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With us ther was a DOCTOUR OF PHISIK
...
Wel knew he the olde Esculapius,
And Deyscorides, and eek Rufus,
Old Ypocrates, Haly, and Galyen,
Sarapion, Razis, and Avycen,
Averrois, Damascien, and Consantyn
...
Of his diete mesurable was he,
For it was of no superfluitee,
But of greet norissyng and digestible.

— Geoffrey Chaucer, Canterbury Tales (GP 411-37, my italics)

Foreword

This project identifies, contextualizes, and transcribes a hitherto unidentified thirteenth-century manuscript fragment housed at the University of Victoria. It arose out of coursework for a manuscript studies class offered through the Department of English, and it is focused primarily on codicology, the study of the manuscript as a material object, as well as historical and cultural contexts. Although I have a very limited knowledge of Latin, the language of the fragment in question, this project entails a full transcription of Latin text and a collation with other Latin manuscripts. Abbreviations were expanded in accordance with comparison manuscripts and an early print edition of the text, as well as through consultation with Adriano Capelli’s Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiani. Training and consultation with my supervisor, Dr. Adrienne Williams Boyarin, was also crucial. The scope of this project highlights how much can be learned about a text by studying its material form.

Introduction

Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4 is a single-leaf fragment with text concerning various fruits and vegetables. It was acquired for the University of Victoria in 2006 by book historian
Erik Kwakkel (University of Leiden). At that time, Kwakkel determined that it was written in France ca. 1250-1300 and noted its similarity to several medieval encyclopedic texts, including Rabanus Maurus’ *De universo*, Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum naturale*, Piero Cantalupo’s *De flores dietarum*, and Isidore’s *Etymologies.* However, no positive identification was made, and the leaf was internally labeled as simply “medieval plants fragment.” In 2015, undergraduate student Zoe Lommerse discovered that a significant portion of the text was included in Bartholomeus Mini de Sini’s *Tractatus de herbis*, as preserved in the late thirteenth-century London, British Library, MS Egerton 747. Aided by Iolanda Ventura’s edition of Egerton 747 and the British Library’s facsimile, Lommerse produced a partial transcription, but it quickly became clear that much of the text did not match. In the following year, continuing from Lommerse’s initial findings, I undertook a complete transcription, challenged to obtain a more precise identification. In Minta Collins’s introduction to the Egerton 747 facsimile, I found that parts of Isaac Judaeus’ *Liber dietarium universalium et particularium* had been added to Egerton 747 as later marginal insertions, and further, after reviewing the facsimile images, that all of the text matching Fragm.Lat.4 was written in the margins. Through investigation of the works of Isaac Judaeus and his *Liber dietarium*, then, I was able to confirm that the Victoria fragment records part of the Latin version of Isaac’s Arabic text on diets (*Kitāb al-aghdhiya*), as translated

---

1 Dr. Kwakkel worked at University of Victoria, as a sessional instructor and limited-term Assistant Professor for Medieval Studies and History, from 2005 to 2010. In the summer of 2006, he acquired several fragments from the Netherlands for the University’s Special Collections and Archives.

2 Kwakkel, “Encyclopedic Texts on Plants, Fragment.”

3 Lommerse made this finding in December 2015, during project-related coursework for an undergraduate manuscript studies class with Dr. Adrienne Williams Boyarin. Her initial partial identification and resulting partial draft transcription formed the basis of my original work.


by the eleventh-century Benedictine monk Constantine the African. The full text of the fragment—on the medicinal and nutritional uses of melon, cucumber, squash, watermelon, and lettuce—can be verified through comparison with what is still the only edition of the complete Liber dietarium, in the 1515 Opera omnia Ysaac printed in Lyon by Andreas Turinus.\footnote{Isaac Judaeus, \textit{Omnia opera Ysaac}, fol. 124r-125r (near the beginning of the “Tertia particulares de herbis”). The text can also be verified by comparison with Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MSS Clm. 13066 (fol. 60vb-61va) and 13111 (fol. 84rb-84vb), and Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS LJS 24 (fol. 65va-66rb)—all of which are available online. My Appendix B (below) collates variation between these texts and the Victoria fragment.}

Difficulty with initial identification was connected to a misreading of the Victoria fragment’s material form. Fragm.Lat.4 appears to have been cut out of its original codex and reused as a wrapper or binding aid, such that, in the initial assessment, the orientation of its recto and verso were misunderstood.\footnote{Kwakkel, “Encyclopedic Texts on Plants, Fragment,” initially reversed the recto and verso, though the online record of his description, and associated labels on digitized images of the leaf, have since been revised to reflect my findings.} When the fragment was reused, its orientation was correctly preserved (judging by stitching holes), but it was also sloppily trimmed along the opposite margin, so that marginal corrections done by the main-text scribe are cut off on both sides. The current margin measurements, before identification of the text and its order, were therefore misleading. This copy of the \textit{Liber dietarium}, however, was never a pristine production: the parchment is of “mediocre quality,”\footnote{Ibid.} and the scribe made many errors.

Nevertheless, Fragm.Lat.4 is now, with this identification, a noteworthy survival and a significant part of the University of Victoria’s medieval holdings. It is a remnant of an influential component of the medieval medical curriculum (on which more below), and it is an artifact of the transmission of Judeo-Arab learning into the Latin West, through two extraordinary figures...
of early medieval learning: Constantine the African and Isaac Judaeus. This thirteenth-century fragment is, moreover, the only known copy of the Liber dietarium in Canada. My work on this new witness to the text aims to provide resources and contextual material for future researchers.

What follows is divided into three sections, a conclusion, and three appendices. The first section gives a brief biography of Isaac Judaeus and introduces the Liber dietarium universalium et particularium, and the second gives a brief biography of Constantine the African. The purpose of these two biographical sections is to give readers background information on the authorship and transmission of the text that Fragm.Lat.4 contains. The third section discusses the Italian city of Salerno, a prominent center for medical studies in medieval Europe, where medical curricula (including Isaac Judaeus’s texts) were set, and where many of the changes that took place in medieval medicine during the eleventh and twelfth centuries first developed. The purpose of this third section is to provide some context for Constantine’s translation of the Liber dietarium, i.e., to explain why it was important and why it was produced at all, as well as to provide a sense of how the text was received during the Middle Ages. The third section also touches on the subject of the Articella, a compilation of medical writings used as the standard text for the study of medicine at medieval universities and considered to be the primary canonical collection on medicine during the period. Because the Liber Dietarium was often included in Articella compilations, this section provides further background on the place of the Liber dietarium in the medieval world, and on the type of manuscript from which Victoria’s Fragm.Lat.4 could have come, or from which it could have been copied. The conclusion brings together all of the information discussed in the first three sections and considers the medieval and modern receptions of Constantine’s translation of the Liber dietarium. Finally, a full transcription of Fragm.Lat.4 is included in Appendix A; textual notes collating the Victoria fragment with
variants in other manuscripts and an early print edition are in Appendix B; and an index of extant manuscripts containing all or part of the *Liber dietarium* is Appendix C.

**Isaac Judaeus and the *Liber dietarium universalium et particularium***

Isaac Judaeus, also known as Isaac Israeli ben Solomon or Isḥāq ibn Sulaymān al-Isrāʾīlī, was a philosopher and court physician from about 905 until his death in approximately 932.⁹ He lived in a region that today is part of Tunisia, first serving the caliphate of the Aghlabid dynasty, and subsequently that of the Fatimid dynasty after their overthrow of the Aghlabids in 909 (Veit 230). While his works on urinalysis, fevers, and diet were influential to both Judeo-Arab and Western medical traditions, little else is known about his life (Ferre and Veit 309), except that he died without marrying or fathering a child. In addition to medical texts, he wrote philosophical works and is considered to be the first Jewish Neoplatonist (Veit 231, Ferre and Veit 310).

Although Isaac was marked as a cultural outsider by the names given to him in both Latin and Arabic traditions (“Judaeus” and “al-Isrāʾīlī”), his knowledge was not allocated the same outsider status as his person. He was apparently a highly regarded court physician during his lifetime, surviving both the execution of his mentor (Veit 230) and the overthrow of the court in which he served. He was likely an important figure even before his appointment as court physician, as he was called from his home in Baghdad to the court of Ziyādat Allāh III in Kairouan (Tunisia) early in his career (Veit 230). Shortly after the translation of Isaac’s works from Arabic into Latin, more than a century after his death, they became compulsory reading for medical students at European universities—a subject discussed in greater detail below. While

⁹ Medieval biographers disagree on the year of his death; modern research has shown that a date of 930-932 is most likely. See Veit, “Les Diètes universelles et particulières d’Isaac Israeli,” 230, and Ferre and Veit, “Arabic into Hebrew,” 310.
both Muslim and Christian worlds, throughout the Middle Ages, nominally labelled Isaac as an outsider because he was a Jew, his scientific and medical knowledge and Arabic writings were nevertheless granted space at the center of cultural canons.

The entirety of Isaac’s medical works was translated into Latin by Constantine the African sometime in the latter half of the eleventh century (Veit 231). Of the original text of the Liber dietarium in Arabic, known as the Kitāb al-aghdhiya, only a single complete manuscript survives: Istanbul, Maktaba al-Suleymaniye, MS Fatih 3604-2607 (Veit 232). Although two printed versions of Constantine’s translation of Isaac’s oeuvre survive, one printed in 1515 titled Omnia Opera Ysaac, and one printed in 1536 titled Opera Constantini Africani, only the 1515 edition includes the full Liber dietarium. Extant medieval manuscripts of the Liber dietarium usually do not contain the full text but rather extracts and redactions—even in the earliest examples, which date to about 1150 (Veit 236). This does not mean that it was not a significant text—Raphaela Veit’s recent work adds 30 manuscript witnesses to the previously known 82\(^\text{10}\)—but it does make it difficult to know the relative rarity of the text contained in the Victoria fragment. Some reasons for this situation will be explained below, in remarks on the medieval usage of this text in Europe, particularly its inclusion in Articella texts, and in the conclusion.

**Constantine the African and the Liber dietarium universalium et particularium**

Constantine the African was a key figure in the transmission of Arabic texts into Latin-Christian Europe. He lived in the eleventh century,\(^\text{11}\) and his influence lasted well into the fourteenth century—the result of his numerous translations of medical and scientific texts, as well as his

---

\(^{10}\) For extant manuscripts, see Veit “Les Diètes universelles,” 243-49; Nicoud, “Inventaire n° 4”; and my Appendix C below. My thanks to Monica Green for sharing Veit’s essay with me.

\(^{11}\) He lived from about 1020 to around 1087 (Garcia-Ballester, “Introduction” 10), but his exact dates are uncertain.
authoring of a few original texts. Constantine translated and revised the writings of various authors of medical texts written in Arabic, including all of Isaac Judaeus’ medical works. In her comparison of the *Liber dietarium* with its Arabic source, *Kitāb al-aghdhiya*, Raphaela Veit notes that while Constantine made no additions in his translation, he did significantly restructure the text by altering its division into parts and chapters. The Arabic text was comprised of four parts, whereas the Latin translation was comprised of two: the *universales* and *particulares* (Veit 232-233). The *universales* section consists of the first book of *Kitāb al-aghdhiya*, while the *particulares* section is divided into five parts. The first two parts of the *particulares* divide the second book of the Arabic text in two; the third part corresponds to the third Arabic book; and the fourth and fifth books also divide the final book of the source text into two (Veit 233). Finally, within each book, Constantine altered the partitions between chapters, and made many elisions, ranging from omissions of words to entire passages (Veit 233).

Constantine was also the translator of the *Isagoge Ioannitii ad Tegni Galeni* of Ḥunayn ibn ’Iṣḥāq al-‘Ibādī (Johannitius) (Wallis 139), the central text of the *Articella*, a compilation of medical writings used as the standard university text in medieval European medical faculties. The *Articella* is discussed in more detail below, but, as with the *Liber dietarium*, and the other works which he translated, Constantine made substantial alterations to, and elisions from, the *Isagoge* (Wallis 139). Despite his penchant for omissions and alterations, Luis Garcia-Ballester writes that Constantine “produced a great torrent of terminology, methods, [and] medical doctrine characterized by a logical and coherent structure” (“Introduction,” 10). His work was therefore of foundational and lasting influence to medieval higher learning.

Three conflicting biographies of Constantine exist from the Middle Ages. The first was written by his fellow Montecassino monk Peter the Deacon in his *De viris illustribus* (On *Distinguished Men*). Peter “depicts [Constantine] as the conduit of exotic eastern science and
medical lore to the Christian West” (Wallis 136), and he presents him as a man of science who is well-versed in virtually every aspect of human knowledge, pursuing learning for its own sake. This rather fanciful account claims that Constantine was learned in “necromancia” and “musica” (d’Alverny II 423, Wallis 137), and the account is likely somewhat embellished. The second, and most dubious, biography paints Constantine as a “dangerous incompetent” and “fugitive from Spain” (Wallis 136); however, as Faith Wallis points out, this biography was likely composed by rivals to discredit Constantine. A third, and much more interesting biography survives, written by a “Master Matthaeus F.,” as a marginal gloss in a manuscript of a Constantine’s translation of the Liber dietarium. This account, attached to a medieval commentary on the same text from which Victoria’s Fragm.Lat.4 comes, describes Constantine as “a merchant, who came [to Europe] in the course of business” (qtd. in Wallis 138). Instead of the great man of learning from Peter the Deacon’s biography, this description presents Constantine as a travelling, multilingual figure who supplies a demand by creating Latin translations of Arabic texts in order to supplement the knowledge of doctors and medical scholars working in Europe at the time. Matthaeus F.’s biography recounts that Constantine visited Italy and watched a doctor at work. Upon asking the doctor where he gained his knowledge, the doctor responded by saying he had done so by trial and error and a great deal of practice. According to the biography, Constantine then returned to Africa and began collecting medical texts, and when this task was completed he returned to Europe and acquired patronage in order to undertake their translation into Latin. In this narrative, the role Constantine plays in the translation and transmission of texts parallels his

12 Wallis gives her account of this biography and theories about its composition, but she does not name her source text. See Wallis, 136.

13 See Appendix C below, “Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS O 62 a” and d’Alverny II 423 for the reference to the MS.
recasting as a member of the mercantile class rather than a man of letters. While this was probably the least-known biography of Constantine during the Middle Ages, as it is preserved as a marginal insertion in only one manuscript, it is interesting that it is associated with the text presently under discussion, the *Liber dietarium*. This biography is thus associated explicitly with Constantine’s transmission of Jewish learning via Arabic language and Muslim courts, and with a text that has practical medicinal use (e.g., it allows one to look up a specific food and read about its properties and uses). In this case, Constantine’s life is not only remembered due to the translations he produced, but also alongside translation itself.

A 1536 collection of Constantine’s translations, printed in Basel by Henricus Petrus as the *Opera Constantini Africani*, does not contain anywhere near the full number of Constantine’s translations, and it omits several of the most significant translations he produced. It also does not contain the *Liber dietarium universalium et particularium*, which just 21 years earlier—in the 1515 Lyon edition—had been a key text in the association of Constantine with Isaac Judaeus and Judeo-Arab translation projects.¹⁵

**Salerno, the *Articella*, and Medicine in Medieval Universities**

The southern Italian city of Salerno was the site of Constantine the African’s initial arrival on the continent. Salerno was associated with a number of significant changes in European medicine during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, a reputation which it had already established before

---

¹⁴ Although Constantine is sometimes thought to have converted from Islam to Christianity (both in the Middle Ages and now)—see Skinner (143) for a modern example of the misconception—there is no indication that this is true. The only evidence to suggest it (obliquely) seems to be the “Mattheus F.” biography (d’Alverny II 423).

¹⁵ A full PDF scan of the 1536 *Opera Constantini Africani* is available (and downloadable) from GoogleBooks.
Constantine’s arrival, but which was only bolstered by the production and dissemination of his translations. Constantine’s first patron in Europe was Archbishop Alphanus of Salerno (Wallis 139), before he moved to Monte Cassino, where his patron then became the Abbot Desiderius and where he lived the remainder of his life (Wallis 136). Luis Garcia-Ballester refers to these three individuals as the main innovators in medicine during the eleventh century, citing the translations produced by Alphanus and Desiderius as well as Constantine (Garcia-Ballester “Introduction,” 13). According to Garcia-Ballester, it was essentially these three men, working on their own, who laid the foundation for a paradigm shift in medicine during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and, after their translations, “we have to wait until sometime in the first half of the twelfth century to find clear signs of contact between Latin medical literature translated from Greek or Arabic and the intellectual activity of Salernitan physicians” (“Introduction” 15). Although Salerno was known as a center of advanced medical practice before Constantine’s arrival, it did not become a center for medical theory until about half a century after his death, when his translations first came to the attention of physicians in and around Salerno.16

According to Faith Wallis, the cultural forces driving the changes in medicine that took place during the eleventh and twelfth centuries were “translation, medical theory, academic instruction, and the textualization of medical practice” (131). All of these were associated with the city of Salerno and the advent of medical instruction at universities. Wallis sums up the changes in medical instruction and practice as “medicine’s theoretical turn” and states that it “first emerges into view in the writings associated with the city of Salerno” (129). She argues that this “theoretical turn” was essentially “the impetus to recast medical practice into a more systematic, rational form” (129). It was due specifically to the “diffusion of Constantine’s works

---

16 This would seem to explain why few manuscripts of the Liber dietarium survive from earlier than 1150 and that none contain the full text—a question implicitly raised by Veit, page 236.
in Southern Italy—and more precisely around Salerno itself” that Western medicine made this
turn (Garcia-Ballester “Introduction,” 14). Wallis writes that “text-based medicine […] would
become the hallmark of Salerno” (133), and its association with the textualization of medicine
was partially responsible for Salerno’s renown as a center of medical knowledge. The Articella,
which I mentioned above as the summative collection of this newly textualized learning, was
first compiled in Salerno for use in university instruction (O’Boyle 82), and it was likely there
that Constantine translated the Isagoge, the central text of the Articella. Wallis writes that “the
Articella was the backbone of the theoretical component of the new medical curriculum
associated with Salerno” (139), and its spread throughout Europe facilitated the assimilation of
medical instruction into universities (O’Boyle 82, Siraisi 188, Wallis 191-92).

Articella, or Ars medicina, is the name given to medieval collections of medical writings
based around five core texts, but often featuring several standard supplementary texts. These
types of manuscripts were originally assembled in the early twelfth century and were considered
the standard medical textbooks for university education in Europe from the early thirteenth
century until about the sixteenth century (O’Boyle 82). Of the six supplementary texts typically
included in the Articella, five are Latin translations by Constantine the African, of which four
were originally written in Arabic by Isaac Judaeus (O’Boyle 110). Regarding the texts of Isaac
included in copies of the Articella, Cornelius O’Boyle writes:

The Universal and Particular Diets were the first texts of the [supplementary] sub-group
to appear alongside the Ars medicina, and quickly became frequent additions to the
collection […] they maintained their popularity throughout the thirteenth century and
continued to appear alongside the Ars medicina until well into the fourteenth century.
(111)

O’Boyle also notes that by the time the early 1270s came around, Isaac’s works in general were
so well known to medical scholars that the titles of individual texts did not need to be mentioned
in university statutes stating the required texts for medical study (126). They could be referred to
simply by the epithet “the books of Isaac.” From about the mid thirteenth century to at least mid fourteenth century, the Liber dietarium was a popular and well-known text for medical students. This widespread circulation is corroborated by the fact that an exceptionally disproportionate number of the manuscripts of the Liber dietarium which survive date from approximately this hundred-year period (1250-1350). The inclusion of the Liber dietarium in the Articella, and thus in university curriculums, seems to have greatly increased the rate at which manuscripts of the Liber dietarium were produced for this duration, that is, within a relatively short period of time. Given these facts, and the dating of Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4, it is likely that the Victoria fragment was originally part of a codex owned by someone who studied and/or taught medicine at a university in France (most likely Paris), and that they used or copied the manuscript for that purpose.

**Conclusions**

While Veit, Wallis, O’Boyle, and others point out that Constantine’s translation of the Liber dietarium was a core text in university medical curriculums throughout the Middle Ages, the statutes of the Sorbonne from 1270-1274 put a much stronger emphasis on the teaching of its universales than its partiuclare (Veit 240). This points to the likelihood that the universales section was more widely read, used, and copied, and it suggests that the partiuclare might survive with less consistency of content and copying. Though both the universales and the partiuclare were used in Articella compilations, for instance, comparison with a complete

---

17 See the first part of Appendix C below, which lists 54 of 117 extant manuscripts as dated from approximately this time.
British Library *Articella* shows that the fragment’s text is omitted.\(^{18}\) Furthermore, many of the manuscripts listed by Veit and her sources contain only the *universales* section.\(^{19}\) Certainty about the number of other manuscripts witnesses containing the text of the Victoria fragment will have to await collation with a significant sampling of other known manuscripts.

Unlike other modern scholars, such as Veit, Cornelius O’Boyle considers the *universales* and *particulaires* sections of the *Liber dietarium* to be separate texts. This appears to be based on his observation that they are treated as separate texts in the records of university curriculums (O’Boyle 24n51), whereas Veit points out that the original Arabic text by Isaac consisted of four parts and that Constantine translated these as a whole (Veit 233). As mentioned above, in Constantine’s translation, the *universales* section is comprised of the first part of the Arabic text, whereas the *particulaires* consist of the remaining parts of the complete original text (Veit 232-33). The reason for the treatment of the *Liber dietarium* as either one or two texts therefore lies in whether or not the Arabic text is considered a more authoritative version of the text than the Latin translation and its history of transmission. Medieval Europeans seem to have treated the *universales* and *particulaires* as distinct texts, and this can be credited to the partitions of Constantine’s translation, the version of the text they would have almost exclusively

\(^{18}\) See London, British Library, MS Harley 3140 (available online), where Isaac’s *Dietae particulares* (fols. 110v-137r) includes only the first part of the *particulaires*, thus omitting Fragm.Lat.4’s text and much else.

\(^{19}\) This is true of six manuscripts on Veit’s list (op. cit. note 29), and for others she notes fragments or uncertainties; Nicoud, “Inventaire n° 4,” designates eight manuscripts with *universales* only, not counting cases of ambiguity or commentaries. Thorndike and Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits*, is also a useful resource for identifying specific content in manuscripts containing Isaac’s translated works.
encountered. Since O’Boyle’s work focuses on the history of the *Ars medicina*, it make sense that he refers to the *universales* and *particulares* as separate texts, because that is how they are described in the medieval materials and manuscripts upon which he based his research. Veit, on the other hand, to better understand the transmission of the text into Latin Europe, undertakes a comparison of Constantine’s Latin with Isaac’s Arabic text, in which such stark division does not exist, and thus refers to a single text. Neither understanding is necessarily more correct, and I have, in my research, followed the majority of scholars, who consider *Liber dietarium* to be a single text with two major sections. However, in relation to the text contained on Fragm.Lat.4, it is useful to consider the separate treatment of the sections, for instance, in the statutes of the Sorbonne and in extant manuscripts.

Regarding the relationship between Constantine’s translation and Isaac Judaeus’ Arabic text, there is some uncertainty about authorship. On the one hand, Isaac authored an original text, however, this was not the text known to Latin-literate Europeans, nor is it the text most commonly studied by modern scholars. Medieval European physicians likely almost exclusively read the text in Constantine’s translation, and modern scholars research and write about the translation almost as exclusively, with the notable exceptions of Veit, Ferre, and Charles Burnett. Because of the substantial elisions and restructuring of the text made by Constantine, because it was transmitted in parts, and because it has received so much more attention than the original Arabic work, is it fair to say that the *Liber dietarium universalium et particularium* and the *Kitāb al-aghdhiya* are the same work?

---

20 This is also reflected in references to the *Liber dietarium* in the *Cartularium Universitatis Paris* as translated by Faith Wallis, p. 193 of *Medieval Medicine: A Reader*. The *particulares* section is referred to as a stand-alone text.
Though some surviving manuscripts name Constantine as a translator of Isaac’s text (d’Alverny II 423), there seems to have been some disagreement even during the Middle Ages about Isaac’s authorial relationship to the Liber dietarium and his other works translated by Constantine. D’Alverny writes that “Constantine was severely criticized, first for assuming an undeserved fame in appearing as an author when he was merely compiling and adapting” (II 425), implying that this criticism arose in the Middle Ages, and she states that Constantine “names only the Greek physicians,” omitting the names of “the intermediary” Jewish or Islamic authors he translates (II 424). Yet this seems inconsistent with references to Constantine’s translations in surviving medieval sources. For example, a bull of Pope Clement V, addressing the curriculum at Montpellier University, dated 8 September 1309 and translated by Faith Wallis, states that bachelors wishing to be promoted to the rank of master within the university are “obliged to possess” the books “of Constantine and Isaac” (Wallis 196). The reference is to Constantine and Isaac together as collaborators, not Constantine as translator or Isaac as author. The wording of this bull suggests that medieval intellectuals were aware that Constantine’s translations were not completely equivalent with his Arabic source texts, but also that Isaac was not disconnected from the texts Constantine translated. Constantine and Isaac are rhetorically granted equal status as producers of the texts the bull discusses, and no distinction is made between the authorial status of either. This is in keeping with a modern perspective, provided by d’Alverny but not heeded in practice, that Constantine’s “works must be considered adaptations rather than translations” (II 425).

Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4 is, then, an example of Constantine’s Latin adaptation of Isaac Judaeus’s Kitāb al-aghdhiya, rare in North American libraries, and not known to exist anywhere else in Canada. Although it is in some ways a very typical example of a manuscript witness to this text (see Appendix B below), it possesses several unusual attributes
which make it interesting, for example: the fact that it has been trimmed and rebound, that it may be a fragment of a manuscript which survives in whole or part elsewhere; and the fact that it contains an unusual reference to Galen (recto line 23) in place of Hippocrates, who is cited in all comparison texts I have been able to examine. These and other small details of its text and material features may allow future research into its exemplar, origins, and provenance.

The text Fragm.Lat.4 preserves is of intrinsic value as an example of textual transmission of knowledge and texts between cultures. The frontispiece to the 1515 edition depicts Isaac seated at a table between Constantine and “Haly Abbas” (‘Ali ibn al-‘Abbas al-Majusi), a tenth-century Persian physician whose works Constantine also translated and whose texts also appear in Articella manuscripts as the five core texts (the Pantegni). All three men have books, a pen at the center of the table, and they seem to debate their respective texts; the maker of the early modern woodcut imagined a lively and ongoing tradition that placed men of different languages, times, and regions together. Although Constantine and Isaac are, traditionally, both marked as cultural outsiders by their respective designations as “the African” and “the Jew,” their works are granted an insider status, highly regarded in the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance. Even Chaucer, when he wrote his Canterbury Tales at the end of the fourteenth century and described an English pilgrim physician, expected his audience of vernacular readers to know that Constantine’s texts (not to mention those of Haly Abbas, Hippocrates, Galen, and others) were

---

21 Garcia-Ballester provides a clue that may explain this anomaly: “the Hippocratic tradition was covered by the shadow of Galen, and this state of affairs was something that the Latin West inherited from their Islamic teachers” (“Introduction” 10). It is thus possible that the scribe writing the Victoria fragment could not read his exemplar and made an educated guess based on a name he expected to see in the context, or that he attempted to correct the text based on his own knowledge. The four texts compared to the fragment clearly cite Hippocrates, but it would be helpful in determining Fragm.Lat.4’s origins to determine whether other manuscripts exist that cite Galen.
associated with doctors, as were the healthy and moderate diets advocated by a book like the
*Liber dietarium*.

The mythology surrounding the life of Constantine the African portrays him as either a
person of grandiose intelligence, or as a simple but exotic merchant who chooses to become a
transmitter of knowledge rather than goods. No biography of Constantine adequately explains
why he was known as “the African,” nor how he became a polyglot expert in medical knowledge
and its technical vocabulary. The frontispiece image of the 1515 edition puts him ever in
conversation with Isaac and Haly Abbas. Chaucer’s General Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*,
in the epigraph that began this project, puts him ever in the company of Greek and Arab writers
of medical and scientific knowledge, and associates him with good diets. In the 1309 bull of
Pope Clement V, Constantine is on equal footing with the authors of his source texts, as his work
was being transmitted to new readers. Victoria Fragm.Lat.4 is, now securely, part of this
conversation, a small piece of this textual and cultural transmission history.
Frontispiece of *Omnia opera Ysaac* (Lyon, 1515)
Appendix A: Transcription of Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4

In general, transcription conventions conform to guidelines set out by Clemens and Graham (74-81), with the following exceptions: rubrication and decorated letters are indicated by boldface, marginal or interline insertions are marked by single slashes (\/), and cancelled text is indicated by strikethrough. Corrupted or lost text is reproduced, in double square brackets ([[]]), with reference to other examples of the same text (see Appendix B for details). The primary text used to assist transcription was the 1515 Lyon edition, which differs from Fragm.Lat.4 in consistent but minor ways, both in the restructuring of sentences and the addition of new clauses. In almost no case, however, does it contain material elided in the Victoria fragment. Fragm.Lat.4 therefore seems to represent a fairly faithful copy of Constantine’s translation of this section of the text: the beginning of the third division of the *particulares*, fols. 124r-125r in the 1515 edition.

[recto]
1 Sem(en) melonis atq(ue) radix ei(us) minus carne fr(igid)a sunt. S(ed) cum desicca(n)tur
2 s(unt) sicca in .ii. gra(dus) idc(ir)co plus carne s(unt) colatiua. Sem(en) au(tem) ur(inam) p(ro)uo(cat). Renes (et)
3 uesica(m) ab harenis (et) lapidib(us) mundific(at) maiore(m) t(ame)n acc(i)o(ne)m facit i(n) reni(bus)
4 q(ua)m in uesica. Renes (e)n(im) sunt carnosi vn(de) lapides (et) harene i(n) eis nasc(e)n
5 tes s(unt) molles. vesica quid(em) q(uonia)m (est) n(er)osa duros g(e)n(er)at lapides (et) harena(m)
6 Qua de re n(ece)sse (est) ut fortior me(decin)a detur uesice qua(m) renib(us). Corticis au(tem)
7 melonis puluis oris fetore(m) tollit. Si ex eo lauet(ur). diasc(orides). Sem(en) inquit
8 melonis in s(upe)rificie mundat(um). (et) cu(m) carne melon(is) (et) cic(er)is et fabe farina
9 temp(er)atu(m) in modu(m) t(ro)cisci compo(n)itum (et) ad solem desiccat(um) ual(et) ad faciem
10 m(un)danda(m) et cuted extenuand(er)a. Rursus radicis pulu(er)is. ii .3. po(n) dus c(um) ox
11 imelle bibitu(m) irritat uomit(um). Est (etiam) et aliud g(en)us melonis q(ui) pales
12 uocat(ur). (et) dic(untu)r wlgarit(er) sarracenici(m). hu(mid)itas isti(us) minor cet(er)is (est).
fr(i)redi(ores)
13 t(atem)n illis s(unt). p(ro)in(de) sunt tardiores duriq(ue) ad (con)u(er)sione(m). d(ici)m(us)
etiam) corrup(tio)ni ino
14 bedientes. vn(de) calorem h(abe)ntib(us) in st(omac)o atq(ue) febricitantib(us) (con)ueniu(n)t. q(uonia)m g(ro)s

15 sicies eor(um) q(ue) fri(gidi)tas repugna(n)do febrrib(us) ear(um) calorem exting(un)t De cucum(eri)lib(us).

16 Cucum(eri)es fr(gidi)i s(unt) \( \text{et} \) hu(mid)/ in .ii. g(r)a(du). grossi sunt (et) duri ad dig(er)endum. (et) tarde e

17 st(omac)o descendu(n)t. st(omac)o u(er)o s(unt) nociui. n(er)uositate(m) .(enim). eius p(er)cuciu(n)t. Qui ci

18 bum aliq(uem) in st(omac)o inuenie(n)tes cum sui fr(igit)ate illu(m) seruant crudu(m). n(ec) dim(it)

19 tu(n)t a st(omac)o dissolui. S(ed) t(ame)n minus st(omac)o nocent q(ua)m melones. q(uia) cucum(eri)es di

20 gest(iu)e inobedie(n)tes u(ir)tuti faciunt in sto(mac)o labore(m). melones u(er)o sto(macu)m emolli

21 u(n)t. (et) (con)u(er)tu(n)tur in uenenosos hu(mores). quib(us) sto(macus) p(er)cuit(ur). v(eru)mpt(ame)n melones si

22 b(e)n(e) digesti fu(er)int meliores q(ua)m cucum(eri)es chymos g(e)n(er)ant. q(uia) cucum(eri)is cy

23 mus (est) g(ro)ssus. fl(eg)mati uitreo uicinus. vn(de) G(alenus). cucum(eri)es s(unt) grossi (et) difficiles

24 ad dissoluendu(m) (et) mag(is) q(ua)m melones ur(inam) p(ro)uo(cant). et uentre(m) humectant

25 Cytruli s(unt) fri(gidi)ores et cucum(eri)lib(us) g(ra)uiiores. fri(gidi)tudo .(enim). eor(um) De citrulis

26 est in fl(i)n(e).ii. gra(dus). p(ro)in(de) g(ro)ssum g(e)n(er)ant fl(eg)m(a). (et) n(er)uositati sto(mac)i cucum(eri)i

27 b(us) magis nocent. Rursus p(ro)p(ter) suam duritie(m) (et) fri(gi)tudine(m) sunt grossor(um)

28 (et) fr(gidi)or(um) hu(morum) g(e)n(er)atiui. Q(uod) c(er)tificatur. q(uia) cytruli in s(toma)co moram facientes ue

29 nenosor(um) corrup(tio)nem g(e)n(er)ant hu(morum). Cytruli (er)g(o) magis st(omac)o nocent. medul
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30 la t(ame)n eor(um) p(er)fectio(m) generat chimum De cucurbitis.

31 Cucurbita (est) fri(gida). (et) hu(mida) in .ii. gra(du) chimu(m) fl(egm)aticu(m) g(e)n(er)at p(ro)p(ere) a (con)uenit

32 cal(or)is n(atur)a e(contrar)io fri(gidi)s col(er)icus melior (est) q(ua)m sangui(nolentis). q(uia) ei(us) hu(miditas)

33 sto(macu)m hum(ec)tat. atq(ue) siti(m) col(er)icam extinguit. Simil(ite)r debem(us) eam int(e)ll(ige) re

34 esse nociua(m) fl(egm)a(tis) plus q(ua)m mel(anchol)icus. Que q(uidem) meli(us) (est) si col(er)icus tali m(odo) de

35 tur. coq(ua)tur cu(m) coctanis aut s(unt) malig(ranati). succo. aut ag(re)stis uue. cum ace

36 to malor(um) cit(ri)nor(um). au(t) cu(m) oleo amigdalino. au(t) ol(e)o omfacino (con)diat(ur).

[verso]

1 fl(egm)a(tis) au(tem) elixa (et) ab aqua exp(re)ssa cum synapi pip(e)o utili(us) datur

2 et m(en)ta ut eor(um) cal(id)itate (con)dim(en)tum ei(us) sit cu(m) coctanis et cet(er)is suprad(ic)tiis. ut temp(er)iem accipiat. et ad

3 m(en)tum ei(us) sit cu(m) coctanis et cet(er)is suprad(ic)tiis. ut temp(er)iem accipiat. et ad

4 extinguendu(m) calorem (et) ad sto(macu)m (con)fortandu(m) p(re)ar(um) p(ere)ar(um). Que (etiam) h(abe)nt acc(i)o(ne)m

5 me dici(ne) (con)g(ru)a(m). q(uia) si op(era)n(ium) pasta (et) assent(ur). et succus int(ri)nsecus in pasta

6 i(n)ueniarur (et) potui donet(ur). calorem febris mitigat. sitim q(ue) extinguit.

7 Pret(er)ea si c(um) cassiafist ula. uiol(a). zucc(ar)a ma(n)na ad potandu(m) t(ri)buat(ur) co(lera) ru(bea). pur

8 gatur. porro si in aqua elixet(ur) eius q(ue) ius cum melle (et) modico nitro

9 potui detur: eos quib(us) fl(egm)a ut co(lera) d(omi)narui detur. su(m)ma cel(er)itate adiu

10 uat (et) tuetur. Corticis u(er)o eius succus cu(m) oleo ro(saceo) mixt(us). dolore(m) capitis

11 ortu(m) ex col(er)ica (com)pl(exi)one amputat. Rursus si ex eod(e)m succo i(n) aure cal(idu)m
12 ap(ostem)a h(abe)n(te distillet(ur). mire dolore(m) placat. et ap(ostem)ati repugnat. S(ed) t(ame)n co

13 l(er)ice passioni nocet. †q(ualite)r† aquis lacuu(m) assi(mi)lau(er)nt p(ro)p(ter) sue lub(r)i(citatis) indig(entiam)

14 Lactue duo s(unt) g(e)n(er)a. est .(enim). domestica (et) siluestris. domes(ti)ca De lactuca.

15 licet sit fr(igid)a et hu(mida). non t(ame)n d(omi)nantur ei ultime hee ete(n)i(m) q(ua)litates si

16 q(ua)n'ti/tatie lactue d(omi)narent(ur). natura cibi careret. s(ed) acc(i)o eius soli medi(ci)ne

17 (con)uenit max(ime) in fine sui temp(or)is c(um) indurat(ur). I(de)o(que) antiqui dix(er)unt eam

18 fr(igid)am esse in .ii. g(r)a(du). et aquis lacuu(m) eam assi(mi)lau(er)nt. q(ua)r(um)

19 flumin(m) fr(igid)a (est) p(ro)p(ter) solis calore(m) eam usq(ue) in p(ro)fundum

20 tate(m) terre. (et) (com)mixtione(m) sui cum luto. lactuca u(er)o cu(m) sit mediocrit(era)

21 fr(igid)a et hu(mida) melior (est) cet(era)is herbis ad g(e)n(eri)andum bonu(m) sang(u)inem in q(ua)lita

22 te (et) q(ua)ntitate. Q(u)e si non lauet(ur) aqua melior (est). aqua .(enim). sue fr(igidit)ati et hu(miditati).

23 t(ri)buit augm(en) tum. lactuca cito dig(er)itur. ur(inam) p(ro)uoc(at). sto(ma)ci morcione(m) de co(lera) r(ueva)

24 ortam exti(n)guit. v(n)de fi(t) causa pla(n)di tussim. Sang(u)inis ebul(l)iti(one)m refrig(era)t

25 \[vigilias habentibus la]udabile(m)/ sompnu(m) p(r)est(at. capitis dolore(m) ex cal(or)is hu(midi) mitigat. catapl(as)ma i(n) timporib(us)

26 ad sup(ra)sc(ri)pta ual(et). S(ed) cocta plus q(u)a(m) cruda fit esui (con)uenie(n)s. q(u)a(e) eius lac

27 calore ignis minuit(ur). p(er) q(uod) erat sompnu(m) inducens. p(ro)p(ter) hoc lact(ua) in exor

28 dio suo c(um) lacte indiget. et p(ro)p(ter) p(ar)uitate(m) sui acuminis (et) p(ro)p(ter) temp(era)iem fr(igidit)a
29 tis et hu(miditatis). fit st(omac)o utilior. fit (etiam) (con)uenie(n)s ad augm(en)tan
du(m) \[lac mulieribus (et) sp(er)m]a uiris [((con)uenientior. c(aus)a sto(macu)m iuuans p(ar)]]uitas e(st) [
[sui acuminis p(ro)p(ter)]] hu(mid)itat(is)/ lac et sp(er)ma \[a[ug]m(en)tat/ p(ro)p(ter)

30 sang(ui)nem\[is] \(bonitate(m)/ que g(e)n(e)rat in q(u)a)titate (et) q(u)a)litate. Rursus ei(us) accio
n(e)c u(e)n(t)i(um) (est)

31 solutiua n(e)c (con)stipat(iu)a. indiget .(enim). acumine. salsedine (et) dulcedine. vn(de) sit

32 solubil(is). aut stiptica(ita)te au(t) pontica(ita)te p(er) que iudicet(ur) esse (con)stipat(iu)a. S(ed) tam(en)

33 cum i(n)duratur (et) lactis copia(m) h(ab)u(er)it eius hu(midi)tas minuit(ur). (et) fit amari

34 saporis. vn(de) fit ap(er)itiua. sang(u)i nem t(ame)n g(e)n(e)rat pessimu(m). Idc(ir)co
assuesca(n)tib(us)

35 fit nociua. tenebrositate(m) oculor(um) facit p(ro)p(ter) mortifitac(i)o(ne)m sensus q(u)a)m
i(n)

36 ducit. vn(de) sp(irit)us uisibil(is) extinguit. sp(er)matus mat(er)iam corr(um)pit. q(uia) cu(m)
sua

**TEXTUAL NOTES**
recto line 23  Reference to *Galenus* (Galen) is unusual: comparison texts cite Hippocrates.
verso 13  *qualiter* may also be expanded as *quare*.
verso 25  Insertion is cropped at left margin but reconstructed with reference to
comparison texts; scribe connects insertion to beginning of line.
verso 29  Insertions cropped at both left and right margins but reconstructed with
reference to comparison texts; interline signes-de-renvoi mark intended
insertion points.
verso 30  Insertion interline above erasure by subpunction.
verso 32  Letter erasures by subpunction.
Appendix B: Textual Notes by Comparison with 1515 Print Edition and Available Digitized Manuscripts

This appendix collates variation between UVic Fragm.Lat.4, the 1515 Lyon edition *Omnia Opera Isaeac* (fol.124rb-125rb), and three digitized manuscripts that include corresponding text: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MSS Clm. 13066 (fol. 60vb-61va) and 13111 (fol. 84rb-84vb), and Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS LJS 24 (fol. 65va-66rb). The list here includes all reversals of word order, additions, and omissions, but it does not note minor differences in spelling or abbreviation. Comparison texts are indicated by: Ly for the 1515 edition (printed in Lyon); M1 for Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MSS Clm. 13066; M2 for Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MSS Clm. 13111; and P for Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS LJS 24.

[recto]
1 atque] Ly et
eius] M2, P om.

2 in .ii.] Ly, M1, M2, P in fine .ii.
carne sunt colatiua] P carne colatiua
prouocat. Renes] Ly, M1 prouocat et renes

3 uesicam ab harenis et lapidibus mundificat] M1 uesicam mundificat ab harenis et lapidibus
apedibus mundificat] Ly mundificat et lapidibus
accionem facit in renibus] Ly in renibus; M1, M2, P in renibus facit actionem

4 uesica. Renes] Ly uesica habet actionem: renes
enim sunt] Ly autem sunt; M1 Sunt enim
sunt carnosi] P carnosi sunt

5 quidem quoniam] Ly que
est neruosa duros] M2 neruosa est duros

6 quam renibus] M1 quam sunt semina; M2 quam sunt renibus
ut] Ly, P om.
medecina detur] Ly detur medecina

7 eo] Ly aceto
semen inquit] Ly inquit: semen

8 in] Ly om.
mundatum] Ly excorticatum

9 temperatum in] Ly, P temperatum et in

10 radicis puluis. ii .3. pondus cum] M1 radicis eius puluis duarum 3 pondus cum; M2, P radicum eius pulueris ii.3. pondus cum; Ly radicum eorum puluis.3.ii.cum
11 irritat vomitum) Ly vomitum irritat
   Est etiam et aliud genus melonis] Ly, M2 Est et aliud melonis genus; M1 Est et ad melonis genus; P Est etiam aliud melonis genus

12 et] M1 qui; P que
   et dicuntur vulgariter] Ly, M2 que vulgariter dicuntur
   vulgariter] P om.
   ceteris est] Ly, P est ceteris

13 tamen illis sunt] M2, tamen illis ceteris sunt; P tamen sunt illis
   proinde sunt tardiore] Ly, M1 proinde tardiore
   corruptioni inobedientes] Ly, M2 eos corruptioni esse inobedientes; M1, P corruptioni esse inobedientes

14 habentibus in stomaco] M2 in stomaco habentibus
   quoniam] Ly quia

15 que] Ly et
   earum calorem extingunt] Ly eorum ardores extingunt; M1 ardores eorum extingunt; M2, P ardores earum extingunt
   De cucumeribus] P om.

16 frigidi sunt] M2 sunt frigidi
   e] Ly, M1, P a

17 uero] Ly, M1, M2, P om.
   enim] Ly, M2 om.
   qui] Ly quia

18 aliquem in stomacho] Ly, M1, P in stomacho aliquem
   illum] Ly eum

20 labor] M2 calorem
   uero stomacum] M1, M2, P uero etiam stomacum
   stomacum molliunt] Ly stomacum substantium molliunt

21 verumptamen melones si] Ly si melones

22 chymos generant] Ly generant chimum

22/23 cymus est grossus. flegmati] Ly grossus est chimus flegmati; M2 chimus est laudit flegmaticus

23 uitero uicinus] P uicinus uitero
   Galenus] M1, M2, P Ypocras; Ly Hippocras
   sunt] M2 om.
24 dissoluendem] Ly digerendum
prouocat et uentrem] Ly prouocat: uentrem

25 frigidiores et cucumeribus grauiores] Ly frigidiores et grossiores et duriores et grauiores cucumeribus; M1 frigidiores et grossiores et grauiores cucumeribus; P frigidiores grossiores grauiores cucumeribus eorum] M2 illorum

26/27 nerusositi stomaci cucumeribus magis nocent] Ly, M1, P magis cucumeribus nocent nerusositi stomaci

28 et frigidorum] Ly om.
humorum generatiui] Ly humorum et superfluorum generatiui

28/29 uenenosorum corruptionem generant humorum] Ly corruptionem et venenosos humores faciunt; M1, P corruptionem uenenosorum subeunt humorum; M2 uenenosorum corruptionem subeunt humorum

29 magis stomaco nocent] M1 magis stomaco nocent omnibus; M2 magis omnibus stomaco nocent; P magis omnibus nocent stomaco

30 tamen eorum] M1 om.
generat chimum] M1, M2, P chimum generat

31 est frigida] Ly, M2 frigida; P frigida est
humida in] Ly, M2 humida est in

31/32 chimum flegmaticum generat propterea conuenit caloris natura] Ly phlegmaticum generat chimum: proinde cholerice nature conuenit; M1, P flegmaticum chimum proinde caloris natura conuenit et; M2 Chimum flegmaticum generat proinde calidis natura conuenit

32 econtrario] Ly econtra
frigidis colericis melior] Ly frigidis nocet: cholerice etiam melior; M1 frigidis nocet colericis melior; M2 frigidis etiam colericis melior; P frigidis. Colericis etiam melior

33 atque] Ly et
colericam extinguit] Ly cholericorum humores extinguit
eam intelligere] Ly, P intelligere eam

34 est si] M2 om.
si colericis tali] Ly choleric si hoc

34/35 detur] M1 metetur (?); M2 datur

35 coquatur cum coctanis aut sunt] Ly coquatur in citoniorum et; M1 coquatur sunt cum coctanis aut cum; M2 Coquatur sunt cum coctanis et cum;P Coquatur scilicet cum coctanis et
agrestis uue cum aceto] Ly vue agrestis: aut cum succo; M1 agrestis uue aut cum aceto; P agrestis uue. aut aceto

36 cum] Ly om.

[verso]
1 autem] Ly uero sic datur; M1, P sic detur
elexa et] Ly elixa in aqua et
apius utilius] Ly apio et menta: utilius
utilius datur] P om.

1/2 datur et menta ut eorum] M1 preperetur ut ex horum; P datur et menta preparetur ut ex horum

2 et menta] Ly om.
temperetur. et] Ly, M1, M2, P temperetur
calidum generat chimum] Ly chimum generat calidum; M1 calorumque generet chimum; P calidum que generat chimum

3 accipiat. et ad] Ly, P accipiat ad; M2 accipiat et

4 ad] Ly, M2 om.
preparetur] Ly, M2 om.
etiam] M1, M2, P quaque

5 operiantur] Ly inuluatur

6 et] Ly, M1, M2, P om.
donetur] M1, P datur
sitim que] Ly sitim; M1 et sitim

7 cassia fistula uioa] P cassia fistula manna uioa
ad potandum tribuat colera rubea purgatur] Ly potui detur: purgat cholerum
tribuat colera] M1, M2, P tribuat solummodo colera

9 eos quibus] M1 eis sunt quibus; P eis scilicet quibus
ut] M1, M2, P seu
uidetur] M1 eos; P uidetur eos
summa celeritate] Ly om.

10 uero duo] Ly, P duo; M1 om.

11 ortum ex] M2 om.; P de
colerica complexione] M1 colore
complexione amputat] M2, P complexione ortum amputat
ex eodem] P eusdem
12 placat] Ly mitigat

13 qualiter aquis lacuum assimilautunt] Ly, M1, M2, P om.

14 duo sunt genera. est] Ly duo genera sunt; M2 duo sunt genera

15 licet sit frigida] Ly licet frigida sit
    non tamen dominatur ei ultime hee et enim] M1 non tamen dominatur ei ultime hee non; M2 non ei tamen ultime dominatur hee enim; P non tamen ei ultime dominantur et enim

16 lactue dominarentur] Ly dominarentur: lactuca

17 maxime] Ly magis

18 frigidam esse] Ly, P esse frigidam
    eam] M1 om.

19 in] Ly ad

19/20] et propter uicinitatem terre] Ly et terre vicinitatem

20 et commixtionem sui] M2 et sui commixtionem

21 melior est] M1, M2 est melior
    generandum bonum sanguinem] M2 bonum sanguinem generandum

21/22 qualitate et quantitate] P quantitate et qualitate

22 est] M1, M2 om.
    frigiditati et humiditati] Ly, M1, M2, P humiditati et frigiditati

23 tribuit] Ly prebet
    stomaci morsionem] Ly morsionem stomachi
    colera rubea] M1 rubea colera

24 vnde fit causa placandi tussim] Ly vnde tussim placans; M1 vnde fit causa tussim placandi; M2 et tussim propter bane (?) natis placat; P vnde fit causa tussim placans

25 vigilias habentibus laudabilem somnum prestat capitis dolorem ex caloris humidi mitigat] Ly somnum vigilias habentibus prestat laudabilem capitis dolorem de cholera vel sanguine factum amputat humidi mitigat; M1 somnum uigilias habentibus prestat laudabilem capitis dolorem de rubea colera seu sanguine factum amputat; M2 uigilias habentibus somnum laudabilem prestat capitis dolorem de rubea colera seu de sanguine factum amputat; P somnum uigilias habentibus prestat laudabilem capitis dolorem de rubea colera seu sanguine factum amputat
26 uaele] M1, M2 opitulatur; P operatur
    sed] Ly et
    fit esui] Ly esui est

27 per] Ly propter
    erat sompnum] Ly, M1, P sompnum erat; M2 sompnum
    hoc lactuca] Ly, P hoc ergo lactuca

27 exordio suo] Ly suo exordio

28/29 et propter paruitatem sui acuminis et propter temperiem frigiditatis et humiditatis. fit
    stomaco utilior. fit etiam conueniens ad augmentandum lac mulieribus et sperma uiris
    conuenientior lac et sperma] Ly fit utilior stomaco et ad augmentandum lac mulieris et viris
    semen conuenientior. Causa stomacum iuuans est paruitas sui acuminis propter sui
    frigiditatis humiditatisque temperiem: sperma et lac; M1 fit utilior stomaco et ad
    augmentandum lac mulieris et uiri sperma conuenientior causa stomacum iuuans paruitas est
    sui acuminis propter humiditatis sueque frigiditatis temperiem sperma et lac; M2 fit utilior
    stomaco et ad augmentandum lac mulieribus et uiri semen conuenientior. Causa stomacum
    iuuans paruitas est sui acuminis propter humiditatisque frigiditatis temperiem. Sperma et lac;
    P fit utilior stomaco et ad augmentandum lac mulieris et uiri sperma conuenientior. Causa
    stomacum iuuans paruitas est sui acuminis propter humiditatisque sue frigiditatis temperiem.
    Sperma et lac

30 sanguinis bonitatem] Ly bonitatem sanguinis
    quantitate et qualitate. Rursus] Ly qualitate et quantitatis perfectione. Rursus; M2, P
    quantitate et qualitatis perfectione. Rursus
    accio] P om.

31 enim acumine salsedine] Ly etiam acumine et salsedine; M2 enim acumine et salsedine

32 solubilis aut stipticitate aut ponticitate per que iudicetur esse constipatatiua] Ly solubilis: et
    stipticitatem: et ponticitatem non habet: per quam constipatiua iudicetur; M2 solubilis.
    stipticitate aut ponticitatem non habet per quam constipatiua iudicetur; P solubilis.
    Stipticitatem aut ponticitatem non habet per que constipatiua iudicetur
    aut] M1 nec etiam hunc
    ponticitate per] M2 ponticitate non hunc per
    indicetur esse constipatatiua] M2 constipatatiua indicetur
    esse] M1 om.

34 tamen] M1, M2 om.
    fit aperitiua] P fit uenarum aperitiua
    Idcirco assuescantibus] Ly, Idcirco eam assuescentibus; M1, M2 Idcirco eas assuescentibus;
    Idcirco ea assuescentibus

35 nociua tenebrositatem oculorum facit] Ly nocitiua tenebrositatem in eorum oculis facit; M1,
    M2 nocitiua quia tenebrositatem eorum oculis facit; P nociua quia tenebrositatem eorum
    oculis facit
35/36 propter mortifitacionem sensus quam inducit. vnde spiritus uisibilis extinguit spermatis materiam corrumpit. quia cum sua] Ly spermatis materiam corrumpit. Causa visum obscurans est mortificatio sensus: vnde visibilis spiritus extinguitur. cum sua etiam; M1 spermatis materiam corrumpit. Causa visus obscurans est. sensus mortificatio vnde spiritus extinguitur visibilis. cum; M2, P spermatis materiam corrumpit. Causa visum obscurans est mortificatio sensus. vnde spiritus extinguitur visibilis. Cum sua etiam
Appendix C: Manuscripts Known to Contain All or Part of the Liber dietarium

This appendix lists all known manuscripts that contain the Liber dietarium universalium et particularium, including fragments and manuscripts that contain only part of the text. Most items included here come from Marilyn Nicoud’s similar Appendix in her Les Régimes de Santé au Moyen-Âge (“Inventaire n° 4. Manuscrits des Diètes universelles et particulières d’Isaac Israéli et de leurs commentaires”) and Raphaela Veit’s list of additional manuscripts (i.e., not cited by Nicoud) in her article “Les Diètes universelles et particulières d’Isaac Israeli: Traduction et Réception dans le Monde Latin.” Based on my own research, I add to these British Library, MSS Egerton 747, Harley 3140, and Harley 3247; Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS Lat. 961/1; and Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4. In total, there are 117 manuscripts.

Where possible, I divide the manuscripts into two main categories: those with similar origins to Fragm.Lat.4 (by date and region of origin, i.e., France ca. 1250-1300); and those identified with different origins, or for which date or place of origin is unknown. The majority of the manuscripts listed in Veit’s and Nicoud’s lists have sufficient cataloguing information available online, though some (such as those housed in private or small museum collections) do not. The purpose of this organization is to establish an approximate picture of how the Victoria fragment relates to other manuscripts of the Liber dietarium. When I consulted digitized manuscripts, originally in an attempt to determine whether I could find the manuscript to which the fragment once belonged, I was surprised to find that an apparently large portion of manuscript witnesses visually resemble the fragment, at the level of script and decoration. Manuscripts I was able to consult digitally (even partially, and irrespective of whether they contain the text of the Victoria fragment) are indicated with an asterix. Slightly less than half of the manuscripts I viewed via digital surrogates resembled the Victoria fragment in script, decoration, and mise-en-page. All of those which bore such resemblance either shared approximate dates of production and/or are thought to have been produced in France. Organizing manuscripts based on this criteria also demonstrates the extent to which other extant manuscripts were produced during a specific period of time, i.e., from the mid twelfth century to about 1300. Given this information, it is possible to say that Fragm.Lat.4 is a typical example of a Liber dietarium manuscript, produced around the same time as, and superficially resembling, a significant portion of other known manuscript witnesses.

**Manuscripts with date or place of origin similar to Victoria Fragm.Lat.4**

Baltimore, Private Collection, Harry Friedenwald, MS 3. (c. 13th century)

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, MS Lat. fol 303. (c. 13th century)

Bruges, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 471. (c. 13th century)

*Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS Lat. 914. (c. 13th century ex. to 14th century in.)

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 511. (c. end of 13th century to 14th century)

Cambridge, Saint John College, MS D.24. (c. 13th century)

Cambridge, University Library, MS Peterhouse 155. (c. 13th century)
Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS F 238. (c. end of 13th to start of 14th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS F 286. (c. enf of 13th century to start of 14th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS O 62 a. (c. second quarter of 12th century to end of 13th century)\(^{22}\)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS Q 176. (c. mid to end of 13th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS Q 182. (c. mid 13th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS Q 187. (c. end of 13th century to start of 14th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS Q 195. (c. start of 13th century to start of 14th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS Q 203. (c. second half of 13th century to 14th century)

*Jerusalem, The National Library of Israel, Ms. Fr. 93. (c. 13th century, France)

London, British Library, MS Sloane 1933. (c. 13th century)

*London, British Library, MS Harley 3140. (c. 1300)

London, British Library, MS Harley 3247. (c. 13th century)

Lucca, Biblioteca Statale, MS1452. (c. third quarter of 13th century)

Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 1877. (c. 13th century)

Manchester, Chetham’s Library, MS 11380 (Mun. A. 4. 91). (c. second half of 13th century to start of 14th century)

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS M19 SUP. (c. 13th century)

Moulins, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 49. (c. 13th – 14th century)

*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 13066. (c. 13th century)

\(^{22}\) This is the MS which contains a biography of Constantine the African written in its margin (fol.49v-50) (d’Alverny II 423).
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 13111. (c. 13th century)

Naples, Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini, MS CF 1.21 (olim XVI.7). (c. 12th century ex. to 13th century)

Oxford, All Souls College, MS 69. (1280)

Oxford, All Souls College, MS 74. (c. end of 13th century)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F. 5. 30. (c. second half of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 865. (c. 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 874. (c. start of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS 6868. (c. 1280-1310)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7034. (c. second half of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7035. (c. 12th to 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7036 (c. third quarter of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7044. (c. mid 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 14390. (c. middle to third quarter of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 16176. (c. middle to second half of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 16179. (c. middle to second half of 13th century)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 729. (c. middle to third quarter of 13th century)

Parma, Biblioteca Palatina. MS Par. 4. (c. 13th century)

Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS LJS 24. (c. mid 13th century, Paris)

---

23 Given the dating and dimensions of this manuscript (255 x 177 mm) and the fact that it is an incomplete copy of the Liber dietarium with a particulares section, it is the most likely candidate on this list to have once contained Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4. However, lacking other information or further consultation with the manuscript, this can only be speculated.
Prague, Narodniknihova, MS VII E. 5. (c. 13th to 14th century)

Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 1006. (c. 13th century)

Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 617. (c. 13th century)

Seo de Urgel, Biblioteca Capitular, MS 77 (2052). (c. 13th to 14th century)

Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 13. (c. 13th century ex. to 14th century in.)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1206. (c. second half of 13th century)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1304. (c. 12th to second half of 13th century)

*Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Archivio di San Pietro, MS H 42. (c. 12th century ex. to 13th century)

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS Lat. 2325. (c 13th century)

Worcester, Cathedral (Chapter Library), MS F. 85. (c. 13th century)

Worcester, Cathedral (Chapter Library), MS Q. 41. (c. 13th century)

**Manuscripts of unrelated date and origin, or for which relevant information unknown:**

Baltimore, Private Collection, Harry Friedenwald, MS 2. (c. 15th century)

Baltimore, Private Collection, Harry Friedenwald, Unknown Shelfmark. (c. 14th century)

*Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc. Med. 6. (c. 12th century)

Bruges, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 464. (c. 1232-14th century)

Bruges, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 468. (c. 14th century)

Bruges, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 472. (c. 15th century)

Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1er MS 14306-09. (c.14th century)

Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1er MS 15480-81. (c. 14th century)

Chalons-Sur-Marne, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 315. (c. end of 15th century)

24 Consists of only the third book of *particulares.*
Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 329. (c. 14th century)

Cracovie, Bibliothek Jagiellonskiej, MS Cod. 783. (c.1464-1468)

Durham, Cathedral Library, MS C.IV.13. (c. 13th century in.)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS F 172. (c. start of 14th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS F 258 (c. start of 14th century)

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt, Amplon, MS 199. (c. mid 14th century)

Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 1212. (c. 12th century ex. to 13th century in.)

London, British Library, MS Egerton 747. (c. 1300, with the Liber dietarium added as marginal insertion by a different hand sometime later)

*London, British Library, MS Sloane 3282, pt 2. (c. 12th century, France)

Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 3370.

Madrid, Bibliotheca della Universitat Complutense, MS 116 (116-2-31).

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS H 208 INF. (c. 1483-1484)

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS I 128 INF. (c. 15th century)

Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS Lat. 961/1. (c. 1301-1400)

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 238. (c. 15th century)

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 922. (c. 14th century)

*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 3521. (c. second quarter of 14th century, Italy)

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 11349. (c. 14th century)

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 13086. (c. 14th century)

New York, Private Collection, H. P. Kraus (olim Helmingham Hall 58 ; Philip Robertson 50). (c. 12th century ex. to 13th century, Bury St Edmunds)

---

25 The description of this manuscript is very similar to French manuscripts dated around the same time as Victoria, McPherson Library, Fragm.Lat.4. See Daniela Camanzi’s description, cited in the bibliography below.
Oxford, All Souls College, MS 68. (c. start of 14th century to 15th century)
Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodl. 355. (c. 14th century)
Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lat. misc. e. 2. (c. 1220-1230)
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 275. (c. 13th century, Italy)
Oxford, Magdalen College, MS 169. (c. 15th century)
Oxford, Merton College, MS 263 (C.2.14). (c. 13th century, Italy)
Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS Lat. 750. (c. 14th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 6859. (c. 14th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 6871A. (1240)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 6883. (c. 14th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 6883A. (c. 14th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7029. (c. 11th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7037. (c. start of 13th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7038. (c. 14th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7039. (c. end of 12th to start of 13th century)
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 7040. (c. 1210-1220)
*Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Lat. 15113 (part 7 of 7). (c. second quarter of 13th century)
Séville, Biblioteca Colombina, MS 7-2-10.
Séville, Biblioteca Colombina, MS 83-4-25.
Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitulares, MS 98-3. (c. 14th century)
Tortosa, Biblioteca Capitular, MS 234.
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1115. (c. 1430-1431)
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1140. (c. 1472)
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1141. (c. last quarter of 15th century)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1261. (1476)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. Lat. 1232. (c. first half of 14th century)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 4455. (c. 14th century)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 5367. (c. 14th century, Italy)

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 6241. (c. 12th century)

Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, MS Z Lat. 533 (=2024). (c. 14th century)

Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, MS Z Lat. 536 (=1999). (c. 14th century)

Volterra, Biblioteca Guarnacci, MS LV1.7.9 (6221). (c. 14th century)
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