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Pseudo-Ovid is one of the more prolific authors of the high Middle Ages. Put differently, the Roman poet Ovid was liked so much that he was often imitated by authors whose names we do not know, but who were successful enough in their efforts to be judged worthy of being transmitted with the genuine poems of Ovid. In some instances, it was not before the nineteenth or even the twentieth century that a composition was proven to be medieval. The pseudo-Ovidian verses that form the background to the question in the title of this paper circulated as De medicamine aurium, ‘Medicine for the ears’, and are linked, as we shall see, with a mirror, a work which, like so many in the Middle Ages, has speculum in its title. Here is the text and a translation:

Ne tibi displiceat quod sic sum corpore paruus.
Ortulus iste breuis mitia poma gerit.
Plurima doctorum. sunt hic experta priorum.
Letior hinc sumas quæ meliora putas.
5 Materies monstrat quanti medicamina constant.
Teque quod amplecti. quæque cauere decet.
Si fueris diues quæ sunt pretiosa require.
Si nummis careas elige quod valeas.
Nec nos contempnas uiles cum uideris herbas.
10 Quod lenue compones gratius. esse. solet.
Cælestis medicus cuius manus omnia prestat.
Mirandum prodit quod tibi uile fuit.

(O do not scorn me, because of body I am so small: this tiny little garden bears mellow fruit. Here you will find a great many experiences of earlier learned men; from here you will take with greater joy what you consider best. How costly medicines are, drug-lore does show, and what it behoves you to embrace and what to shun. If you be rich, look for medicines that are expensive; if your purse is empty, choose what you can afford. And do not spurn us common herbs, when you gaze upon us: a simple composition is usually nicer. The heavenly physician, whose hand provides all these, presents as amazing that which you had believed to be so ordinary.)

1 Cf. Franco Munari, Ovid im Mittelalter (Zürich/Stuttgart, 1960); id., ‘Tradition und Originalität in der lateinischen Dichtung des XII. Jahrhunderts’, Romanische Forschungen, lxix (1957-8), pp. 305-331 (= Franco Munari, Kleine Schriften (Berlin, 1980), pp. 131-57). To the bibliography in Ovid im Mittelalter (p. 60), we may add Carlo Pascal, Poesia latina medievale. Saggi e note critiche (Catania, 1907).

2 This Latin text is from the oldest manuscript known to me, Bodleian Library, MS. Rawlinson C.235, f. 9r. The Middle English translation was last printed in George R. Keiser, ‘Verse Introductions to Middle English Medical Treatises’, English Studies, lxxxiv (2003), pp. 301-17, at p. 306.

3 Materies: I assume this is shorthand for materia medica.
This is just the first half of the poem of Ps-Ovid. It is in elegiac couplets. The second half, as printed by the German-Jewish-American scholar Friedrich Walter Lenz some fifty years ago, continues with hexameters and, unlike the lines just cited, does indeed address the ears:

Hoc medicamentum surdis est auribus aptum:  
De semperuiue suco cochlearia bina,  
Tantundem sumas olei quod prebet oliua.  
Hinc oui testa porrorum collige sucum,  
Lactentis pueri suntum sumito lactis.  
Hec tribus ad solem uitro suspende diebus,  
Noctibus et totidem sub aperto desine celo.  
Ex hoc auricule studeas infundere surdi,  
Et (conieci, ut cod.) solis radium patiens assumat in aurem.

(This medicine is good for deaf ears: Take two spoonfuls of juice of semperuiua, and likewise of oil provided by the olive. Next, the juice of leeks collected in an eggshell, and milk the same amount of a woman who suckles a boy. For three days let them be hung up in the sun, and for an equal number of nights, leave them under the open sky. Try to put this into the deaf ear, and the patient should let sunshine into his ear. <Thus, the ear finally becomes completely free from disease.>)

Poetic merit aside, the poem (i.e. the two parts ‘Ne tibi displiceat’ + ‘Hoc medicamentum’) was fairly popular, Lenz listed twenty-four manuscripts between the thirteenth (if not the end

---

4 Also found in the Middle English version of the *Speculum* in BL, Add. MS. 34111, ff. 40r-190r, on f. 40r (printed in Keiser, see n. 2 above). Line 5 of the poem is lacking both in the Latin text there and in the English translation, so presumably it was not in the copyist/translator’s exemplar.


6 Text as printed by Lenz, p. 537.

7 Four different plants are listed under this entry in Jacques André, *Les Noms des plantes dans la Rome antique* (Paris, 1981).

8 Lenz, p. 530, affirms that from the point of metre, the verses are basically correct (‘ohne wesentlichen Anstoß gebaut’). There is no overlap with Q. Serenus’s chapter on diseases of the ears (likewise in hexameters, vv. 161-87, or with the *Regimen sanitatis Salernitana*, as printed in vol. v of De Renzi, *Collectio Salernitana*. (I am grateful to Gerhard Fichtner, Tübingen, who provided me with a concordance for this work many years ago.)

9 Thomas Haye, *Das lateinische Lehrgedicht im Mittelalter. Analyse einerGattung*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte, xx (Leiden, 1997), exaggerates when he calls *De medicamine aurium* ‘a genuine medical didactic poem’ (p. 327). Haye’s claim (p. 490) that Pliny the Elder reported that Ovid had composed a medical poem on ailments of the ears, which Haye derives from a misunderstanding and, to tell the truth, negligent reading of Lenz p. 526, is wrong. Plin. nat. 30,33 says (and I quote the full Latin text, since Lenz’s citation is not absolutely correct) ‘Anginis felle anserino cum elaterio et melle citissime succurrurit, cerebro noctuae, cinere hirundinis ex aqua calida poto; huius medicinae auctor est Ouidius poeta’ (‘In [cases of] quinsy very speedy relief is afforded by goose gall with elaterium and honey, by the brain of an owl, and by the ash of a swallow taken in hot water. The last prescription is on the authority of the poet Ovid.’ Translation by W. H. S. Jones, in vol. viii of the ed. in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1963.) Haye’s dating of the combined poem (p. 50), end of 12th to beginning of 13th century, cannot be upheld, as we shall see, and has to be brought forward.
of the twelfth century) and the fifteenth century, to which the manuscripts I am about to mention must be added. Lenz saw correctly – following earlier discussions by Kunz and Pascal – that the two parts of the poem do not fit together particularly well; he sees in part 1 the introduction to a larger medical work in verse, of which only what is now part 2\(^\text{10}\) of the poem has been preserved. He concluded, as we shall see absolutely correctly, that De speculo medicine or medicaminis, given as the title of the poem in three manuscripts\(^\text{13}\) relates to the title of the medical compendium of which these verses formed a part. This work, Lenz surmised, might have been called Speculum medicinale or medicina\(^\text{14}\), similar to the encyclopaedias of Vincent of Beauvais († 1264), which were likewise based on excerpts; or perhaps more to the point and nearer in time, the Speculum ecclesiæ of Honorius Augustodunensis (who died around 1137)\(^\text{15}\).

The really relevant Speculum medicine is, however, a work of this title by Arnau de Vilanova, completed in 1308\(^\text{16}\). This date excludes any direct relation between our poem and Arnau; in fact, speculum as the title of a book was so popular – and remained so well into the early modern period – that there is no need to assume that Arnau knew the Speculum medicine we are interested in and borrowed its title.

Our Speculum medicine predates Arnau de Vilanova’s at least by approximately a century and a half, if we accept the date for Bodleian Library, MS. Rawlinson C.235 ‘middle of the twelfth century’, kindly proposed to me by Rod Thomson; Thomson added that the Bodleian manuscript had undoubtedly been written in England. The first part of the manuscript contains the medical poem of Quintus Serenus; then, on f. 9r, we read ‘Incipit commentum in libro qui uocatur specul(us)’, followed by the twelve verses I quoted at the beginning. Somebody able to write those verses would undoubtedly have known that speculum is a neuter, and therefore Rawlinson C.235 cannot be the author’s copy, which will thus predate it.

\(^{10}\) Carlo Pascal, Poesia latina medievale, pp. 101-7.

\(^{11}\) Lenz, p. 531.

\(^{12}\) Haye does not comment on this.

\(^{13}\) Gothanus membr. II 120 (13th century); Vat. Palat. lat. 910 (a. 1467); Florent. Riccardianus 489 (13th century); Lenz did not know Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 4772, ff. 202r-203v; the poem, ending with v. 22, is on f. 202r, and is followed by De quattuor humoribus hominum (like Vat. lat. 1602 [14th century], according to Lenz, p. 539f), lacking v. 25. Lenz prints, on p. 539f, his collation of three manuscripts of De quattuor humoribus hominum (also called De quattuor elementis); the text itself is in Pascal, pp. 107-10.

\(^{14}\) Ironically, the first publication of this poem by Heinrich Stefan Sedlmayer, Wiener Studien, vi (1884), p. 149 was based on Florence, Laurentian Library pl. 36,27 (14th century); in the Vienna catalogue, De medicamine aurium is not distinguished from De quattuor humoribus hominum. Pascal (pp. 107-11) saw correctly that De quattuor humoribus hominum is but a versification of Isidore’s account, orig. book IV, chs 3, 5 and 6.1.

\(^{15}\) The really relevant Speculum medicine is, however, a work of this title by Arnau de Vilanova, completed in 1308. This date excludes any direct relation between our poem and Arnau; in fact, speculum as the title of a book was so popular – and remained so well into the early modern period – that there is no need to assume that Arnau knew the Speculum medicine we are interested in and borrowed its title.

\(^{16}\) Our Speculum medicine predates Arnau de Vilanova’s at least by approximately a century and a half, if we accept the date for Bodleian Library, MS. Rawlinson C.235 ‘middle of the twelfth century’, kindly proposed to me by Rod Thomson; Thomson added that the Bodleian manuscript had undoubtedly been written in England. The first part of the manuscript contains the medical poem of Quintus Serenus; then, on f. 9r, we read ‘Incipit commentum in libro qui uocatur specul(us)’, followed by the twelve verses I quoted at the beginning. Somebody able to write those verses would undoubtedly have known that speculum is a neuter, and therefore Rawlinson C.235 cannot be the author’s copy, which will thus predate it.

\(^{16}\) There is also a Specchio di medicina by Aldobrandino da Siena (14th cent.), in Madrid BN 1458 (L. 190), 15th cent., according to Kristeller IV 522a, and the Speigel der Arztny by Laurentius Phrisius (Lorenz Fries, † 1530/32), Strassburg 1518 (with a number of printings).
After those verses, the author adds a short preface in prose. In it, he names his work: ‘I wish to collect in an orderly manner those receipts that were scattered in an unbefitting way and appeared somewhat difficult, in this tiny booklet, which I would like to be called Speculum medicine, following the authority of somebody by the name of Paul.’

Before we deal with this ‘somebody called Paul’, we return to F. W. Lenz and his edition of Ps-Ovid’s *Medicine for deaf ears*. Lenz suggested that these verses are the fragmentary remains of a ‘compendium’, i.e. a medical work in verses like many, but no longer extant. Lenz’s presumed author had taken verses 1-12 from another work and added a number of metrical receipts, of which only the *Medicine for deaf ears* (= verses 13-21 or 22), survives in our manuscripts. In the medieval transmission of Ovid, our verses 1-21 would then have been combined, at a later date, with Ovid’s fragmentary *Medicamina faciei femineae*, which runs to 100 verses; just half of these refer to the care of the face in the morning (the other part is taken up by the introduction). As it turns out, Lenz’s hypothesis was mistaken and nearly the opposite of what had really happened. The verse preface of the *Speculum medicine* in elegiac couplets (verses 1-12) had been detached from the medical compilation it introduces, was combined with the following lines 13-21 on deaf ears, in hexameters, and both entered the transmission of Ovid’s works from the thirteenth century onwards; as we saw, Lenz lists, and draws on, a total of twenty-four manuscripts from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries.

From Ovid, we return to the Paul alluded to in the preface of the *Speculum medicine*. Who was this elusive author named Paul? The one Paul that is relatively well known in the history of medicine is Paul of Aegina, the author of the last medical handbook of late antiquity and active towards the middle of the seventh century in Alexandria (in 642, when it was taken by the Arabs). His compilation in seven books is justly famous for its surgical part (book 6), known to the Middle Ages via Albucasis, the Muslim doctor from a little place near Córdoba, who heavily relies on him. Paul of Aegina’s Book 3 on internal medicine was translated into Latin perhaps not before the year 1000, but this Latin version does not seem to have enjoyed wide circulation. And what is more, none of the sections in our *Speculum medicine* match anything in Paul of Aegina.

Therefore, the Paul in question must have been somebody else. As it turns out, ‘Paul’ is a mistake for Pliny. It would seem unlikely that Paul and the author of the *Naturalis historia* could be confused, but the fact was established first by Alf Önnerfors in his 1963 study of the transmission of the *Medicina Plinii* and subsequently confirmed by Monica Green when she examined the tradition of gynaecological texts in the early Middle Ages. The alleged name of the author, Pliny, had been written in a very ornamental way, perhaps even in Greek letters, which gave rise to misreading PLINI as PAUU; the latter was in turn interpreted, not unreasonably, as PAULI. Monica Green discovered that gynaecological excerpts attributed to Paulus really came from Pliny; well, not directly, but via the *Medicina Plinii* in one of its later manifestations as *Physica Plinii*. While the three books of the *Medicina Plinii*, dating probably from the early fourth century CE and made up from...
medical advice contained in the *Naturalis historia*, were printed for the very first time and edited by Valentin Rose in 1875, the five books of the *Physica Plinii* had appeared in print 350 years earlier, in 1528. The very first recipe in the *Physica Plinii* turns out to figure also as the first item in our *Speculum medicine*; it recommends a remedy for headache (Plin. *phys.* 1, 1).

Because I had spent some time studying the transmission of the *Physica Plinii* myself, it was no great feat to make this identification when I enjoyed leafing through the pages of a medical book from the late sixteenth century edited by Henrik or Heinrich Rantzau (Ranzovius in Latin) that interested me because it contained a Latin medical poem, supposedly written by a contemporary of Ovid (as Rantzau believed) by the name of Macer, dealing with the medicinal properties of herbs, for which reason the author and the book were usually referred to as Macer Floridus. It has since been established that the author was medieval and came from Meung in France. His real name was Odo, and in spite of the wide circulation this poem enjoyed in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the 1832 edition by the German physician Ludwig Choulant has not been replaced. In Rantzau’s edition of Macer (Hamburgi, 1590; it was reprinted in Leipzig in the same year), it is followed by a *Speculum medicorum incerti auctoris* (fig. 1). Rantzau printed it from a manuscript in his possession, ‘ex bibliotheca sua Bredenbergensi’ without supplying further details. He characterized it as ‘rudi ac inculto quidem stylo conscriptum’, a judgement that is perhaps a little harsh, but understandable in an accomplished humanist author like Ranzovius. The printing lacks the introductory poem, but in all other respects and apart from the slight variation in the title it is identical with the *Speculum medicine* in MS. Rawlinson C.235 in the Bodleian Library.

Rantzau’s *Speculum medicorum* is divided into two parts. While part 1 consists of material taken from the *Physica Plinii*, the second, different in character by listing compound medicines rather than recipes based on one main ingredient (or simple) like the *Physica Plinii*, draws on the medical treatise of Esculapius. Esculapius is of course the Latin form of Asclepius, the famous if possibly mythological physician who later turned into a god, in fact the god of medicine in later ages. This work was printed, for the first time, in a collective volume together with the *Physica S. Hildegardis* in Strassburg in 1533, and again eleven years later, in 1544, as part of the *Experimentarius medicinae*. A critical edition may be found in a 1996 Madrid thesis, alas unpublished.

---


23 Cf. the articles on ‘Rantzau, Heinrich (1526-1598/99)’, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. xxi (Berlin, 2003), by Bernhard Ebneth, pp. 146-9; and *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. xxvii, by Handelmann, pp. 278-9.


26 Breitenberg Castle, where Rantzau was also born. It appears that the copy in the Czech National Library in Prague (Národní knihovna České Republiky), XIV.H.28 (13th cent.), although it belonged to an ‘eques Henricus Ranzou’, in all likelihood to be identified with our Henricus Rantzovius, was not the basis of the printed edition. So far, I have been unable to check another copy of the *Speculum medicorum* in the same library, VII.G.25 (12th-13th cent.).

HENRICI RANZOVII.

EDITIO

DVORUM LIBRORUM MACRI DE VIRTUTIBUS HERBARUM,
DE QUIBUSDIAM ANIMALIUM PARTIBUS, AC TERRAE SPECIEBUS, ITEMQ; MEDICAMENTIS TOTIUS CORPORIS HUMANI.

IAM RECENTER EX BIBLIOTHECA SUA BREDENBERGENSI DEPRONTORUM, QUORUM PRIOR ANTE HAC NON TAM EMENDATE EXSTITIT, POSTERIOR VERO ANTEA TYPIS NUNQUAM SIT EXPRESSUS, AUT IN LUCEM EDITUS.

ACCESSIT INCERTI AUTORIS

SPECULUM MEDICORUM, RUDI AC INCULTO QUIDEM SYLO CONSCRIPTUM, ID PROPTER RES RAMEM EX EADEM BIBLIOTHECA IN LUCEM EDITUM.

TITULOS CAPITVM CVIVSQUE LIBRI IN PRINCIPIO, ELENCHUM AUTEM, OMMNIM SÆQUE IN HOC MACRI VOLUMINE CONTINENTUR, IN SINE HYSUS OPERE INVENIES.

M. D. X C.

Fig. 1. BL., 957.m.19.
Few among my readers will be familiar with this work, so some remarks about its contents might not be amiss. Esculapius deals with chronic diseases and follows more or less the order in Caelius Aurelianus’s *Chronic Diseases*. With Caelius Aurelianus, it shares a common source, i.e. the work on chronic diseases by the Greek methodist physician Soranus of Ephesus (early 2nd century CE). The closeness of both Latin works is such that for a long time it was believed that Esculapius was nothing but a simple abridgement of Caelius Aurelianus. However, over sixty years ago Pierre Schmid demonstrated in his doctoral thesis that this could not be the case. Nevertheless, our text of Esculapius does contain extensive quotes from the *Medicinales responisones* of Caelius Aurelianus, a handbook for beginners in question-and-answer form only partially preserved independently, with roughly half the book on internal diseases solely found in our transmission of Esculapius. The earliest manuscript of Esculapius, from the late eighth century, written in Visigothic Spain or the Visigothic area in Southern France and now part of the Hunterian manuscripts in the library of Glasgow University (T.4.13 = Hunter 96), also happens to transmit the earliest fragment of the *Medicina Plinii* (ch. 1,10) and a number of other medical texts.

From Esculapius, we now return to Rawlinson C.235 and the *Speculum medicin*, part 2. This second part starts with a preface of its own, in which the compiler talks about his bad health interfering with the progress of the work. For this reason, after remedies for the diseases in the head, i.e. headache, ears, eyes, mouth, teeth, uvula, throat and windpipe (chs 1–11), he continues with the kidneys and the bladder, finishing with sciatica and gout (chs 12–30).

Are there other manuscripts where we can find the *Speculum medicin*, or the *Speculum medicorum* for that matter? Thorndike-Kibre (282.4) list, not surprisingly, both the verse preface ‘Ne tibi displicet’ and the prose preface ‘Cum animaduetem quam plurimos medicorum’; moreover, for the text itself, there is a reference to Beccaria’s catalogue of medical manuscripts from the ninth to the eleventh century.

Now one of the manuscripts that turn up in Thorndike-Kibre is Oxford, Merton College 324, a fifteenth-century manuscript which, surprisingly, shares a number of not so common texts with only one further manuscript listed in Thorndike-Kibre. This manuscript is also in Oxford, but housed in the Bodleian Library (a mere five minutes’ walk from Merton College), e Musaeo 219, and was written in England late in the thirteenth century. If you were indeed to walk from Merton College to the Bodleian, you would pass, just before you reach it, the Radcliffe Camera on your left and All Souls College on your right. And if I had not had the good fortune of spending the Hilary term of 2007 as a Visiting Fellow at All Souls College Oxford, I would never have discovered that there was not one *Speculum medicin*, but two; two works that not only share the title, but also the verse and the prose prefaces, and a number of receipts from the *Physica Plinii* and Esculapius. In other respects, they differ greatly with

---

29 Another ten works in Thorndike-Kibre start with ‘Cum animaduerterem’, one more ‘Cum animaduetrisem’. Among these, Michael Scot († c. 1235; Th-K 281.8) may be the earliest that can be dated, but the *Speculum medicin* would be earlier by at least a century. The opening words were borrowed from a work that featured prominently in the basic teaching of Latin, the *Disticha Catonis*; the epistula that serves as preface starts ‘Cum animaduerterem quam plurimos grauiter in uia morum errare’. For the text of the epistula, possible sources and later borrowings and allusions, see *Disticha Catonis*, recensuit et apparatu critico instruxit Marcus Boas (Amstelodami, 1952), pp. 4–11. Boas cites none of the incipits in Thorndike-Kibre. The epistula also forms part of the translation into Greek by Maximos Planudes, see *Maximus Planudes: Disticha Catonis in Graecum translata*, edidit Vincentius Orotleca (Roma, 1992), p. 1.
31 Section 163 (e Musaeo 219, f. 61r), diseases of the penis, Ranzovius ch. 13, Phys. Plin. p. 95 Köpp/ Recept. Lauresh. 2,113, and section 164 (e Musaeo 219, f. 61), Ranzovius ch. 13, Recept. Lauresh. 2,114; section 164 (f. 61v), Ranzovius ch. 17; section 165 (f. 61v), Ranzovius ch. 25, cf. Esc. 42.1; section 182 (f. 67v), Ranzovius ch. 28, cf. Esc. 45.1/45.3/45.12; and others.
regard to contents and length. No. 1 (*Speculum medicine Pauli*) is the one I have been discussing so far; no. 2 is a Salernitan work that has not yet appeared in print and that consists of excerpts, sometimes attributed to specific authors, of therapeutic material (signs and symptoms, aetiology, treatment) from *practicæ* of one sort or another.

This Salernitan *Speculum medicine* (no. 2) had been studied by Tony Hunt, a fact that was brought to my attention by Monica Green, to whom I had turned with my query about this text, and she very kindly put her full notes at my disposal. Hunt had seen, absolutely correctly, that Merton 324 is a copy of Bodleian, e Musaeo 219, something that is suggested by the fact that both manuscripts transmit the same texts in the same order, as may be gathered from the curious arrangement of the texts which follow the *Speculum medicine*, viz. Ps-Cleopatra and Trotula. Nevertheless, recognizing the relationship of these two manuscripts was not as simple as it may appear in retrospect, because the older one, Bodl. e Musaeo 219, is incomplete in its present state. Its first folio bears the number 38,32 which means that folios 1-37 are now missing; as a consequence, the text starting now on top of f. 38r cannot be identified by its incipit.

Hunt’s interest was of course in Anglo-Norman medical texts, and he was satisfied to list the other witnesses of the *Speculum medicine* he could identify, remarking that some were extremely abbreviated. I surmise that he drew this conclusion from the respective number of folios. The second *Speculum medicine*, ascribed to Asclepius in Merton 324, and which I will refer to hence as *Speculum medicine Asclepii*, is present in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 466, pp. 233-93, written in the thirteenth century. There, it has no title and neither the verse nor the prose preface, but begins with the first item, the brain: ‘Quia de egritudinibus singularum partium corporis tractaturi sumus ideo principium nostre orationis a cerebro faciamus’. On the other hand, the work in British Library, Royal MS. 12. E. XXII from the early fifteenth century, which occupies folios 18r to 103v and whose length seems similar to that of the Oxford Merton and Bodleian manuscripts, is probably the *Speculum medicine Pauli*, although it starts with a section on hair on f. 18v, but has the usual incipit with the section on headache on f. 20r. I owe this information, lacking from the published catalogue, to the kindness of Dr Laura Nuvoloni.

And of course, the medical manuscripts in the Harley collection that have just been catalogued by her also contain two manuscripts with the *Speculum medicine*. Harley 2390, ff. 25-51, is from the fifteenth century. The much older Harley MS. 5228, likewise a composite manuscript, has a short excerpt in its third unit (ff. 68-72v), dating from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, and a longer one in unit 5 (ff. 94v-101v), from the late twelfth century, predating Bodleian MS. e Musaeo 219 by roughly a century.

One of the authors mentioned by name in the *Speculum medicine Asclepii* is none other than the famous Trotula. The recent edition (indeed the first critical edition of the text) by Monica Green33 allows us to compare a passage that is on f. 66r of Bodl. e Musaeo 219:

Trotula. Ad pustulas quas habet infans in pedibus et manibus ultra modum. Accipe squillam et iusquiamum ipsam herbam et sambuci frondes equo pondere tere et coque in aceto non multum et appone.

ad pustulas uel lepram uel pruritum tintimalli cum aceto et oleo coque fortiter et unge donec scabies sanetur.
Aliquando pustule parue nascuntur in pueris que trito sale saliri debent et fasciari ut resoluentur. quibus nec dulcia nec unctuosa danda sunt. (Green, p. 112 = De sinthomatibus mulierum 128a)

32 Arabic numerals, and for that reason added long after the manuscript was written, perhaps in the sixteenth century.
We notice that some text found in the independent transmission of the *Trotula* is missing, which is not all that surprising; it is more startling, however, that at the beginning of the passage marked *Trotula*, there are two additional recipes absent from the *De mulierum sinthomatibus*. Recipes of this kind are so unspecific that nobody could tell whether they are genuine and later on dropped out of the *Trotula*, or are, in this passage, attributed to this work incorrectly. Since the *Trotula* itself was compiled from earlier and multiple sources, there is little point in speculating.

Should we be surprised to find passages from the *Trotula* without an indication of the source? Surely not. While the ones we have just discussed come from the first part, *De sinthomatibus mulierum*, the next passage appears in the *De curis mulierum*, the second treatise in Green’s edition, and corresponds to her paragraphs 152–3. The topic is prolapse of the rectum and pain. The next section of the *Speculum medicine Asclepii* (ch. 166, Bodl. e Musaeo 219, f. 62r) deals with tenesmus, that is painful defaecation with slimy blood-stained faeces. While the ultimate source of this passage is Esculapius, its introduction corresponds more or less exactly\(^{34}\) to the beginning of ch. 30 in the *Speculum medicine Pauli*\(^ {35}\) and is not found in Esculapius. We must therefore conclude that the author or compiler of the *Speculum medicine Asclepii* drew on the *Speculum medicine Pauli*, and did not borrow from the full text of Esculapius. This explains the strange fact that we had mentioned earlier, namely that both the verse and the prose prefaces of the two *Specula* are almost identical, the main difference being that the *Speculum medicine Asclepii* exchanges Paulus as the source of what follows with Galen, at least in Merton 324, the only manuscript I have been able so far to examine in this respect.

We can now modify the hypothetical relationship between the two *Specula* proposed by Tony Hunt. Rather than an extended version that was abbreviated in the course of transmission, a work of modest extension, the *Speculum medicine Pauli*, correctly called in the preface a ‘paruissimus libellus’, served as one of the sources of the long version, called by me the *Speculum medicine Asclepii*. The compiler – let us call him Asclepius for simplicity’s sake – even copied the style of his predecessor when he introduced the second part of his compilation:\(^ {36}\)

Now that we are finished with the more difficult diseases and their treatment, beginning from the head and descending then step by step through all lower parts, the organs of breathing and nutrition down to the secrets of nature [this is the term he chooses to refer to the genitals and the fundament], we showed from close up which treatments were more suitable and easier, so we will now devote ourselves to the discussion of the treatment and causes of the diseases both natural and accidental of the lower parts that may be inspected by human eyes and palpated with human hands.

The clumsiness is not just due to my translation, which tries not to pass over incongruencies in the Latin, but to the compiler himself, who forgets in the middle of his convoluted sentence that he, in what follows, is not dealing with the diseases of the nether parts (that was the subject of the preface to the second half of the *Speculum medicine Pauli*), but with those diseases that can be observed on the surface of the body. Thus, the following

\(^{34}\) *Speculum medicine Pauli* replaces ‘de renum uitiis’ with ‘de ani uitiis’.

\(^{35}\) Ranzovius, sig. Y4v.

\(^{36}\) F. 64r: ‘Expletis igitur de difficilioribus egritudinibus et earundem curis a capite incipiendo et sic gradatim per omnes partes inferiores et per spiritualia et nutrituia usque ad secreta nature descendendo que apiciora et abiliora ad curandum fuerint eminus ostendendo nunc ad partes inferiores que uisibus humanis et manibus contemplari et attractari poterint ad curas et causas inforimtatum earundem naturalium quam accidentalium discuciendo attendamus’.
ch. 170 concerns pain in the neck and the shoulders, ch. 171 receipts for the face and the removal of blemishes.

I would like to sum up my findings as follows. The pseudo-Ovidian De medicamine aurium is indeed in two parts, and there is absolutely no reason to believe that parts 1 and 2 of the poem, distinguished by metre, were written by the same person and that both originate from a didactic poem listing cures for various ailments. It remains to be seen whether part 2 (the verses detailing a medicine for deaf ears) can be traced and shown to have formed part of a more extensive composition, as Lenz had believed. Rather, part 1, ‘Ne tibi displiceat’, was conceived as a poetical preface to the Speculum medicine. This compilation by an unknown author must predate the first known manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C.235, written in England around the middle of the twelfth century. Its text is drawn from the Physica Plinii Bambergensis, for part 1, and from Esculapius, for part 2; a few passages in the Rawlinson manuscript remain to be identified. This Speculum medicine was printed, from a manuscript now presumably lost, but once in the possession of the German humanist Henrik Rantzau, as Speculum medicorum in Hamburg in 1590 and again, in the same year, in Leipzig. Both the verse and the prose prefices of the Speculum medicine were used for the beginning of a composite Salernitan therapeutic manual, circulating under the title of Speculum medicine Asclepii. While the Speculum medicine Asclepii does indeed incorporate not just the prefices, but also contents from the earlier Speculum medicine, the bulk of the material is by various Salernitan authors, Copho, Asclepius, and Trotula among them, whose names appear occasionally at the beginning of sections ascribed to them. A translation into Middle English is preserved in British Library, Add. MS. 34111, from the second quarter of the fifteenth century (fig. 2). While Tony Hunt had seen correctly that the works in Rawlinson C.235 and the much more extensive Speculum medicorum are related, it now turns out that the longer text is an amplification of the earlier work, the Speculum medicine (Pauli), and I am very much aware that I am thus robbing, not Peter, but Tony, to pay Paul.

What I have presented here is very much work in progress, and it seems certain that we have not even identified all the pieces in the puzzle, let alone arranged them in a satisfactory manner – the mirror, if I may borrow this metaphor once more, is still in pieces and cannot show the complete picture. But one day the Speculum medicine will allow us to see how the Salernitans incorporated in their writings not just fresh or newly translated material, but also many patches recycled from the medical literature in Latin current in the early Middle Ages.37

37 Research for this article was funded in part with a grant given by the Spanish Ministry of Education, HUM2006-13605-C02-01/FILO.
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Incipiunt capitula in librum sequentem qui dicitur speculum medicorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>De apoplexia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>De 4th humoribus in corpore superflue dominantibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quando corpus sit purgandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De signis vniuersis replecionis sanguinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>De signis vniuersis replecionis colera(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>De signis vniuersis replecionis flegmatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>De signis vniuersis replecionis Melancolie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>De particulari replecione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>De signis replecionis capitis ex sanguine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>De signis replecionis capitis ex colera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>De signis replecionis capitis ex flegmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>De signis replecionis capitis ex Melancolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>De epilencia et eiusdem cura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Qualiter debeat epilencia cognosci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>De soporismis(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>De litargia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>De frenesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>De conferentibus capiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>De nocumentibus capiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Experimenta replecionis de litargia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>De melancolica passione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>De maniaca passione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>De inflammacione cerebri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>De vertigine et scotomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>De emigranea passione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>De tinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>De purgacione capitis per gargarismata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Diuerse cure pro dolore capitis secundum diuersorum Magistrorum auctoritates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Galienus de cephalica passione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>De aucrate(?) in capite uel in corpore nascente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>De fluxu capillorum et earundem restauracione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>De depilatoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>De tintura capillorum et earundem ornatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>De oculis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>De conferentibus et nocumentibus oculis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>De clarificantibus visum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>De maculis telis et albugine oculorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>De lacrimis oculorum stringendis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>De caligine oculorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De auribus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>De curis aurium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41 De conferentibus et nocentibus auribus
   De naribus
42 De morbis narium
43 De fluxu sanguinis narium
44 De fluxu sanguinis post flebotomiam et inflacione brachii
   De ore et gingiuis
45 De uiciis oris gingiuarum et laboriorum et eorum curis
46 De amissione loquele vel memorie
   De dentibus
47 De egritudinibus dencium et eorum curis
48 De conferentibus et nocentibus dentibus
   De uua et faucibus
49 De vua et faucibus et eorum curis
50 De squinancia
51 De Raucedine vocis
52 De dolore ceruicis
53 De disma(?) et Asma
54 De Emoptoicis
   De pectore
55 De cura pectoris et precordiorum
56 De aperitiuis et pector mundificantibus
57 De tussi
   De corde
58 De cardiaca passione
59 De confortantibus cor
60 De conferentibus et nocentibus cordi
   De stomacho
61 De passionibus stomachi et eisdem curis
62 De confortantibus stomachum
63 De cacostomachis
64 De signis replecionis stomachi ex flegmate
65 De signis replecionis stomachi ex colera
66 De signis replecionis stomachi ex Melancolia
67 De conferentibus et nocentibus stomacho
68 De incisiuis |
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70 De cibis facile digestiuis
71 De cibis difficile digestiuis
72 De generantibus bonos humores
73 De generantibus malos humores
74 De facile corrumpentibus
75 De difficile corrumpentibus
76 De cito exeuntibus
77 De tarde exeuntibus
78 De cibis inflantibus
79 De parum nutrientibus
80 De multum nutrientibus
81 De diversis curis stomachi secundum diversos auctores
82 De auferentibus ventositatem
83 Item cophos de diversis curis stomachi
84 De fastidio pocionati superueniente
   De vomitu
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85 De purgacione stomachi per vomitum
86 Ad vomitum prouocandum
87 De effectu cacapuciorum(!) et modo sumendi
88 Quare vomitus fuit inuenitus
89 De reiectione medicine per vomitum
90 De vomitu post acceptam medicinam
91 De singultu pacionate(!!) superueniente
92 De sincopi pacionato superueniente
93 De spasmo pacionato superueniente
94 De siti pacionatorum
   De intestinis
95 De signis replecionis intestinorum ex flegmate
96 De signis replecionis intestinorum ex colera
97 De signis replecionis intestinorum ex Melancolia
98 De laxatiuis
99 De scamonea
100 Qualiter et cum quibus medicine acuuntur
101 De puluere laxatiuo
102 De cibo laxatiuo
103 De potu laxatiuo
104 De pane laxatiuo
105 Qualiter beate fieri arbor uel uitis laxatiua
   De vomitu
106 De curis ad ventrem laxandum
107 De constrictiuuis
108 De curis ad uentrem stringendum
109 De solucione medicine pacionatorum
110 (!) De torcione ventris pacionatorum
111 Si pacionatus parum fuerit solutus
112 (!) De fluxu ventris pacionati
113 De dissenteria diarraia et lienteria
   De vermis(!)
114 (!) De lumbricis et alii vermis in homine et de omni morsu venenosos
115 De repugnantibus veneno
116 De necantibus lumbricos
117 De hominibus toxicatis
   De epate
118 De signis replecionis epatis ex flegmate
119 De signis replecionis epatis ex Melancolia
120 (!) De signis replecionis epatis ex colera
121 De signis replecionis fellis
122 De conferentibus et nocentibus epati
123 De apostematibus spiritualium siue de pleuresi
124 De opilatiuis
125 De aperitiuis
126 De mundificatiuis
   De pulmone
127 De signis replecionis pulmonis ex flegmate
128 De signis replecionis pulmonis ex Melancolia
129 De signis replecionis pulmonis ex colera
130 De conferentibus et nocentibus pulmoni
131 De periplemonia et ei<us>dem cura
   De splene
1042 De signis replecionis splenis ex Melancolia
1043 De signis replecionis splenis ex flegmate
1044 De signis replecionis splenis ex colera
1045 De conferentibus et nocentibus spleni
1046 De viciis splenis et eiusdem curis
1047 De yctericia
1048 De ydropisi
1049 De renibus et lumbis
1049 De signis replecionis renum et lumborum ex flegmate
1050 De signis replecionis lumborum ex Melancolia
1052 (,) De signis replecionis lumborum ex colera
1052 (,) De nefretica passione et eiusdem curis
1053 De diaforeticis
1054 De repercussiiuis
1055 De yliaca passione et nefretica
1056 De vesica
1056 De signis replecionis vesice ex flegmate
1057 De signis replecionis vesice ex melangolia
1058 De signis replecionis vesice ex colera
1059 De purgacione per vrinam
1060 De fragentibus lapisdem
1061 De lapidibus in vesica et eiusdem(!) curis
1062 De colica passione
1063 De curis virge virilis
1064 De curis genitalium
1065 De viciis ani
1066 De tenasmon
1067 De emoroidis
1068 De ficu
1069 De fistulis in fundamento
1070 De diuersis medicinis pro morbis excibus(?)
1071 De maculis faciei et eiusdem(!) curis
1072 De glandulis
1073 De morbo regio
1074 De verrucis
1075 De pediculis delendis
1076 De pulicis(!) fugandis
1077 De muscis fugandis
1078 De muribus fu |
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gandis et necandis.
1079 De scabie
1080 De lepra
1081 De paralisi
1082 De arthetica passione
1083 De sciatica passione neraurum et genuum tibiarum et pedum dolore et eorum curis
1084 De podagrica passione
1085 De omnimoda gutta
1086 De gutta fistula
1087 De simplici fistula
1088 De cancro et carbunculo et carne mortua
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1089 De serpiginet et inpetigine et carne mortua
1090 De corrosiuis
1091 De igne sacro
1092 De combustura ex igne vel aqua facta
1093 De morsu canis
   De apostematibus
1094 De maturatiuis
1095 De mollificatiuis
1096 De induratiuis
1097 De generantibus bonam carnem
1098 De conglutinatiuis
1099 De cicatrizantibus
1000 De mitigantibus dolorem
101 De aperientibus ora venarum
102 De lenificatiuis
103 De aperitiuis
104 De rarefactiuis
105 De repercussiuis
106 De Maturacione et cura apostematis
   De wlneribus
107 De wlneribus et eorum curis
108 Experimenta vite vel mortis hominis plagati
109 De signis mortiferis in omni infirmitate secundum Galienum
1016 (/>) De secretis pronosticis ypocratis vite vel mortis
1012 (/>) De diebus uiuendis(?) in incepcione omnium egritudinum
1012 De Ranculo
1013 De ossibus fractis
1014 De inpinguantibus extenuatunm
1015 Ad membrum extenuatunm reparandum
1016 De extenuatione pinguium corporum
1017 De attenuatiuis
1018 De incisuis
1019 Qualiter cauteria debeant fieri et in quibus locis et quibus de causis.