 366.

⁵⁴ *Hippocratis Praesagiorum libri tres: Ejusdem De ratione victus in morbis acutis libri quatuor, interprete Guilielmo Copo Basileiensi*, s. l. s. a., fol. AIIv.

⁵⁵ On the Hippocratic translations by Kopp see n. 20 above.

⁵⁶ See Durling, "Linacre" (n. 18 above), 86.

⁵⁷ *Galenus De sanitate tuenda*, ed. Konrad Koch, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* 5, 4, 2 (Leipzig, 1923), xx.

⁵⁸ *Galenus In Aphorismos* (n. 34 above), fol. AIV.

⁵⁹ See Fortuna, "Le prime traduzioni" (n. 7 above), 491–98.

⁶⁰ See Philippe Hoffmann, "Un mystérieux collaborateur d'Alde Manuce: l'Anonymus Harwardianus," *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Moyen Age–Temps modernes* 97 (1985): 45–143, at 113–15; and Hoffman, "Autres données relatives à un mystérieux collaborateur d'Alde Manuce: l'Anonymus Harwardianus," *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Moyen Age–Temps modernes* 98 (1986): 673–708, at 683.

TRANSLATION THEORY AND SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGY

The humanists were inclined to overestimate their achievements in every discipline at the expense of their predecessors, whose own merits were generally not properly acknowledged.⁶¹ Naturally, the preface provided an ideal place for self-promotion, and the medical translators tended to describe their activities and achievements in their dedicatory letters in somewhat repetitive slogans: praise for their own translations as ensuring a renaissance of ancient medicine, and attacks on previous translations. An example is Kopp's assertion in the preface to his Hippocratic translations: "ita medicina quoque omni humano generi tum utilis tum necessaria, a barbarica illuvie defecata, ad pristinam incipiat resurgere venustatem."⁶² In the preface to his translation of Galen's *Art of Medicine*, Leoniceno writes in a very similar vein: "ut . . . vetus medicina, quae olim in clarissima luce versabatur, nunc autem in libris barbarorum in litteris iacet obruta tenebris, tandem exerat caput et in pristinam claritatem atque splendorem revocetur."⁶³ The shallower the attacks on older translations are, the more violently are they executed. In the prefatory letter to Lorenzi's translation of Galen's *On the Different Kinds of Fevers*, for example, Ottato dismisses older translations of this text as not only barbarous, but also *inepta*, *inversa*, and *deformia*.⁶⁴

A different case presents itself in the form of the two dedicatory letters that Lorenzi addresses to Piero dei Medici: the one heads his translation of Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*, the other his translation of Galen's commentary. In these letters, Lorenzi sets out a systematic theory of translation (especially in the first letter) and scientific terminology (especially in the second letter).⁶⁵ Lorenzi affirms that translation must be literal, by rendering the "sensus integrum et solidum" of an ancient text, without "festivitates concinnitatesque"; yet it must not lose every *gratia* by failing to express "verbum de verbo" as previous translations had done.⁶⁶ Regarding the issue of scientific terminology, Lorenzi suggests that these two complementary rules should be followed: first, rely on Latin authors in order to use "non exculcata passim-

⁶¹ See n. 26 above.

⁶² *Hippocratis Praesagiorum libri tres* (n. 54 above), fol. AII.

⁶³ *Nicolai Leoniceni In libros Galeni . . . prefatio* (n. 49 above), fol. 5r.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, fol. 25r.

⁶⁵ On humanist theories of translation, see Mariarosa Cortesi, "La tecnica del tradurre presso gli umanisti," *The Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Proceedings of the First European Science Foundation Workshop on "The Reception of Classical Texts" (Florence, 26–27 June 1992)*, ed. Claudio Leonardi and Birger Munk Olsen (Spoleto, 1995), 143–68, who takes up some of the methodological suggestions put forward by Ernesto Berti, "Traduzioni oratorie fedeli," *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 2 (1988): 245–66.

⁶⁶ *Hippocratis medici Sententiarum particulae VII* (n. 44 above), fol. AIIv.

que iacientia nuncupamenta,” but “speciosa et amoena”;⁶⁷ second, coin entirely new words — “Latinis hominibus incognita et hactenus infecta” — where absolutely necessary: “Audendum enim quandoque est.”⁶⁸ In any event, useless transliterations, which are in evidence in older translations, are to be avoided.

Lorenzi states that he did not aim at a translation of Hippocrates or Galen, but “certare cum eis . . . et linguam linguae contendere.” He also writes that he is the first to undertake this new kind of writing: “ego primus (quod sciam) attingere ausus sum.”⁶⁹ This is, of course, a well-worn device of self-promotion and hence well suited for use in a prefatory context; the real import of Lorenzi’s contribution to medical terminology remained yet to be established. Moreover, his self-assertion regarding his pioneering role must have rung somewhat hollow, since his reputation as a plagiarist dated back to his false claim of having been the author of Poliziano’s Apicius collation.⁷⁰ In fact, it has been suggested that Lorenzi’s prefatory letters contain material that Poliziano prepared for his lost translation and commentary of Galen’s commentary on Hippocrates’ *Aphorisms*.⁷¹ I favor a reading that links them to Gaza’s prefaces to his translations of Aristotle’s *On Animals* and Theophrastus’s *On Plants*. Such a reading would be supported by the fact that both texts not only present almost the same theory of translation and scientific theory, but also literally coincide in non-random ways. In particular, the central passage of Lorenzi’s first letter seems to be a summary of Gaza’s preface to his translation of Aristotle:

[Gaza:] Videbam per multa errasse interpretes tum imperitia linguae tum Aristotelicae disciplinae inscitia. . . . Laboravi eisdem hac in re vehementer. . . . Sententiam vero auctoris passim adeo depravarunt, ut argumento quidem interpretationis eorum nemo tam indoctus sit, qui non rectius iudicare de rebus naturae quam Aristoteles posse videatur. . . . Afferrem hoc loco scripta illorum interpretum erroresque singillatim enumerando reprehenderem, nisi longior essem

[Lorenzi:] qua in re satis quidem laboravi. Nam quae priores converterunt, ea partim ob infantiam inepte atque sordide protulerunt, partim inscitia passim auctoris depravarunt sententiam, ut non temere quis vel mediocriter eruditus aut honestius interloqui valeat aut facile damnare ea, quae nobilissimus medicus acri subtilique ingenio et iudicio conscripsit. Percenserem illorum errata, nisi scirem omnia illa innotura nostram legentibus interpretationem. Eam autem

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid., fol. BIVv.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Lorenzi’s plagiarism has been pointed out by Augusto Campana, “Contributi alla biblioteca del Poliziano,” *Il Poliziano e il suo tempo: Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento (Firenze, 23–26 settembre 1954)* (Florence, 1957), 173–229.

⁷¹ See Alessandro Perosa, “Codici di Galeno postillati dal Poliziano,” *Umanesimo e Rinascimento: Studi offerti a Paul Oskar Kristeller da Vittore Branca, Arsenio Frugoni, Eugenio Garin et al.* (Florence, 1980), 75–109.

in re non dubia praesertim apud te, princeps doctissime, qui ante doctor pro tuo singulari iudicio semper damnasti illorum interpretationem melioremque desiderasti. . . . Me plurimum elaborasse in his libris interpretandis fateor. Cum nihil a primis interpretibus illis iuari possem, sed omnia ex codicibus veterum auctorum petere necesse haberem, lectione longa notationeque varia Plinium, Cornelium, Columellam, Varronem, Catonem, M. Tullium, Apuleium, Gellium, Senecam, compluresque alios linguae Latinae auctores evolvere diligentius oportuit.⁷²

Lorenzi thus speaks about his kind of translation — which, as we know, aims at giving the “sensum integrum et solidum” to an ancient text — by employing an expression similar to Gaza’s “cultius atque integrius.”⁷⁴

In the second part of the prefatory letter to his translation of Aristotle, Gaza discusses the issue of scientific terminology, a topic also addressed by Lorenzi in his second letter. The opinions expressed by Gaza and Lorenzi are very similar indeed, even though their arguments differ.⁷⁵ However, both writers begin by expressing a certain anxiety over the fact that readers may be offended by new words. This, however, is probably a commonplace and therefore not terribly significant. Both authors also refer to the same passage from Cicero, but while Gaza quotes Cicero as defender of the linguistic riches of Latin, Lorenzi cites him as a supporter of linguistic innovation. Moreover, Lorenzi attacks the practice of transliteration of Greek terms in the same words as Gaza does in his preface to the translation of Theophrastus:

[Gaza:] Inter iuniores vero scilicet nostrae aetatis homines aut paulo antiquiores, qui . . . ut Latine singula dictarent, minus curarunt, Graecis ipsis vocabulis usi adeo sunt, ut nullum fere fructum ex eorum interpretatione homo Latinus capere possit.⁷⁶

sic effecimus, ut non exculcata passimque iacentia nuncupamenta poneremus, sed speciosa et amoena adscire placuit, imitati M. T. Ciceronem, Plinium, Celsum, Varronem, Apuleium, Senecam et alios complures, quos evolvere et transire necesse habuimus. Neque, ut nostrae aetatis interpretes devorato pudore insecite incurioseque fecerunt, a quibus haud quicquam iuari potuimus, ad verbum sententias explicuimus.⁷³

[Lorenzi:] Nam qui nostri saeculi vel paulo superioris aevi medicinae volumina transferre in Latinam linguam aggressi sunt, Graecis ipsis vocabulis et quidem interpellatis aut etiam barbaris usi sunt, adeo ut nullam utilitatem ex illorum interpretationibus capere possit.⁷⁷

⁷² *Aristotelis De animalibus, interprete Theodoro Gaza* (Venice, 1498), fol. AV. The first edition was published in Venice in 1476.

⁷³ *Hippocratis medici Sententiarum particulae VII*, fol. AIIv.

⁷⁴ *Aristotelis de animalibus*, fol. AVr.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. AVIr; *Hippocratis medici sententiarum particulae VII*, fol. BIVr.

⁷⁶ Charles B. Schmitt, “Theophrastus,” *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, ed. Paul Oskar Kristeller, vol. 2 (Washington, DC, 1971), 267.

⁷⁷ *Hippocratis medici Sententiarum particulae VII*, fol. BIVv.

As we have seen above, Lorenzi himself expresses his indebtedness to Gaza in his second letter. In fact, he even admits to using some of the terms for diseases first coined by Gaza — yet with the express intent of emulating the latter’s work rather than of plagiarizing it:

Ceterum non me fugit, ut nonnullis usus sim nominibus morborum, quae prius in Theodoro Gazae scrupulosus comperiat lector licebit. Tantum enim abest, ut criminis scrupulum abnuam (si tamen per hoc me quispiam criminis accessit, quod cunctis laudi fuit aemulari maiorum faberrime effecta), ut sponte et volens praedicem planeque confitear: me ab eo summpere adiutum in vertendis istiusmodi commentationibus.⁷⁸

As yet, no systematic lexical research into Gaza and his influence on medical humanism has been undertaken, so it is difficult to evaluate Lorenzi’s precise debt to Gaza.⁷⁹ Further research will probably show, however, that his terminological usage was highly influential not only on Lorenzi, but on a host of other medical translators as well.

TEXTUAL EMENDATION

Gaza’s preface to his translations of Aristotle’s *On Animals* is cited by Leonicensio at the beginning of his *In libros Galeni e Graeca in linguam Latinam a se translatos prefatio communis*, which was published for the first time in Venice in 1508, together with two Galenic translations: the *Art of Medicine*, translated by Leonicensio himself, and *On the Different Kinds of Fevers*, translated by Lorenzi. Leonicensio’s reference to Gaza concerns the translator’s duty to correct the translated text in cases where the sources transmit it wrongly, for whatever reason:

ad alias interpretandi difficultates hanc quoque scribit accedere, quod exemplaria Graeca, si quando librorum culpa vel aliquo alio casu habent mendosa, corrigere sit necessarium. Aliquando vel ipsi interpreti vel auctori, cuius opus interpretandum suscipitur, paratur infamia. Solere autem homines potius de interprete quam de autore operis male iudicare.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Ibid. If Gaza was indeed the translator of Hippocrates’ *Aphorisms*, this passage can be explained as an attempt to hide the plagiarism; if Lorenzi was the translator, it can be explained as a contribution to the erroneous attribution of the translation. See n. 45 above.

⁷⁹ Perfetti, “Cultius atque integrius” (n. 46 above), 267–71, provides a stylistic and lexical analysis of Gaza’s translation and gives some examples of anatomical terms in Gaza’s translation and in George of Trebizond’s translation. It is worth noting that Lorenzi translates three terms according to Gaza’s translation (φρένες = *praecordia*; κοτυληδόνες = *acetabula*; πιμελή = *pinguedo*), and two terms according to George’s translation (γονή = *genitura*; ἰχώρ = *sanies*). Regarding Linacre’s medical terminology, one must commend once again Durling’s seminal contribution, “Linacre” (n. 18 above), 99–103.

⁸⁰ *Nicolai Leonicensi In libros Galeni . . . prefatio* (n. 49 above), fol. 2r.

Unlike the other prefaces discussed above, Leoniceno's *Prefatio communis* does not take the form of a dedicatory letter. Rather, it is a sort of brief philological treatise on emendation within which Leoniceno deals with three textual corrections: the first regarding Aristotle's *On the History of Animals* (VIII 22: 50, 8 L.: πλῆν: πρίν), and the other two concerning Galen's *Art of Medicine* (28: 77, 3 B. = I, 381, 3 K.: αἰτίαν: οὐσίαν; 34: 91, 14 B. = I, 395, 17 K.: διὰ μειζόνων: διὰ μειόνων).

The confines of this article prevent me from discussing the modest value of these emendations in detail. Suffice it to say that the first, which is grammatically incorrect, regards a difficult passage widely discussed in the famous polemic on the rabid dog;⁸¹ and that the other two were evidently received favorably by Leoniceno's readers, for they were annotated in the margins of Par. gr. 2273, a manuscript written by the Aristotelian scholar and member of Aldo's circle Nicolò Leonico Tomeo.⁸² The identity of this annotator is unknown, but Philippe Hoffmann found the same hand in the margins of some other manuscripts written by Tomeo.⁸³

Rather than delving deeper into Leoniceno's emendation here, I would finally like to consider the criteria that Leoniceno used as the basis of his proposed corrections. Leoniceno insists that his emendations aim at resolving textual difficulties while respecting the tradition: "neque tamen hoc [to correct] temere aut nimium licenter agimus."⁸⁴ Indeed, in the case of the first emendation, he tries to show that there are factual and content-related inconsistencies in the source-text, an argument he backs up with a discussion of the many different interpretations offered by the previous commentators or translators. Only after this does he propose his emendations, which nevertheless do not depart very far from the text of the manuscripts.

Leoniceno claims that the emendations must affect only one or two letters in the text of the manuscripts. As regards the first passage (πλῆν: πρίν)

⁸¹ This debate is reconstructed by Mugnai Carrara, *La polemica* (n. 30 above).

⁸² See Fabio Vendruscolo, "Manoscritti greci copiati dall'umanista e filosofo Nicolò Leonico Tomeo," *Ὀδοὶ διζήσιος: Le vie della ricerca; Studi in onore di Francesco Adorno*, ed. Maria Serena Funghi (Florence, 1996), 543–55.

⁸³ Hoffmann, "Autres données" (n. 60 above), 706–7, dates these and other marginal corrections of the Par. gr. 2273, written by the same hand, to the second half of the fifteenth century; see also Véronique Boudon, *Exhortation à l'étude de la médecine: Art médicale*, Collection des Universités de France 2 (Paris, 2000), 220–22. But they must date from a later time, since they certainly depend on Leoniceno's *Prefatio communis* written not long before 1503; see n. 30 above. On the sources of the marginal corrections of the Par. gr. 2273, see S. Fortuna, "Nicolò Leoniceno e la traduzione latina dell'Ars medica di Galeno," *I testi medici greci: Tradizione e edotica; Atti del III Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 15–18 ottobre 1997)*, ed. Antonio Garzya and Jacques Jouanna (Naples, 1999), 157–73, at 171–72.

⁸⁴ *Nicolai Leoniceni In libros Galeni . . . prefatio*, fol. 2r.

he comes to the following conclusion: “quod una tantum aut altera littera hic commutata facillime possumus facere.”⁸⁵ And with regard to the last passage (διὰ μειζόνων: διὰ μειόνων), he writes: “quod facillime una dempta littera facere possumus.”⁸⁶ In the former instance, Leoniceno speaks of *commutatio* to explain the error and the required emendation, while in the latter, he discovers a case of *subtractio*. Both alteration and subtraction are recorded as accepted methods either in the few ancient and medieval classifications of scribal errors, or in the classification of emendations written by Francesco Robortello of Udine in his 1557 treatise, which he proudly called the first on emendation.⁸⁷

In the case of the first passage of Galen’s *Art of medicine* (αἰτία: οὐσία), and in addition to the mechanical criterion of the one or two letter alteration that justifies the correction, Leoniceno appeals to phonetics, a topic which, according to Jean Le Clerc, author of the *Ars critica* published in several editions from 1697 onwards, had been unduly neglected in the past:⁸⁸

Si cui vero videtur esse nimis dissona castigatio propter magnam duorum verborum, causae scilicet et essentiae, non solum in scriptura sed etiam in prolotione dissimilitudinem, si quis — inquam — hanc mihi obijciat dissonantiam, sciat me non verbum Latinum causam sed Graecum αἰτία, quod idem significat apud Graecos quod apud Latinos causa, primo modo emendare, a quo ad οὐσία alterum verbum Graecum, quod essentiam significat, est brevissimus transitus, cum una fere syllaba distent.⁸⁹

The two words αἰτία and οὐσία are very similar, whether spoken or written. In fact, as written words, they look very similar in minuscule handwriting.

Interestingly, Leoniceno cites his own experience as manuscript reader and collator to prove his point: “Hanc autem duorum Graecorum nominum vicinitatem fuisse causam erroris librarii, indicio esse possunt quidam Graeci codices, in quibus loco verbi οὐσία scribitur aliquando viciose αἰτία.”⁹⁰ In the *Art of Medicine*, there are actually two passages (28: 362, 16 e 17 B. = 382, 9 e 11 K.) that contain the variant οὐσία: αἰτία, and Leoniceno probably knew both of these passages; as the catalogue of his library and a philological analysis of his translation attest, he had access to many Latin and Greek sources of this text. Furthermore, it is possible to show that in his translation of the *Art of Medicine*, Leoniceno probably used the manuscripts Par.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., fol. 2v.

⁸⁷ See Edward J. Kenney, *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley, 1974), 28–36.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 42.

⁸⁹ *Nicolai Leoniceni In libros Galeni . . . prefatio*, fol. 3r.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

gr. 2163 and Par. gr. 2277 in addition to older translations, most prominently among them the medieval Greek-Latin one.⁹¹

Leonicenso's *Preface* does not represent a systematic study of scribal errors and types of emendation; his primary concern was rather the task of explaining and/or translating any given single passage. Nor were his observations terribly original; they would have formed part of a scholarly tradition common to the humanist scholars of Greek. Yet, and in the absence of other theoretical contributions regarding the Greek language by philologists of the same period, Leonicenso does deserve a place in the history of textual criticism.⁹²

In conclusion, the prefaces that introduce the humanist medical translations are normally dedicatory letters. Only Leonicenso's preface to his translations takes the form of a brief treatise. Like other humanist prefaces, these prefaces reproduce the characteristics of style and composition of their ancient Latin models, even if they otherwise differ widely both in length and in content. Further study of them may yield information on the environment and dates in which the translations were undertaken, on the sources that were used, on lost or unknown material, and on the circulation of ancient Greek medical texts during the period. They are important witnesses to the lives and relationships of the humanist physicians, as well as to their scientific programs and activities, which were generally directed at a complete recovery of ancient Greek medicine. Physicians had only recently, and in relatively small numbers, begun to acquire a sound knowledge of Greek; and only some of them began to search for manuscripts and to produce new Latin translations, which actually were very different from the medieval ones. Some of these physicians, like Lorenzi and Leonicenso, also reflected on the problems they encountered in the process of translating: problems concerning style, terminology, and emendation, where the Greek sources were clearly wrong. The prefaces preserve these precious and rare philological remarks.

Università Politecnica delle Marche

⁹¹ See Fortuna, "Nicolò Leonicenso."

⁹² Vivian Nutton has elaborated upon the philological contribution of medical humanism with particular insight; see esp. "John Caius and the Linacre Tradition," *Medical History* 23 (1979): 373–91; and *John Caius* (n. 12 above), 101–3. On Leonicenso's contribution, see Mugnai Carrara, *La polemica* (n. 30 above).