Introduction

Just over a century has passed since a team of scholars from across Europe, led by German historian of ancient philosophy and science Hermann Diels (1848–1922), compiled the manuscripts containing Greek medical texts and their medieval translations into a catalogue. Following such classical bibliographies as the Bibliotheca Graeca by Johann Albert Fabricius (1668–1736) and the several Bibliothecae by Albrecht von Haller (1708–1777), Diels, as the catalogue became known, was a landmark in classical and medico-historical scholarship. It was not completely

1 For a broad approach to Diels’ multifaceted activity, see for example Calder et al. 1999. All works referred to in this introduction are cited in an abbreviated form (author’s last name and year of publication). For the full reference, see the bibliography at pp. xxi–xxx.

2 The catalogue was published in two issues in 1905 and 1906, in the proceedings of Berlin Academy of Science, with a supplement in 1908 in the same series (Diels 1905, 1906a, and 1908, respectively). The 1905 and 1906 issues were published together as a volume in 1906 (Diels 1906b) with a slightly different title (Die Handschriften der antiken Ärzte, Griechische Abteilung) which implied that a similar programme would have dealt with the Latin manuscripts. The frontmatter of the second issue (1906a), which provided a general presentation of the programme, the list of the collaborators, and the bibliography, is reproduced as the front matter of this volume with the same pagination as in the first publication. All three issues (1905, 1906a, and 1908) were reprinted in 1970 with an introduction by Fridolf Kudlien (1928–2008) (Kudlien 1970). The translations under consideration were those in Syrian, Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin according to the treatises.

All references to the catalogue here and in the present work comprise two elements: the first identifies the issue of the catalogue (I, II, or N [for Nachtrag = Supplement]), and the second (in Arabic numerals) provides the number of the page(s) referred to (e.g., I.22 or N.49). A number in Arabic numerals between parentheses after the second element, such as e.g., II.63 (2), indicates the number of mentions of a manuscript on the same page.

3 Fabricius’ Bibliotheca Graeca was originally published in 14 volumes between 1705 and 1728, with a second edition started as early as 1708 and pursued until 1754, and also a third edition of Volumes 1 and 2 published in 1718 and 1752, respectively. The whole Bibliotheca was further published in a revised edition by Gottlieb Christopher Harles (1738–1815) in 12 volumes published between 1790 and 1809, with an Index in 1838. Under the general designation Bibliotheca Graeca, all volumes have a distinctive title that indicates their respective contents. In the first volume this title makes an explicit reference to manuscripts (… notitia Scriptorum Veterum Graecorum quorumcumque monumenta integra, aut fragmenta edita extant: tum plerorumque è MSS. ac deperditis …). On Fabricius, see Verner 1966.

4 The first of Haller’s Bibliothecae was the Bibliotheca botanica (1771–1772), which included large chapters on ancient physicians (see for example, Dioscorides, vol. 1, pp. 79–87 [page 79 is numbered 97]). It was followed by the Bibliotheca chirurgica (1774–1775), the Bibliotheca anatomica (1774–1777), and the Bibliotheca medicinae practicae (1776–1788).

5 For the history of the search for the manuscripts of Greek medical texts from the Renaissance to Diels, see Touwaide 2009, particularly pp. 456–508.
unprecedented, however. From the late eighteenth century on, several similar compilations were made, indeed, but they relied either on earlier literature or on in situ inspection of just some collections by single scholars. These were the bibliographies compiled by Johann Christian Gottlieb Ackermann (1756–1801)⁶ and the pioneering search for manuscripts by the German scholar Friedrich Reinhold Dietz (1804–1836) in the 1830s⁷, followed shortly after by the exploratory missions of the French historian of medicine Charles Daremberg (1817–1872), mostly in England⁸, with a similar collection of material in loco at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris by the Greek ophthalmologist Georges Costomiris (1849–1902)⁹. Diels’ enterprise was different in its systematicity and scale, in addition to its organization, its team¹⁰, and its international network¹¹ which combined in-house bibliographical research¹² and in-
situ examination of entire library collections by local scholars or members of Diels’ team in mission abroad\textsuperscript{13}.

Remarkably enough, the vast collection of data contained in the two issues of Diels’ catalogues was assembled in barely four years\textsuperscript{14}, witnessing an exceptional mobilization of efforts and resources\textsuperscript{15}. Although a supplement—presented as the first—was published in 1908, it was not followed by any other. Shortly after, the team lost some of its collaborators in the First World War\textsuperscript{16}, and the systematic search for the manuscripts of ancient medical texts was no longer pursued. Nevertheless, several

\begin{itemize}
  \item d. Donau; Montague Rhodes James (1862–1936) in Cambridge; Philip Christian Molhuysen (1870–1944) in Leiden; Alessandro Olivieri (1872–1950) in Naples; Adriano Piccolomini (1843–1907) in Cesena; Anton Ritter von Premerstein (1869–1935) in Vienna; Hans Raeder (1859–1969) in Copenhagen; Walter Scott (1855–1925) in Oxford, with a parenthesis in Montreal (1905–1908); Hermann Schöne (1870–1941) in Basel; Rezső Vári (1867–1940) in Budapest, and Eric Otto Windstedt (1880–1955) in Oxford. This list is not exhaustive, however, as other names appear scattered in the catalogues. The different collaborators interacted as the references to collations (see below) indicate.
  \item The consulted bibliography (listed in the 1906a issue [pp. XI–XXIII ] with a supplement in 1908 [pp. 23–24]) does not account for the full extent of the library resources consulted by the collaborators of the catalogues, which contain scattered references to works not included in the bibliographical lists.
  \item One such mission was that of Max Wellmann, who spent 1906–1907 in Italy, where he particularly investigated the collections of the Vatican and the Marciana libraries. As a result, the 1908 supplement contains multiple annotations made on the basis of his personal consultation of manuscripts.
  \item To give an idea of the sheer quantity of data presented in the catalogues, suffice it to say that the number of items from Greek manuscripts only amounts to over 14,000. To this we should add the multiple collations of manuscripts made by the collaborators of the programme during in loco research stays or on their behalf that are mentioned in the catalogue. Ilberg, for example, collated himself or received collations of most of the Hippocratic writings from manuscripts at the Vatican Library, and in Florence, Venice, Vienna, and Paris, whereas Helmreich concentrated on Galen (in one case at least, he had a collation of all but one manuscript of a Galenic treatise; see I.83–84).
  \item For the history of the programme, see Kollesch 1973, 1989, and 1999; and more recently, Nutton 2004.
  \item This was the case of Bruno Rappaport (1875–1915), who managed the data of the catalogues in collaboration with Johannes Mewald (1880–1964). On this, see Diels’ introductory remarks (\textit{Vorbemerkungen}) to the catalogue (Diels 1906a: pp. I–IX), which include the reports by Rappaport (pp. III–VI) and Mewaldt (pp. VI–VIII). On Rappaport, see the obituary by Regling, 1920. Another victim of the First World War was Joseph Heeg. During the compilation of the catalogues, the program lost another of its members, the orientalist Ludwig Nix (1865–1904) who had collected much material about the Arabic translations of Greek medical works.
\end{itemize}
editions of Greek medical texts were published thanks to the material collected during the compiling of the catalogues.\footnote{The first such edition was that of Philumenus, \textit{De venenatis animalibus}, by Max Wellmann who discovered the text in the manuscript \textit{Vaticanus graecus} 284 during his research stay at the Vatican Library (Wellmann 1908). This edition, which inaugurated the \textit{Corpus Medicorum Graecorum}, brilliantly illustrated the function of the catalogues as a source of firsthand material for the preparation of the critical editions to be published in the \textit{Corpus}. It is probably significant that it was followed in 1914 by the edition of the Arabic translation of a Pseudo-Galenic treatise by Gotthelf Bergsträsser (1886–1933) (Bergsträsser 1914), and the first edition of Galen in the \textit{Corpus} by three collaborators of the programme (Mewaldt et al. 1914). Another Galenic edition, prepared by another group of three collaborators, followed the next year (Diels et al. 1915), together with Celsus by Friedrich Marx (1869–1941) and, the following year, Quintus Serenus Sammonicus by Friedrich Vollmer (1867–1923). After a short interruption due to World War I, no fewer than 15 editions were published between 1921 and 1937, with one edition every year from 1926 on, including (in chronological order of publication) the vast medical encyclopedias of Paul of Aegina (Heiberg 1921–1924), Oribasius (Raeder 1926, and 1928–1933), and Aetius (\textit{partim}; Olivieri, 1935), in addition to the first Hippocratic edition (Heiberg et al., 1927), Soranus (Ilberg, 1927), Galenic commentaries on Hippocratic treatises (Wenkebach 1934 and 1936) and Galenic works (Koch et al. 1923; De Boer 1937). All this attested to the vitality of the \textit{Corpus} and the usefulness of the catalogue.}

\textit{Addenda} and \textit{corrigenda} to Diels,\footnote{As early as 1916, Giovanni Mercati (1866–1957), then a scrittore at the Vatican Library, published some \textit{addenda} (Mercati 1916, 1917a, and 1917b). Corrections like these are scattered throughout twentieth-century scholarly publications related to the Greek medical literature. Most of them can be found in Touwaide 2016, \textit{passim}, together with new ones. Additions and corrections to Diels’ lists of manuscripts of the Latin translations of Greek medical texts have been systematically made, though later. Richard Durling (1932–1999) revised Diels’ lists of the Galenic Latin manuscripts (Durling 1967 and 1981, completed only recently by Fortuna and Raia 2006; a cumulative catalogue of the Galenic and Pseudo-Galenic Latin texts [including manuscripts] compiled by Stefania Fortuna and her group is now available online in the form of a constant work in progress [Galeno, \textit{Catalogo delle traduzioni latine}]). Pearl Kibre (1902–1985) compiled new lists of the Hippocratic Latin manuscripts in several installments (1975–1982) followed by a publication in the form of a monographic catalogue in 1985. It may be relevant to note here that Durling expanded his search for Latin medical manuscripts by browsing a collection of material similar to Diels, Kristeller’s \textit{Iter Italicum} (Durling 1985–1993).} studies of the manuscripts or tradition of specific medical treatises,\footnote{An early work of this type is Ilberg 1911 on Soranus, followed shortly after by Diels 1912 on Galen’s commentary on Hippocrates \textit{Prorrbeticum}, and Helmreich 1913 on Symeon Seth.} and the systematic inventory of the manuscripts of texts to be edited, with the analysis of their tradition,\footnote{The best examples are the introductions to the editions published in the \textit{Corpus Medicorum Graecorum} (which became more developed over time). Their template includes a list of manuscripts, their description, and a detailed philological analysis. Although these introductions focus on identifying the manuscript(s) to be used as a source or sources of the editions, they provide relevant data on codicology and book history.} punctuated the twentieth-century scholarship devoted to the ancient medical literature. After World War II, an
unprecedented increase in the interest in paleography and codicology soon led to a renewed search for, and study of, manuscripts, new catalogues, and, more recently, computerized databases allowing for the storage and multi-criteria querying of increasingly larger amounts of information, in addition to the digitization of the collections of manuscripts of several libraries across the world. In the field of Greek medical manuscripts and texts, this resulted in the rediscovery or, in some cases, in the true discovery of manuscripts, new catalogues of medical manuscripts, the history...
of collections of such codices, an accrued attention to medical illustration, studies of the textual tradition of Greek medical texts or genres, the medical production of some regions, and new critical editions, particularly from the mid-twentieth century onward. This activity, which also generated a forum in the form of a series of conferences launched by Antonio Garzya (1927–2012) in 1990 and regularly held

27 For some catalogues, see Hunger and Kresten as early as 1969 about the series medici graeci of the National Library of Austria in Vienna, and, more recently, Bouras-Vallianatos 2015 about the holdings of the Wellcome Library in London, with a short supplement in Bouras-Vallianatos 2020. A different type of catalogue is that of Formentin 1978, about the libraries of a region.

28 See, for example, Formentin 1997 about the medical manuscripts in the collection of the national library in Naples.

29 A pioneering work in this field was MacKinney 1965, which lists the medieval manuscripts known at that time in several languages with medical illustrations, with some descriptive elements. Recently see Bernabò 2010.

30 For the entire tradition of some works, see, for example (in chronological order of publication), Kudlien 1960 (Hippocrates, De articulis), Rivier 1962 (Hippocrates, De morbo sacro), and Alexanderson 1963 (Hippocrates, Prognosticon) and 1967 (Galen, De crisibus). Among the studies in subsequent years, one might cite Morani 1981 (Nemesius) or, more recently, Perilli 1999 (Galen’s Hippocratic lexicon). Similar work is being done in Latin, for example by Green 1996 and 1997, on Trotula. Research was also devoted to some lesser-known physicians such as Mercurius (see the study by Masullo 2006), or to some segments or manuscripts of the tradition of one or more works. This is the case of Wilson 1987, for example, regarding a group of Galenic manuscripts (the codices copied by Ioannikios), and Petit 2006 on a group of manuscripts in relation with a text ([Galen], Introductio).

31 For this type of catalogue, see, for example, Ihm 2002 on medical commentaries (with references to the manuscripts), or Karas 1994, and Tselikas 1995 on iatrosoxia (Byzantine and later).

32 For Southern Italy, for example, see Ieraci Bio 1989.

33 After an interruption provoked by World War II, the Corpus Medicorum Graecorum published anew critical editions as early as 1950 with a predilection for Galen, also including, however, Hippocratic treatises, Areteaus, Rufus of Ephesus, Aetius, and Leo medicus, and, more recently (from 1983 on), Stephanus of Athens and Johannes of Alexandria. In the 1960s, the French Collection des universités de France launched a new Hippocrates (see Joly 1978 for the first volume; the programme has been pursued by Jacques Jouanna) and, very recently, a new Galen (see Boudon 2000 for the first volume). All this in addition to editions in series specifically devoted to the history of ancient and medieval/Byzantine medicine as Studies in Ancient Medicine (for example, Dickson 1998 on Stephanus, and Zipser 2009 on Johannes archiater) or, more recently, Medicine in the Medieval Mediterranean (Bennett 2016 on hospital formularies) and Textos Médicos – Ediciones Críticas (Lamagna 2017 on Johannes Actuarius’ Greek translation of Avicenna, De urinis). See also such volumes as Pritchett 1975 and 1982 (both on Johannes of Alexandria) or Garzya and Masullo 2004 (on Cassius Iatrosophista). To this, one might add editions of iatrosoxia (for example, Tselikas and Ilioudis 1995 and 1997, or Clark 2011).
since 34, was accompanied by a transformation in the history of science and the history of the book. While the former moved its focus from the Great Scientists 35 to the histoire vécue 36, the latter shifted from book production 37 to book use, that is, to reading, studying, annotating, sharing, and collecting 38.

Both transformational trends highlighted limitations of Diels’ catalogues: they are devoted to authored works with a focus on the major physicians of classical antiquity and of the period that became defined in the meantime as Late Antiquity, that is, the period up to the end of the School of Alexandria in the 7th century A.D. 39. With only some exceptions 40, they omit the multiple small, but no less important, anonymous works, notebooks, and other formularies that give witness to the practice of medicine 41, and also many of the physicians of all epochs (but especially the Byzantine ones, also with some exceptions, however 42) who have not been credited with such a foundational role as Hippocrates and Galen.

---

34 For the proceedings of the first conference, see Garzya 1992. The conference has been fairly consistently held every four years, alternately in Naples and Paris. The many communications presented in each edition dealt with a great many authors and texts, including lesser known physicians and their treatises. The proceedings were first edited by Antonio Garzya, and then by Garzya in collaboration with Jacques Jouanna before being edited by both, along with Véronique Boudon-Millot and Amneris Roselli.

35 As an example of this historiography, see the monumental encyclopedic Introduction to the History of Science (1927–1948) of George Sarton (1884–1956).

36 See, for example, Perrin 1988 on the skin (followed by Herida 1998, on skin in the Hippocratic writings), Rey 1993 on pain, or Dumouchel 1995 on emotions. One might also mention here the development of the history of the body, particularly its specific perception and its representation, including its defects (Fischer 1991).

37 The focus on book production might be best identified by the development of codicology, explicitly formalized as a discipline in its own right during this period (see Dain 1949).

38 On this approach, see, for example, the works of Guglielmo Cavallo, particularly Cavallo 1988 about libraries, and Cavallo and Chartier 1995 on reading, with a panoramic presentation of medieval reading culture. On reading Greek medical literature, more specifically, see, for example, Cavallo 1993 or, more recently, Mondrain 2003.

39 On the chronological span of the catalogues (from the 5th century B.C. to the 7th A.D.), see Bruno Rappaport’s report in the 1906 issue, p. III.

40 Some of these exceptions might be the Excerpta (or Excerpta varia) listed for several authors, as well as the pseudepigraphic literature (mostly Hippocratic and Galenic) (see for example the remedies attributed to, or extracted from the works of, Hippocrates [I.48–49] and Galen [I.132–133]), in addition to some iatrosophia of the Ottoman period listed mostly under Hippocrates (I.42), Galen (I.123 and N.38) and Meletius (II.64), but also under Erasistratos (II.36) and Magnus (II.59), besides references to iatrosophic literature about Iustus (N.56), Logadius (N.56), Lucas (N.56), and Syncellus (N.66).

41 For such works (hospital formularies), see, for example, Bennett, 2016.

42 These exceptions are the following (in alphabetical order of their names as in Diels) with their reference to Diels: Abraham (II.3; N.42), Antonius Pyropulus (II.15; N.45), Beniaminus (II.22;
A *New Diels* is now a desideratum of the scholarly community. While urgently needed, it would require that Greek medical manuscripts be newly catalogued and their texts accurately identified, building on the twentieth-century classical scholarship briefly presented above and indeed, going even further through a renewed *in situ* autoptic analysis of manuscripts and the reading of their many texts. Whereas codicological analysis would allow for a better approximation of the time or period and place of production of the manuscripts (and also of their texts in some cases), reading and precise identification of all their texts would lead to a more complete and accurate knowledge of medical literature and practice from antiquity to the Renaissance, particularly thanks to the treatises of the period posterior to the 7th century and, for all periods, the multiple anonymous texts of all types not considered in Diels’ catalogues.

The present work aims to lead the study of Greek medical manuscripts and literature of the classical and post-classical periods in that direction. While it fundamentally reproduces Diels’ lists of Greek manuscripts, it reformats them in different, yet complementary, ways and provides new search tools that may be used for at least two purposes: compiling a catalogue of Greek medical manuscripts that will eventually generate the material necessary for a *New Diels*, and investigating the tradition, reception, and intellectual, and scientific history of Greek medical literature and medicine.

43 Some *instrumenta studiorum* that might be considered as partial *New Diels* are already available. One of them is the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Latin translations of Hippocrates compiled by Pearl Kibre (above). Other two are the analytical lists of the manuscripts of the Arabic translations of Greek medical literature and original Arabic medical literature compiled by Sezgin 1970 (medicine, pharmacy, and zoology) and 1971 (alchemy, chemistry, botany, and agriculture), and Ullmann 1970 (medicine). One might also add the inventory of illustrated medical manuscripts compiled by MacKinney as early as 1965 (not only Greek and Latin, but also Syriac, Arabic and Turkish, and the roman languages, English, and German). Relevant also, the bibliographical lists compiled by Gerhard Fichtner (1932–2012) for Hippocrates and Galen (first published on demand, with several successive versions from 1985 on, and now available on line on the website of *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*).

44 For a proposal in that sense, see Touwaide 2018. Whereas a publication upon completion of the research would be highly desirable, a gradual publication of available data in the form of a work in progress on the Internet might be useful, be it for a catalogue of manuscripts or a *New Diels*.
As such, the present work offers a set of new *instrumenta studiorum* for further developments in manuscript studies, the classical, medical and scientific traditions, and medical history.

Each of the five tomes of the present work has a specific content and purpose. The first tome exactly reproduces Diels’ lists of Greek medical manuscripts\textsuperscript{45}, excluding the lists of the manuscripts containing the possible medieval translations of Greek medical texts into Syriac, Arabic, Hebrew, or Latin according to the treatises. It is not a photographic reproduction of Diels’ original pages, however. Whereas lists of manuscripts in the original printing of Diels are presented in the form of blocks of continuous texts, they are rearranged here in the form of enumerations that clearly distinguish each item. The bibliography of Diels has been treated in a similar way for the purposes of clarity. The lists of manuscripts and the bibliography comprise most of the first tome, which is complemented by two indices: one of the authors and texts included in Diels, and the other of the manuscripts listed in Diels. For the purposes of easy and direct consultation, both of these indices open the first tome, which aims to not only make Diels available in a handy format, but to facilitate its use in research.

The remaining four tomes differ with regard to substance and purpose. All of them reproduce the contents of the manuscripts as described in Diels, including all annotations about title, *incipit*, *desinit* and lacunae, in addition to possible similarities with other manuscripts, sources, or copies. They proceed by manuscript (instead of by authors and works as in Diels’ original publication). Identification of manuscripts exactly reproduces Diels’ elements (city, library, and collection as appropriate, followed by shelfmark). The identification of many manuscripts required updating. This is the case for the several items known in Diels through earlier literature without exact identification. It is also the case of the codices destroyed during the two World Wars of the twentieth century, and of those that have changed location after the publication of Diels. Finally, it is also the case for those manuscripts which have received new shelfmarks. For all of these manuscripts, tomes two through five provide supplementary information with their exact identification, their state of preservation and location, or

\textsuperscript{45} Until a new reprint is published, Diels does not seem to be widely available (in spite of the 1970 reprint). WorldCat lists only 20 copies across the world. Nevertheless, digital copies are available on the Internet with different levels of quality, accuracy, and completeness via such sites as the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, the Royal College of Physicians (RCP) in London, the Medic@ collection of the BIUSanté in Paris, the Digitale Bibliothek of the Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, and Google. These copies are linked on some other websites such as the Internet Archive, the UK Medical Heritage Library, the Medical Heritage Library, and European Libraries. As mentioned above, a database built on the basis of Diels is available on the website of the Institute for the Preservation of Medical Traditions.
their new shelfmark. Another contribution of these tomes is their index of manuscripts, which includes possible new locations and shelfmarks, thus allowing one to search for manuscripts in two different, yet complementary ways: by their location and shelfmark as in Diels’ time or in present time.

Besides these shared features, tomes two through five differ further by their content. Tomes two through four are each devoted to one author or a group of authors: tome two is devoted to Hippocrates, tome three to Galen, and tome four to the authors defined in Diels as the remaining physicians (Die übrigen griechischen Ärzte ausser Galenos und Hippocrates), that is, all the other authors of classical and late antiquity, with some Byzantine ones as well. These three volumes aim to allow for a general study of the whole manuscript tradition of the textual bodies they are devoted to. Although they still have a limited documentary basis, they compensate for the lack of relevant instruments in currently available literature, and they provide the substance for first reconstructions of the whole tradition of the treatises by (or attributed to) Hippocrates, Galen, and the other Greek physicians considered by Diels.

Tome five goes further in laying down the basis of what will become a general catalogue of Greek medical manuscripts, as it lists the entire contents of all the manuscripts mentioned in Diels. It proceeds as do tomes two through four, by city and library in alphabetical order and, for each library, by collection and shelfmark, with their new locations and identifications as relevant. It also contains all the descriptive annotations about the texts included in Diels. Like tomes two through four, it contains an index of manuscripts that also lists possible new locations and identifications, allowing one to search for manuscripts on the basis of Diels or by their present location and identification.

By reproducing Diels’ inventory of, and data on, Greek medical manuscripts, by rearranging them for new investigations, and by providing them with updated identification and new instrumenta studiorum, this work aims to not only make Diels newly available in a handy format with updated information and to expand the range of its applications, but to make further strides in the direction of a general catalogue of Greek medical manuscripts. This catalogue, in turn, will lead to the much needed *New Diels* that may be expected to transform the study and understanding of the Greek medical literature and medicine, with their tradition.

---

46 For these data, see Touwaide, 2016.
47 For these physicians, see note 42.
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