

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/109293>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

“In Other Words”: *Translating Philosophy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, special issue of *Rivista di storia della filosofia* (2019)

Editors: David A. Lines and Anna Laura Puliafito

WHEN IS A TRANSLATION NOT A TRANSLATION?
GIROLAMO MANFREDI'S *DE HOMINE* (1474) *

DAVID A. LINES

Abstract: This article investigates the claims made in the dedicatory epistle to Girolamo Manfredi's *De homine* (also known as *Il libro del perché*) to have effected an Italian translation of various earlier works. First published in 1474, the *De homine* is strongly dependent on the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*, for which several translations into Latin were available by Manfredi's time as well as the highly influential commentary by Pietro d'Abano. Focusing on one particular section of the *De homine* (II.x), on voice, this article offers an analysis of the various sources used and of the extent to which Manfredi is indeed offering a translation or something different. This study concludes that Manfredi closely followed the translation by Bartolomeo da Messina and the commentary by Pietro d'Abano; it finds no clear evidence of his use of the translations by George of Trebizond or Theodore Gaza. Other sources used include especially Rhazes' *Ad Almansorem*.

Keywords: Girolamo Manfredi, translation, Aristotle, *Problems*, Pietro d'Abano, Rhazes

In the dedicatory epistle to his *Liber de homine* (or *Il libro del perché*), a vernacular work first published in 1474 and destined to enjoy a remarkable *fortuna*¹, the Bolognese medical doctor, professor, and astrologer Girolamo Manfredi (c. 1430-1493)² outlined to his patron Giovanni II Bentivoglio the reasons behind his work:

Cum rerum naturalium causas hinc inde diligenter investigatas et eductas in maternum sermonem e latino traduxi, opus idcirco magis comune ratus. ... Antiqui et enim nostri philosophiam ac omnem rerum naturalium scientiam tetris sermonibus ambiguisque scripturis celabant. Ego autem Ieronimus de Manfredis ut omne humanum genus posset ea intelligere nec tam digna rerum cognitione fraudaretur, elaboravi eorum sententias dilucidando ac in publicum effundendo, tuae magnificentiae praecipue compulsus amore.³

* The research leading to these results was funded by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Starting Grant 2013 – 335949 *Aristotle in the Italian Vernacular: Rethinking Renaissance and Early-Modern Intellectual History, c. 1400-c. 1650*. This grant (PI: Marco Sgarbi) was jointly held at the Università Ca' Foscari (Venice) and the University of Warwick, where it was led by David Lines (and Simon Gilson, now at the University of Oxford). For their helpful comments on drafts of this article, I especially wish to thank Alessio Cotugno, Jill Kraye, Cecilia Muratori, and Sara Miglietti.

¹ On this *fortuna* see especially Carré, Cifuentes 2001 and Carré, Cifuentes 2006.

² On this understudied figure, see especially Trombetti 2007 and Duranti 2008a.

³ Manfredi 1474, unpaginated (I use the digital copy of the Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, Inc. fol. 10689, which I have compared with Manfredi 1988, which however fails to note or publish the text, perhaps because of reliance on a defective copy; see also the Casanatese copy, which indicates printer's signatures: <http://bit.ly/2Fs2VtY>). For the full text, see this article's Appendix. The dedicatory epistle is noted in Carré, Cifuentes 2010a, p. 28, n. 65.

Manfredi's statement is striking both because the Latin language of the dedication points to the diglossic nature of the *De homine* (a point on which I cannot elaborate here) and because he explicitly presents this philosophical-medical work as a translation. Manfredi claims that he has first of all *translated* («traduxi») the causes of natural phenomena from Latin into his mother tongue. Presumably he is referring here to past studies of the causes. He reckons that this operation will make his work more widely available («magis comune»)⁴. Manfredi then contrasts his initiative with that of ancient and modern writers who have hidden their explorations of natural causes under the cloak of dark and ambiguous writings. Unlike them, he wishes all mankind («omne humanum genus») to have access to this knowledge; he has therefore – and this seems to be a second operation – *clarified and elaborated upon* their writings, which he wishes to make known to a broader public («elaboravi eorum sententias dilucidando ac in publicum effundendo»). Manfredi could therefore be understood to be recounting a double process: one of translation into Italian, which lends greater accessibility to the knowledge and discoveries under consideration, and a second one (but closely tied to the first) of re-elaboration. But what, precisely, has he rendered into Italian and re-elaborated? Is the process really quite as neat and sequential as it seems? What does he in fact mean by a “translation”? This article argues that Manfredi made use of at least two sets of writings that have not been sufficiently explored in connection with the *De homine*: on the one hand, the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*⁵ and its exegetical tradition, and, on the other, medieval medical treatises. Furthermore, from its analysis of a portion of the text, it concludes that Manfredi's activities of “translation” and re-elaboration cannot be clearly demarcated; they need to be understood within a context in which “translation” could have a broad valence and did not necessarily mean quite what we mean today. The section on voice and sound in *De homine* II.x allows a first focused study of these issues.

In an article published together with a series of studies of the *De homine* accompanying the 1988 edition of the text, Anna Maria Nada Patrone briefly examined the question of the

⁴ On this expression see this article's concluding remarks.

⁵ There are some brief notes about this in Carré, Cifuentes 2010a, pp. 28-31, but they are taken from disparate parts of the *De homine* and do not clearly enough distinguish the Aristotelian *Problems* from the medieval «Omnes homines» tradition (or *Salernitan Questions*), on which see at least Lawn 1963, Kraye 1995, pp. 209-211, and Blair 1999. The Greek *Problemata* contain some 900 problems distributed in thirty-eight books; they derive (possibly at some distance) from Aristotle; many scholars classify the work as pseudo-Aristotelian and date it to around the third century AD. The medieval *Problemata* (known from their incipit as the «Omnes homines» version) were compiled between the end of the thirteenth and the start of the fifteenth century and have around 380 questions arranged according to thirty-four topics relating to specific areas of the anatomy, such as the eyes. This work has an almost wholly separate tradition from that of the Greek *Problems* (though a few questions overlap). I focus here on the version attributed to Aristotle.

sources of Manfredi's *De homine*. She observed that, while the *De homine* is surely connected to the *Problems* (at the time considered a genuine work of Aristotle), it is unclear which version of that work he knew. She doubted that he would have been familiar with the thirteenth-century translation of Bartolomeo da Messina, while favouring instead (but not demonstrating) a knowledge of the commentary on that work by the physician and astrologer Pietro d'Abano from the first half of the fourteenth century. She left undecided the question of whether Manfredi knew the Latin translations of the *Problems* by George of Trebizond and Theodore Gaza, but in any case emphasized that the connection between Manfredi's *De homine* and the *Problems* is at best a loose one and cannot be considered on the level of a translation. In sum, Nada Patrone highlighted Manfredi's distance from the *Problems*, which (in her view) he reorders, expands upon, and supplements through his own experience⁶.

In summary, Manfredi had available to him four interpretations of the Greek *Problems* (all of them in Latin):

(1) The literal and technical translation from the Greek by Bartolomeo da Messina, surviving in at least fifty-six manuscripts⁷ and first printed in 1475 (one year after the first publication of Manfredi's *De homine*). There is no complete modern edition, but parts of it have been critically edited by Gerardo Marengi⁸.

(2) The first (and most influential) medieval commentary on the *Problems*, completed by 1310 by the Paduan physician and professor Pietro d'Abano. Based on Bartolomeo's translation, this exposition was hugely successful (both directly and indirectly), and although

⁶ Nada Patrone 1988, p. 30. See especially the following statement: «Inoltre il Manfredi potrebbe aver conosciuto la traduzione in latino dei *Problemata* aristotelici di Giorgio di Trebisonda del 1453 o quella di Teodoro Gaza che, su esplicito invito del cardinal Bessarione, attese alla traduzione di questa opera pochi anni più tardi. Tuttavia, come è possibile affermare dopo un'attenta collazione dei *Problemi* aristotelici e dell'opera[,] *Il Perché* di Girolamo Manfredi, pur sussistendo frequentemente una completa analogia tra certi quesiti del Bolognese ed alcune questioni dello Stagirate [sic!] – specie nei trattati dedicati alle passioni dell'animo, agli occhi ed alle narici –, non si verifica un'adesione al testo aristotelico se non da un punto di vista formale e culturale, anche perché, in genere, il Manfredi è più prolisso, ripete spesso, pur se in capitoli diversi e con variazioni espositive, le stesse domande e non rispetta affatto l'ordine di successione dei quesiti aristotelici. Indubbiamente il nostro autore conobbe ed usò rimaneggiamenti dei *Problemata Physica* di Aristotele (anche se il suo *Liber de homine* non è affatto una traduzione del testo aristotelico, come alcuni hanno erroneamente supposto), ma inserì nel suo trattato anche tutto il bagaglio di conoscenze personali, di esperienze culturali che rendono straordinariamente viva ed umana, ma anche stimolante e problematica la figura di questo professore universitario [...]».

⁷ Monfasani 1999, p. 205, nn. 3-4.

⁸ For this critical edition of Bartolomeo's translation of books 1, 6-9, 14, 27-28, 31-33 see Aristotle 1965, pp. 275-336; for book 11 see Aristotle 1962, pp. 105-117; and for books 12-13 see Aristotle 1991, pp. 165-177. However, since at times Marengi's text deviates from what a fifteenth-century reader would have had in front of him, I have preferred to rely on Bartolomeo da Messina 1482. For important notes on this translation see Ventura 2008, pp. 128-131.

it was first printed after the appearance of the *De homine*, there were numerous manuscripts of the work available⁹.

(3) A reworking of Bartolomeo's translation by George of Trebizond, a Greek *émigré* who was active for some time in the court of Pope Nicholas V and finished his translation in 1452. Although this translation, which is quite faithful and depends on some of the best Greek witnesses, was never printed, it had a respectable manuscript diffusion, sometimes together with George's scholia¹⁰. Marengi has provided a modern edition for books 11¹¹ and 12-13¹².

(4) The controversial (but far more successful) translation by Theodore Gaza, who opted for a more humanistic and eloquent rendering, although in the process some of the original's philosophical precision was lost, at times through egregious misunderstandings¹³. Another notable feature of this translation was Gaza's rearrangement of the *Problems*, which is important here because in his rendering book 11 became book 9¹⁴. Gaza's translation circulated in two versions, both in manuscript and print, neither of which has received a modern edition. The first version started circulating in 1454 and was printed only once, in 1472 or 1473¹⁵, so it would have been available to Manfredi as he prepared the *De homine*. I have based comparisons of Manfredi's work with this 1472/73 printed edition rather than with the revised translation, which was first printed posthumously in 1475, thus a year after the *De homine*'s first appearance.

Let us now consider how Manfredi's *De homine* II.x stands in relationship to the corresponding treatment of voice in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*, book 11¹⁶. The first point to note is that of compression: whereas the *Problems* devotes sixty-two questions to the topic, *De homine* II.x is articulated in just thirty-five (unnumbered) questions. The block of questions 1-30 is the one most clearly corresponding to the *Problems*, and within this I have found just over twenty questions that have close correspondences to them. (One question on

⁹ Siraisi 1970; Federici Vescovini 2006; Ventura 2008, pp. 131-139; most recently on Pietro d'Abano see Ventura 2015 and De Leemans, Hoenen 2016.

¹⁰ Monfasani 1976, pp. 150-151; Monfasani 1984, pp. 707-709 (on the scholia by George, pp. 640-666); Monfasani 1999.

¹¹ Aristotle 1962, pp. 121-135.

¹² Aristotle 1991, pp. 165-177.

¹³ For examples of such slips see especially Monfasani 1999, pp. 207-210; Monfasani 2006, pp. 279-281; 284-290. For further commentary see also Ventura 2008, pp. 142-145.

¹⁴ On this rearrangement, which ceased to be an issue from 1501 onward, with the edition by Domenico Massaria of Vicenza, see Monfasani 1999, p. 212; for a concordance, *ivi*, pp. 219-224. Gaza also rearranged the *De animalibus*; see Beullens, Gotthelf 2007.

¹⁵ Aristotle 1473; see Monfasani 1999, p. 207. I have used the copy in the British Library (IB.30628). I wish to thank Sara Miglietti for providing me with a photographic reproduction.

¹⁶ For this book I have especially relied on Aristotle 1962 (Greek text, Italian translation, and Latin translations by both Bartolomeo da Messina and George of Trebizond) and Aristotle 1984, II, pp. 1393-1407 (English translation by E. S. Forster).

voice is treated elsewhere by Manfredi¹⁷.) This compression consists in multiple operations. Often the questions or answers themselves are shortened, as we shall see. In other cases Manfredi omits topics altogether: he seems particularly uninterested in the various problems on echo and choral singing¹⁸. A second strategy Manfredi uses is to rearrange the sequence of questions. For instance, he seems well aware of the frequent duplications found within *Problems*, book 11, and tends to combine questions on the same topic. This means he can group together questions that are otherwise separated at quite some distance in the *Problems*: thus questions 16-18 have to do with stammering, a topic otherwise covered in *Problems*, 11.30 and 11.35. Yet it is not always easy to discern a strong thematic progression in Manfredi's section, and the questions on the sound made by salt when thrown into the fire remain separated from each other (questions 14 and 23). Finally, in some instances Manfredi introduces new questions, or at least ones that have no correspondence in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*. Question 9, for instance, asks why a weak man who wishes to shout can barely be heard¹⁹. Questions 20 and 21 consider differences of sounds or noises among animals or between animals and humans²⁰. Question 1 seems to be part of an intelligent initiative to provide, at the very start of the topic, an explanation of the main anatomical parts and scientific phenomena leading to vocalization. The table below illustrates the correspondences or not between the first thirty questions and the *Problems*:

Manfredi, <i>De homine</i> , II.x (1-30)	pseudo-Aristotelian <i>Problems</i> , book 11
1	-
2	14 and 16
3	16
4	24
5	16
6	17, 56, 61
7	13 and 15
8	40
9	-
10	3
11	5 and 33
12	10
13	11

¹⁷ The question on hearing and yawning in *Problems*, book 11, no. 29 ends up in Manfredi 1474, (II.v.10, f. 80v).

¹⁸ For echo, see *Problems*, book 11, chs. 7-8, 23, and 51; for chorus, see chs. 52 and 59.

¹⁹ Q. 9: «Perché quando uno huomo debile vuole gridare forte e' non se ode quasi la sua voce?».

²⁰ Q. 20: «Perché l'huomo fa de più maneire de voce che nessuno degli altri animali?»; Q. 21: «Perché alchuni animali parlano dearticulatamente et alchuni non?».

14	26
15	12 and 22
16	30
17	-
18	35
19	27 and 31
20	-
21	-
22	41
23	42 and 43
24	-
25	-
26	37
27	39
28	45
29	49 and 58
30	-

We must now consider more in detail how Manfredi handles the text of the *Problems* in this particular section of the *De homine*. Does he, in fact, offer an Italian translation, and if so, is this made on the basis of a clearly identifiable Latin translation? Are there other sources on which he depends? Does he offer something different from the direct rendering that one is led to expect on the basis of his dedicatory epistle? In order to answer these questions, we must take a close look at selected examples.

The first example comes from Manfredi's discussion of why those who are sad or laugh have a very different pitch of voice (high or deep respectively). Let's compare his text with the three Latin translations mentioned above:

Manfredi (II.x.7)²¹: Perché coloro che piangono e li contristati fanno la voce suttile e accuta e coloro che ridono fano la voce grossa? Quando l'aere se manda fuori in quantità fa la voce grossa, per che // come è stato ditto se muove cum più difficoltà. Coloro adonque che piangono e che sonno mesti e tristi mandano l'aere in poca quantità perché se rinfredano dale parte dentro e la virtù si se debilita. Imperhò fano la voce acuta e sottile. Ma quelli che rideno mandano fuori de molto aiere, unde fano la voce grossa.

Bartolomeo da Messina (XI.13)²²: Propter quid plorantes acute loquuntur, ridentes autem graviter? Aut quia hi quidem modicum movent spiritum propter imbecillitatem, hi autem vehementer, quod facit velociter ferri spiritum? Velox autem acutum; et enim distenso corpore proiectum velociter fertur. Ridens autem e contrario

²¹ Manfredi 1474, ff. [89v]-[90r]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 223. In my transcriptions from the Italian, I have modernized accents, punctuation, and capitalization; I have also added apostrophes where necessary, but have maintained the inconsistent spellings of the original.

²² Bartolomeo da Messina 1482, unpaginated; cf. Aristotle 1962, p. 107 (I do not note Marengi's variants unless they are significant). Here and elsewhere, in the Latin I have kept the original spellings but have modernized punctuation and capitalization, silently expanded abbreviations (including ampersands), and distinguished *u* and *v*. The transcriptions from George of Trebizond exactly reproduce Marengi's edition.

dissolutos; imbecilles autem acute (modicum enim aërem movent), hi autem superficialiter. Amplius, ridentes quidem calidum spiritum emittunt, plorantes autem, quemadmodum et tristitia infrigidatio enim loci qui est circa pectus, et spiritum frigidum emittunt. Calidum quidem igitur multum aërem movent, quare tardius fertur; frigidum autem modicum. Accidit hic et in fistulis: calidi enim spiritu fistulantes multum tardius fistulantur.

Idem (XI.15)²³: Propter quid plorantes acute loquuntur, ridentes autem graviter? Aut quia plorantes quidem contententes et congregantes os vociferant, et contentione autem movetur velociter aër qui est in ipsis, et in eo quod per angustum offertur velociter fertur? Propter ambo igitur acuta fit vox. Ridentes autem relaxantes tensione rident et diffundentes emittunt. Igitur propter hoc late et tarde aërem merito graviter vocant.

George of Trebizond (XI.13)²⁴: Quamobrem acute plorantes proferunt, ridentes autem graviter? Vel quia isti paucum spiritum propter imbecillitatem movent, illi autem vehementer: quae res facit ut spiritus velociter feratur, velox vero acutum est; ab ore namque tenso proiectus spiritus velociter fertur. Qui vero ridet contra se solvitur; debiles vero acute; paucum enim aërem movent eumque superficialiter. Praeterea qui rident calidum spiritum emittunt, plorantes autem, sicut et dolentes infrigidati locum circa pectus sunt, et spiritum frigidiorum emittunt. Calor igitur multum aëra movet, qua re tardius fertur; frigus vero paucum. Quid et in fistulis accidit: calidi enim spiritu, per fistulam canentes, multo tardius canunt.

Idem (XI.15)²⁵: Quare acutam proferunt, qui plorant, vocem, qui autem rident, gravem? Vel quoniam qui plorant contrahentes et colligentes os vociferantur? Et sic aër qui est in ipsis tum propter huiusmodi contractionem, tum quia per os fertur angustum velocius movetur; propter utraque igitur acuta vox efficitur. Ridentes autem tensione remissa hiantes rident. Cum igitur hac de causa late tardeque aërem emittant, merito gravem emittunt vocem.

Theodore Gaza (IX.13)²⁶: Quare qui flent vocem mittunt acutiorem, qui rident graviorem? An quia alteri suam ob debilitatem parum spiritus movent, alteri vehementer intendunt, quod facit ut spiritus velocius ferri possit? Velox autem omnis acutus est, quippe qui ab intento proiectus corpore feratur velociter. Contra qui ridet resolvitur et debilitatur, itaque vocem gravius aedit. Parum etenim aëris, idque per summa corporis movet. Ad haec qui rident spiritum calidiorum emittunt qui flent frigidiorum. Nam aegritudo refrigeratio pectoris est. Calor itaque multum aëris movet ita ut lente feratur, frigus autem parum ciet. Idem vel in tibiis fieri novimus. Enimvero qui spiritu sonant calidiori multo tardius agunt.

Idem (IX.15)²⁷: Cur vocem qui flent acutiorem emittunt, qui rident graviorem? An quia flent intendendo corpus contrahendoque os vociferantur? Itaque propere aër interior corpore intento movetur. Cumque per os transeat angustum ferri velocius potest. Utraque igitur ratione fit ut vox acuta aedatur. Contra qui rident remisso corpore hiscenteque ore rident. Cum ob eam rem late tardeque profundant aërem, merito vocem emittunt graviorem.

²³ Bartolomeo da Messina 1482, unpaginated; cf. Aristotle 1962, p. 108.

²⁴ Aristotle 1962, p. 125.

²⁵ Aristotle 1962, p. 126.

²⁶ Gaza 1473, unpaginated.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

In this particular passage, Manfredi merges and condenses two of the pseudo-Aristotelian problems (XI.13 and XI.15). It is worth noting that Manfredi is selective: his explanation of different pitches of voice when people laugh or cry focuses exclusively on the quantity of air that is being expelled, not on whether people do so quickly or forcefully, as indicated by the «vehementer» or «velociter» of the Latin text. Nor does Manfredi refer to the issue of warmth or coldness referred to by all the translators. Indeed, he ignores the entire part of the text following «Amplius» in Bartolomeo's translation of XI.13. Yet on some occasions his translation slightly expands the text. The «plorantes» used by Bartolomeo and George of Trebizond («qui flent» in Theodore Gaza's translation) becomes «coloro che piangono e li contristati» or even «coloro [...] che piangono e che sonno mesti e tristi» in Manfredi. Here there is no corresponding passage in the Latin, unless Manfredi is combining Bartolomeo's use of «plorantes» with «tristitia» (for the latter, George has «dolentes»; Theodore, «aegritudo»). In the case of the Latin's «vox acuta» or «acute», Manfredi twice expands by hendiadys, making this into either «voce sottile e accuta» or «acuta e sottile», while at the same time always rendering the Latin «graviter» with a single expression («voce grossa»). Manfredi may have been encouraged towards this use of hendiadys by Pietro d'Abano, who opened his comment on XI.13 by asking «Quare est quod plorantes contristati loquuntur acute, sed gaudentes et ridentes loquuntur graviter?»²⁸. Note, however, that Manfredi does not pick up on Pietro's use of hendiadys in relationship to those who laugh. Also, Pietro does not use hendiadys in connection to a high-pitched voice, preferring the single adjective «acuta». The introduction of «sottile» seems to be Manfredi's own idea, not sanctioned by any of the translations or Pietro's commentary²⁹. This particular passage is not very helpful, unfortunately, in determining whether Manfredi was familiar with (and used) the more recent Latin translations by Trebizond and Gaza, but the point will become clearer in other examples. Nonetheless, it does suggest that Manfredi's idea of "translation" included not just rendering a work into Italian, but at the same time adapting it for his own purposes by, say, shortening and paraphrasing it.

²⁸ Pietro d'Abano 1482, unpaginated. Similarly, Giacomo della Torre da Forlì's commentary on Galen's Tegni stated «Item plorantes et contristati acute vociferant, ridentes autem et gaudentes graviter» (Della Torre 1547, book II, q. 52, f. 172v). I thank Alessio Cotugno for bringing this passage to my attention. Della Torre (1360/62-1414) was a well-known professor of philosophy and medicine in several Italian universities, including Bologna and Padua, whose works were still read with great attention long after his death. See especially Pesenti 1984, pp. 103-112.

²⁹ A further example of this technique is in Manfredi 1474, II.x.13, where a voice is not just «aspera», as in the Latin text, but «aspera e rauca».

But Manfredi is also capable of expanding rather than abbreviating, as the following example illustrates:

Manfredi (II.x.10)³⁰: Perché l'huomo che ha gran voce è caldo de natura? La voce grande procede da gran quantità d'aïere che se move dalle parte del pulmone alle parte de la gola, e questo non procede se non da calidità de natura, perché il caldo naturalmente move forte ogni cossa. Havendo adonque l'huomo gram voce non procede se non da calidità del pulmone e del cuore, et essendo le parte spirtuale calde è consequentemente la virtù de tutto il corpo etiamdio calda.

Bartolomeo da Messina (XI.3)³¹: Propter quid magne vocis sunt omnes calidi natura³²? Aut quia necesse et aërem multum et frigidum esse in his? Attrahit enim calidum et ventum ad se et aërem, et plus plus; magna autem vox fit in movendo multum aërem et acuta velociter, gravis autem atque in graviter.

George of Trebizond (XI.3)³³: Quare omnes qui natura calidi sunt magnam vocem emittunt? Vel quia necesse est ut multus et frigidus aër in ipsis sit? Calor enim spiritum atque aërem ad se trahit, et intensior plurem; magna vero vox eo fit quod multum aërem moveat, et acuta quod velociter, et gravis, quod graviter.

Theodore of Gaza (IX.3)³⁴: Cur omnes qui natura sunt fervida magna esse voce consueverunt? An quia multum in his aërem fervidumque inesse necesse est? Vis enim caloris facile ad se et spiritum trahit et aërem eoque amplius id agit quo amplior est. Vox autem magna tum oritur cum aëris multum agitur, utque acuta cum celeriter, sic gravis cum tarde aër incitur.

Here Manfredi completely disregards the second question and focuses instead on the first, which receives more attention than in the Latin text. The formulation of the question is identical to that of Bartolomeo da Messina; both George of Trebizond and Theodore Gaza instead turn the question around, asking (more relevantly) why it is that those who have a hot nature also have a loud voice. This is perhaps why Manfredi focuses on the issue of heat. In this case he deviates markedly from Pietro d'Abano, who not only posed the question in the terms later adopted by both Trebizond and Gaza, but also favoured the explanations of Galen and Avicenna *contra* Aristotle. Indeed, following their lead, Pietro holds that the main and most immediate cause in this case is not heat, but the width of the trachea³⁵.

³⁰ Manfredi 1474, f. [90r]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 224.

³¹ Bartolomeo da Messina 1482, unpaginated; cf. Aristotle 1962, p. 105.

³² Aristotle 1962, p. 105: «secundum naturam».

³³ Aristotle 1962, p. 123.

³⁴ Gaza 1473, unpaginated.

³⁵ Pietro d'Abano 1482, unpaginated.

One should not imagine, however, that Manfredi was unfamiliar with Pietro's comments. The following examples confirm (I think conclusively) Nada Patrone's intuition that Manfredi not only knew Pietro, but in several instances followed him closely.

A smoking gun is in II.x.14, where Manfredi addresses the question (asked for instance in *Problems* XI.26) about why salt makes a loud noise when thrown into the fire. The explanation given is that the heat releases air trapped in the salt, and this makes a noise when it escapes. He continues, making a comparison with what happens if a chestnut is thrown into the fire without first having been scored:

Cussì fa la castagna quando non è castrata, che essendo molto humida per lo caldo del fuoco se sotiglia e doventa vapore aereo, il quale non potendo stare in cussì piccolo luoco e non ritrovando spiraculo, fende per forza il cortice e cum violentia escie fuora facendo gram suono, dove se è castrata quel vapore ha la via del suo respiro³⁶.

This comparison, which is not present in the *Problems*, is found instead in Pietro d'Abano's *Expositio*, where it takes the following form:

quod est videre in castanea igni exposita non divisa: humidum enim quod est interius subtilissimum calidum non potens exire propter duritiem corticis, frangit ipsum cum violentia magna et sonum quasi tonitruum causat ...³⁷

The two passages are similar and quite close, although one might hesitate to call Manfredi's a "translation" in modern terms, especially because of the added material underlined in the passage above.

Another convincing example is offered by Manfredi's question in II.x.19, «Perché in quilli che se exercitano fortemente et in li timorosi trema la voce?»³⁸. Manfredi interprets the first verb as referring literally to physical exercise. This view was supported by the reading in Bartolomeo's translation («Propter quid vox tremet et exercitantium se et timentium?») and by Pietro d'Abano's gloss («Quare vox exercitantium se cum adhuc permanent fortes et calefacti etiam exercitio, sicut accidit athleticis et similiter timentibus fit tremula ...»³⁹). A glance at the translations of George of Trebizond and of Theodore Gaza (where «exercitantes se» is replaced by «trepidantes» and «metuentes» respectively⁴⁰) would have pointed Manfredi

³⁶ Manfredi 1474, f. [90v]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 225.

³⁷ Pietro d'Abano 1482 (XI.26), unpaginated.

³⁸ Manfredi 1474, f. [91r]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 226.

³⁹ Bartolomeo da Messina 1482, XI.31 (cf. Aristotle 1962 p. 111) and Pietro d'Abano 1482.

⁴⁰ George of Trebizond, XI.31 (Aristotle 1962, p. 129); Gaza, IX.31 (1473, unpaginated).

in a quite different direction, accepted by most modern translators⁴¹. There is an indication here that Manfredi often stuck quite faithfully to Bartolomeo and Pietro.

Other telling parallelisms can be described fairly quickly. Manfredi asks at II.x.22 why it is that those who wish to sharpen their hearing during a hunt are told to hold their breath in order to hear better where birds or other prey may be found («Perché ode meglio coloro che tengono il fiato, e questo noi vedemo neli cacciatori che comandano dovere tenere il fiato quando voleno udire sutilmente o uccello o altra salvaticina?»⁴²). This precise reference to birds and other animals, not contained in the text of the *Problems*, appears however in Pietro, who speaks about the instructions of the «docti in venationibus avium et ferarum»⁴³. In II.x.26 Manfredi addresses the question of why sounds and voices are heard more clearly if one listens from inside a house (for sounds from outside) rather than from outside a house (for sounds produced within it). Manfredi's phrasing⁴⁴ recalls especially that of Pietro d'Abano, not only because he explicitly deals with both sounds and voices⁴⁵, but also because his reference to a sound that is «disgregato e disunito» is so similar to Pietro's explanation⁴⁶. The most complex and persuasive example of all is possibly at II.x.27, where Manfredi briefly poses and answers the question of why leeks have such a beneficial effect on the voice: «Perché il porro giova alla voce? El porro ha una certa humidità viscosa purgativa abstersiva e mundificativa della canna del pulmone et imperhò clarifica la voce». The leek's viscosity and purgative properties are already clear from Bartolomeo's translation⁴⁷; that of George of Trebizond refers both to its viscosity and its cleansing

⁴¹ The Revised Oxford Translation has «nervous» (Aristotle 1984, 902b30); Marengi translates «quando si è agitati» (Aristotle 1962, p. 57).

⁴² Manfredi 1474, f. [91v]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 226.

⁴³ Pietro d'Abano 1482, XI.41.

⁴⁴ Manfredi 1474, ff. [91v]-[92r]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 226: «Perché meglio se ode un suono fuora de casa essendo in casa che essendo fuora de casa e vegnendo il suono over voce de casa? La voce over il suono unito nel organo del'audire meglio se ode che quando è disgregato e disunito».

⁴⁵ See Pietro d'Abano 1482, XI.37 «Quare sonus vel vox factus extra domum ...». Bartolomeo's translation refers exclusively to «sonus»; George of Trebizond (XI.37; Aristotle 1962, p. 130) uses both terms, but separates them: «Quamobrem vox exterior magis intus in domibus quam interior ab exterioribus audiatur? Vel quia quando ab intra foras sonus prorumpit, in spatium immensum procedens, dividitur ... »; Gaza 1473 (IX.37) uses «strepitus» on one occasion and «vox» on another: «Cur strepitus extrinsecus magis intus auditur quam intrinsecus foris? An quia intrinsecus cum vasta immensa que adeat spacia discerpitur dissipaturque ut pars eius vel minime vel minus sentiri possit? Extrinsecus vero cum vox sese in locum arctiorem stabilioremque aerem conferat, universa ingreditur».

⁴⁶ Pietro d'Abano 1482, XI.37: «non potest quaelibet pars eius causare sonum, ita quod auditu precipiatur eo quod aliqua pars est ab eo divulsa et separata in partes et loca antrosa ...».

⁴⁷ Bartolomeo da Messina 1482, XI.39 (cf. Aristotle 1962, p. 113): «Propter quid porrus confert ad bonam vocem, quoniam et perdicibus? Aut quia et alia elixa leviunt? Porri autem viscositatem habent aliquam: purgativum enim est gutturis».

properties («abstersivum»)⁴⁸, and one might argue that the latter term is reflected in Manfredi's use of «abstersiva». Looking at Pietro's commentary, however, one is struck by the presence of all the expressions used by Manfredi: it is not just that leeks and other plants «habent viscositatem quandam lenitivam», but that «purgare habet porrum guttur et cannam et pulmonem abstergendo et mundificando flegma inde, unde Damascenus ponit illud mundificare cannam pulmonis et pectus, ... porrum discerni conceditur in vocis restauratione»⁴⁹.

These examples could be multiplied, but what they would show is an uncanny number of similarities between Manfredi's *De homine*, Pietro d'Abano's commentary, and the translation of Bartolomeo, with which it circulated. This points to d'Abano's commentary as at least one of Manfredi's main sources (Nada Patrone's doubtfulness about Manfredi's knowledge of Bartolomeo is not justified). From the passages examined above and others in this section of the *De homine* there is, however, no clear indication of use of either Trebizond or Gaza. This does not, of course, necessarily indicate that Manfredi did not compare Bartolomeo's text with that of the newer translations, but the following examples show that Manfredi remains at quite some distance from them, and from Gaza in particular.

For instance, Gaza's generally translated the particle ἦ (which in the *Problems* introduced the sentence after the main question) as «an quia» – a point on which George of Trebizond roundly criticized him⁵⁰: Manfredi's second sentence instead avoids ambiguity by presenting itself nearly always as a statement. Also, *De homine* II.x.10, referred to above, shows that Manfredi does not follow the reference in Gaza's translation to people who have a «fervida natura»⁵¹ and instead describes them as «calidi natura». Furthermore, *De homine* II.x.11, which addresses Problem 33 together with Problem 5, does not reflect the solution of either Trebizond or Gaza, who at 903a7 correctly render the Greek as indicating that the air, because of the sun, hisses («tinniat» or «stridet» respectively), rather than just receiving its

⁴⁸ George of Trebizond, XI.9 (Aristotle 1962, p. 131): «Quare porrum voci confert? Num etiam perdicibus? Vel quia elixa quoque alia leniunt? Porrum autem viscositatem habet quandam: est autem faucium abstersivum». Gaza's choice of words is quite different (Gaza 1473, IX.39): «Cur porrum prodest ad vocem sonoram? Nam et perdicis commodum eadem in re novimus. An quia alius elixum delinit? Porrum autem lenticiam quandam obtinet, quae fauces detergere potest».

⁴⁹ Pietro d'Abano 1482, XI.39.

⁵⁰ See George of Trebizond 1967, p. 282; cf. Aristotle 1962, p. 77; Monfasani 2006, pp. 279-281.

⁵¹ See the criticism of this rendering by Marengi in Aristotle 1962, p. 78. Marengi also thinks that it would be better, with Galen, to consider that the problem refers more precisely to «voce robusta» (or «grossa»). But all the translations, including Gaza's, have «magna vox», by Manfredi rendered «gran voce». The Greek has: *μεγαλόφωνοι*.

movement⁵². It would be especially interesting to note Manfredi's renderings in the case of passages highlighted as problematic by Trebizond in Gaza's translation⁵³. Although many of these passages fall outside of Manfredi's interests and do not appear in the *De homine*, an exception is I.v.26, where he asks why a person sweats more while resting than during vigorous activity. His answer makes no use of Gaza's added clause concerning the classical clepsydra⁵⁴. So, at least at the moment, there are no clear indications that Manfredi used either of the new translations. Rather, he seems to have followed Bartolomeo da Messina's translation and its interpretation by Pietro d'Abano.

The *Problems* is not, however, the only work that Manfredi "translates". Not only are there in some cases interesting overlaps between the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* he addresses and those from the medieval «*Omnes homines*» tradition (something I cannot explore here)⁵⁵, but there are also other evident sources. In particular, the last five questions of *De homine* II.x offer analogues with the *Secret of Secrets* (another pseudo-Aristotelian work with a very complex textual history)⁵⁶ and especially with the *Liber ad Almansorem* by the Persian medical writer Rhazes (Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn Zakariya al-Razi). Consider the concluding questions of Manfredi's section II.x⁵⁷:

- «Perché colui che ha la voce grande et alta è audace?» (II.x.31)
- «Perché l'huomo che ha la loquella veloce e festine è de pocho intellecto et è irascibile e de pravi costumi?» (II.x.32)
- «Perché chi ha la voce grossa e non grande è schiavo del suo ventre, cioè non è huomo che si afatichi ma solo cura de si medesimo?» (II.x.33)
- «Perché l'huomo che ha la voce aspera è invido e tiene male nel cuore suo?» (II.x.34)
- «Perché l'huomo che ha la voce suave a modo de donna è segno di poca sapientia et intellecto?» (II.x.35).

These questions should be compared with the series of observations on voice in Rhazes. In Gerard of Cremona's twelfth-century translation from the Arabic these read:

⁵² Manfredi 1474, f. [90r]; cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 224; George of Trebizond, XI.33 (Aristotle 1967, p. 129); Gaza 1473, IX.33.

⁵³ See the summary in Monfasani 2006, pp. 277-281 and 286-290 and Monfasani 1999, pp. 206-209.

⁵⁴ See Manfredi 1474 (I.V.26, f. 35r-v); cf. Manfredi 1988, p. 130. On this point see Monfasani 2006, p. 288; Monfasani 1999, p. 208.

⁵⁵ So far I have found two cases in *De homine* II.x where questions have counterparts in the *Omnes homines* tradition: these are II.x.2 («Perché la voce di puti e de le femine è sottile e acuta e quella de li gioveni over huomini facti è grossa?») and II.x.11 («Perché meglio se ode de nocte che de dì?»). The matter requires further study.

⁵⁶ This point will have to be explored on another occasion; for the connections between the *De homine* and the *Secret of Secrets*, see Carré, Cifuentes 2010b.

⁵⁷ See Manfredi 1474, ff. [92v]-[93r]; cf. Manfredi 1988, pp. 227-228.

[1] Cuius vox est valde crassa et alta, audax est. [2] Cuius loquela est velox, festinus est et parvi intellectus. [3] Cuius loquela cum quadam festinatione velox est, festinus est, irascibilis et malorum morus. [4] Cuius anheliu longus est, vilis est. [5] Qui vocem habet gravem, sui ventris serviens est. [6] Cuius vox est aspera, invidus est et malum in corde tenet occultatum. [7] Bonitas vocis stultitiam et paucam demonstrat sapientiam.⁵⁸

All of the points listed, with the exception of [4], are present in Manfredi (II.x.32 combines [2] and [3]). He would have been familiar with Rhazes, since at least book VII of the *Ad Almansorem* was a standard teaching text in Bologna's medical curriculum⁵⁹. Of course, here again he may have read the text in conjunction with a commentary, and it remains to be seen to what extent Manfredi's explanations, as well as his questions, are influenced by the medical literature.

In conclusion, Manfredi's *De homine* II.x reflects a synthesis of various sources, including the translation of the *Problems* by Bartolomeo da Messina – supported especially by the commentary of Pietro d'Abano – and the medical works of Rhazes. Other possibilities, whose examination will need to be deferred to another occasion, include the medieval *Problems*, the *Secret of Secrets*, the apocryphal *Secreta* of Albertus Magnus⁶⁰, medieval encyclopaedias, and collections of sayings. As suggested by the various examples taken into consideration above, Manfredi's approach could in some ways be characterized as a “translation”: he does indeed render his various Latin sources (or their contents) into Italian. Yet at the same time his operation is not a straightforward translation: he simultaneously paraphrases, combines, expands, or compresses his sources, as he aims for something that will ensure a wide reading of his work. As we have seen, he completely overturns the order of the *Problems* within the section of book 11 that he is depending on. And on several occasions Manfredi cannot be thought of as translating at all: in *De homine* II.x there are some eight topics for which so far I have found no clear correspondents in the sources⁶¹. Thus, under the guise of translating,

⁵⁸ Al-Razi 1893, II, p. 169. A comparison with the fourteenth-century translation of this passage into Florentine (see Piro 2011, p. 139) shows that Manfredi's questions are modeled on the Latin text, not on the vernacular.

⁵⁹ Malagola 1888, pp. 247–248 (rub. 35).

⁶⁰ On the perceived connection with “Albert” see Carré, Cifuentes 2010b, pp. 47–48.

⁶¹ See questions 1 («Perché la voce in alchuni è grande et in alchuni è piccola, in alchuni altri è grossa et in alchuni è subtile e similmente in alchuni è equale et in alchuni altri è rauca et aspera?»); 9 («Perché quando uno huomo debile vuole gridare forte e' non se ode quasi la sua voce?»); 17 («Perché se ritrovano anche delli huomini facti che sonno balbutienti?»); 20 («Perché l'huomo fa de più maneire de voce che nessuno degli altri animali?»); 21 («Perché alchuni animali parlano dearticulatamente et alchuni non?»); 24 («Perché la lingua in ogni animale è priva di pinguedine over de grassezza?»); 25 («Perché solo l'huomo tra gli altri animali doventa muto?»), and 30 («Perché non se ode nel'aqua ma se vede?»).

Manfredi is in fact producing a work that can stand on its own and that ends up having its own *fortuna* independent from that of the works on which it draws.

How, therefore, are we to understand Manfredi's claim in his dedicatory epistle to have effected a translation («traduxi»)? Here it is helpful to recall the interesting comments on this matter by Antònia Carré and Lluís Cifuentes:

Writing – an activity that was generally understood to include translating, which in turn cannot be separated from the academic practices of commentary and gloss – meant rewriting and updating the *auctores* of tradition in order to enter into dialogue with that very tradition; for this reason, Manfredi felt able to state freely in the prologue of the *Liber de homine* that his work was a translation from Latin to Italian.⁶²

There is much to be commended in this viewpoint, as well as in their observation that Manfredi's compilation involved a whole process of selection, classification, exposition, rearrangement, addition, and omission⁶³. It is certainly true that writing in the Renaissance period could very much mean re-writing, and that the boundaries between a translation and an exposition could be fluid⁶⁴. Yet it is also true that the fifteenth century witnessed ferocious controversies precisely about the liberties that certain translators took, for instance in reordering a text (as Gaza had done with the *Problems* and *De animalibus*) or in other areas, such as rendering philosophical prose in eloquent Ciceronian Latin (a controversial technique both for Gaza and for Leonardo Bruni before him). How can we make sense of Manfredi's statement?

One possibility may be to consider the prefatory epistle to another work by Manfredi – one not often considered, but very similar to it in various ways (though this work, written just a few years after *De homine*, never made it into print). The serviceable modern edition of the *Anathomia* by Singer⁶⁵ shows us a work again written in the vernacular, with a dedicatory letter in Latin to Giovanni II Bentivoglio. This work too focuses on physiology, medicine, and the human body rather than astrology. It too reorganizes the source on which it is mainly based (in this case, Mondino de' Liuzzi's *Anathomia*). The preface contains an interesting comment; after stating that Giovanni Bentivoglio himself has encouraged Manfredi to produce the *Anathomia* in the vernacular («materno sermone»), the author continues:

⁶² Carré, Cifuentes 2010a, p. 28.

⁶³ Carré, Cifuentes 2010a, p. 27.

⁶⁴ See Folena 1991, p. 38 and the «aspetto esegetico della traduzione»; also Morlino 2014, pp. 144-145.

⁶⁵ Singer 1955 (edition, pp. 130–164); the most recent study is Duranti 2008a, pp. 114-131.

Hoc enim opusculum quantum melius potui ex variis antiquorum voluminibus excerpsi ac id abbreviavi, nec eundem forte tenui ordinem ut illi, et ipsum materno composui sermone ut opus hoc delectabilius tuae sit magnificentiae.⁶⁶

Here Manfredi makes no claim to have translated as such: he has excerpted and abbreviated matter taken from various older books and has then (re-)written it («composui») in Italian. Yet the meaning seems to be very much the same as that in his prefatory epistle to *De homine*.

In this context Rita Copeland's differentiation between primary and secondary translations provides a useful framework: primary translations «exhibit a close alliance with the aims and methods of exegetical practice, and like exegesis define their purpose in terms of service to a source text», whereas secondary translations

derive their essential methods and motive from exegesis, but stand in a “secondary” relationship to the exegetical tradition of the schools: they do not define themselves through exegetical models of service or supplementation, but rather through rhetorical models of invention, that is, discovery of one's own argument or subject out of available topics or commonplaces.⁶⁷

Thus one might think of Bartolomeo, Trebizond, and Gaza as having provided “primary” translations of single source texts, which they serve. The *De homine*, on the other hand, is still exegetical in some ways but more inventive and is therefore a “secondary” translation. A slightly different way of thinking about the translator's activity might be to consider the process of transferring material from a source language to a target language as “translation” proper⁶⁸ (for Copeland, “primary translation”), whereas a re-elaboration of materials, especially when these derive from multiple sources in Latin and are rendered into Italian – which is very much what Manfredi does – might better be termed “vernacularization”⁶⁹. The latter process emphasizes content or philosophical/medical teachings over specific words or expressions and can therefore employ techniques such as paraphrase and re-organization within a larger strategy of re-writing. It should be noted that this approach continued well beyond the fifteenth century, not only within more dominant forms of “translation”, but also

⁶⁶ Singer 1955, p. 131.

⁶⁷ Copeland 1991, pp. 6-7.

⁶⁸ On this see Morlino 2014.

⁶⁹ Of course this is a significantly different use from that of Folena 1991, where «volgarizzamento» refers to vertical translation (say, from Latin to Italian), and «traduzione» to horizontal translation between vernaculars. In any case, fifteenth-century authors did not distinguish among types of interpretation in the same way that was done in the Cinquecento by, for instance, Fausto da Longiano (see the article in this issue by Dario Tessicini). According to Fausto's classification, perhaps Manfredi's achievement can best be described as a «metaphrase».

within the products of self-translation⁷⁰.

One advantage of the term “vernacularization” over the Italian term “volgarizzamento” is the removal of any subsidiary association with “popularization”. This point is worth emphasizing, given the persistence on the part of some scholars in identifying Latin works with a learned audience and vernacular works with a popular or illiterate one⁷¹. In the case of the *De homine*, the work’s high linguistic register⁷², its imitation of the scholastic tradition in the *quaestio* format, its allusions to and use of established authorities, its folio format – all of these elements suggest that Manfredi overegged the pudding with the dedication’s reference to how the work would be «magis commune» and ideally be understood by «omne humanum genus». Bearing in mind that Manfredi would use a similar expression («comune ad ogni homo»⁷³) of another vernacular work, his *Tractato de la pestilentia* (1478)⁷⁴, before promptly translating it into Latin, one does well to be cautious. But in any case, the ease with which Manfredi and his learned contemporaries could switch between Latin and the vernacular in their diglossic culture⁷⁵ should prevent us from imagining that, since Latin was the language of the universities, a work in Italian was necessarily meant for the broad public⁷⁶. Manfredi’s operation in *De homine* is thus not so much a translation (in modern parlance) as a vernacularization leading, in effect, to a new work but preserving the “high” audience to which d’Abano’s commentary aimed. It can also be described as a “volgarizzamento”, but only if one dissociates this term from any reference to a low or popular audience: the learned were not necessarily bores who lacked interest in natural curiosities.

⁷⁰ On self-translation in the sixteenth century see especially the article by Sara Miglietti in this issue.

⁷¹ Cornish 2010 is helpful in dispelling some of these myths. See also Frosini 2014.

⁷² See especially Foresti 1988; Tavoni 1992, pp. 29-30.

⁷³ «... si nui havessemo scripto questa opera per littera, non seria sta’ comune ad ogni homo, perché gli homini vulgari non l’haverian possuto intendere»; see Manfredi 2008, p. 8.

⁷⁴ For an introduction to this treatise see Duranti 2008b.

⁷⁵ As an example, see the numerous instances of prognostications published in both Latin and Italian and listed in Bühler 1958, passim. On the larger issue of the relationship between Latin and vernacular in Renaissance Europe, see most recently Deneire 2014 and Bloemendal 2015, both with rich bibliography. Also helpful is Moss 1994.

⁷⁶ Manfredi himself muddied the waters by claiming, at the start of his Latin version of the *Tractato*: «Postquam vulgariibus et indoctis iam satisfacimus ex nostri tractatus de epidimia vulgari compositione, nunc modo incumbit nobis onus doctis et litteratis viris satisfacere eundem tractatum de vulgari ad latinum transferendo»; see Manfredi 2008, p. 9.

Appendix: Dedicatory Epistle of Manfredi, *De homine*, 1474⁷⁷

Mea interest, *magnifice ac genere MILES*⁷⁸ Iohannes de Bentivoliis, ut in omnibus his quibus meae sufficiunt vires meumque potest ingenium, tuae semper studeam *magnificentiae*⁷⁹ ob ingentia mihi beneficia a te collata die noctuque complacere. Tuae preterea virtutes ac benignitas, quae omnem virum discretionis capacem in tuum amorem impellunt, me ad tibi perpetuo serviendum etiam inclinant. Tuae insuper dignissimae prosapiae de Bentivoliis antiquum nomen et e[r]ga *populum*⁸⁰ bononiensem ingentia merita ac humanitas non parva: quae semper extitit quoslibet ad te diligendum alliciunt. Quid *longius*⁸¹ repetam? Nos his nuper diebus vidimus quanto studio, quanto labore quantaque caritate in populum tuum bononiensem fame admodum laborantem usus es. Nam si tua non affuisset *humanitas*⁸², quot pauperes viri fame periissent, quae seditiones et tumultus quaeve scandala in hac urbe fames haec adductura erat? Tu gelator pacis, tu benignus, tu misericors. Tu pius, tuque humanissimus existis. O felicia tempora quae te tulerunt, foelix patria quae aluit, foelix populus cui te frui contigit. His itaque commotus rebus quoddam meo iudicio dignissimum opus et varium et magno labore ac lucubratione compositum tibi nominique tuo dedicare constitui, non parum pro materia et rerum varietate delectationis ac emolumenti allaturum tibi arbitratus. Cum rerum naturalium causas hinc inde diligenter investigatas et eductas in maternum sermonem e latino traduxi, opus idcirco magis comune ratus. Quid enim iocundius? Quid delectabilius? Quid praestantius? Quidve magis humano intellectui satisfaciens quam rerum causas cognoscere sermone pariter claro et aperto, id attestante Virgilio Marone in Georgico Carmine cum inquit «foelix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas»? Antiqui et enim nostri philosophiam ac omnem rerum naturalium scientiam tetris sermonibus ambiguisque scripturis celabant. Ego autem Ieronimus de Manfredis ut omne humanum genus posset ea intelligere nec tam digna rerum cognitione fraudaretur, elaboravi eorum sententias dilucidando ac in publicum effundendo, *tuae magnificentiae*⁸³ praecipue compulsus amore. Et easdem per quesita et responsiones exaravi, quod tibi et omnibus legentibus delectabilissimum fore arbitror simulque desidero. Et si perpetuum fuerit hoc

⁷⁷ Manfredi 1474, flyleaf, from the digital copy of the Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, Inc. fol. 10689 as above. Text compared with the Bologna 1497 ed. in Wellcome Library, 4.c.2 (SR), here indicated as W.

⁷⁸ W: *illustrissime ac excellens princeps*.

⁷⁹ W: dominationi.

⁸⁰ W adds: *tuum*.

⁸¹ W adds: *illustrissime etc. de te*.

⁸² W: *dominatio*.

⁸³ W: *tue illustrissime dominationi*.

opus (ut Deum Maximum oramus efficiat) non nihil etiam apud futuram posteritatem ad gloriam nominis tui perpetuandam labor noster afferet, quod etiam nobis defunctis per ea quae te prosequor affectione optatissimum eveniet. Tuque foeliciter vale, *Miles generosissime*⁸⁴, tuamque felicem ac prosperam sortem fata conservent.

References

- al-Razi 1893: Abubecri Rasis *ad regem Mansorem De re medicina, liber II*, trans. Gerardus Cremonensis, in Richardus Förster (ed.), *Scriptores physiognomici Graeci et Latini*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1893, II, pp. 163-179.
- Aristotle 1473: Aristoteles, *Problemata*, per Johannem Vurster de Compidona et Johannem Baumeister socios, Mantuae, [c. 1473].
- Aristotle 1962: Aristotele, *Problemi di fonazione e di acustica*, a cura di Gerardo Marengi, Libreria scientifica, Napoli, 1962.
- Aristotle 1965: Aristotele, *Problemi di medicina*, a cura di Gerardo Marengi, Istituto editoriale italiano, Milano, [1965].
- Aristotle 1984: *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. by Jonathan Barnes, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1984, voll. 2.
- Aristotle 1991: Aristotele, *Profumi e miasmi*, a cura di Gerardo Marengi, Arte Tipografica, Napoli, 1991.
- Bartolomeo da Messina 1482: [Bartolomeo da Messina, transl. of Aristotle, *Problemata* interspersed with the commentary in Pietro d'Abano 1482].
- Beullens, Gotthelf 2007: Pieter Beullens, Allan Gotthelf, *Theodore Gaza's Translation of Aristotle's De animalibus: Content, Influence, and Date*, «Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies», XLVII (2007), pp. 469–513.
- Blair 1999: Ann Blair, *The "Problemata" as a Natural Philosophical Genre*, in Anthony Grafton, Nancy G. Siraisi (eds), *Natural Particulars: Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe*, MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1999, pp. 171-204.
- Bloemendal 2015: Jan Bloemendal (ed.), *Bilingual Europe: Latin and Vernacular Cultures. Examples of Bilingualism and Multilingualism c. 1300-1800*, Brill, Leiden, 2015.
- Bühler 1958: Curt F. Bühler, *The University and the Press in Fifteenth-Century Bologna*, The Mediaeval Institute, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, 1958.
- Carré, Cifuentes 2001: Antònia Carré, Lluís Cifuentes, "Quesits" (*Barcelona, Pere Losa, 1499*): una traducció catalana desconeguda del "Liber de homine" ("Il perché") de Girolamo Manfredi amb filtre napolità, «Arxiu de textos catalans antics», XX (2001), pp. 543-560.
- Carré, Cifuentes 2006: Antònia Carré, Lluís Cifuentes, *Exito y difusión de la literatura de problemas en la Castilla del siglo XVI: la traducción castellana de "Il perché" de Girolamo Manfredi (Zaragoza, 1567)*, «Asclepio. Revista de historia de la medicina y de la ciencia», LVIII (2006), 1, pp. 149-196.
- Carré, Cifuentes 2010a: Antònia Carré, Lluís Cifuentes, *Girolamo Manfredi's "Il perché": I. The "Problemata" and its Medieval Tradition*, «Medicina & Storia», X (2010), 19-20, pp. 13-38.
- Carré, Cifuentes 2010b: Antònia Carré, Lluís Cifuentes, *Girolamo Manfredi's "Il Perché". II. The "Secretum secretorum" and the Book's Publishing Success*, «Medicina & Storia», X (2010), 19-20, pp. 39–58.
- Copeland 1991: Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- Cornish 2010: Alison Cornish, *Vernacular Translation in Dante's Italy. Illiterate Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- De Leemans, Hoenen 2016: Pieter De Leemans, Maarten J.F.M. Hoenen (eds), *Between Text and Tradition: Pietro d'Abano and the Reception of Pseudo-Aristotle's "Problemata Physica" in the Middle Ages*, Leuven University Press, Leuven, 2016.
- Della Torre 1547: Jacobi [de Turre] Foroliviensis *Medici singularis expositio, et quaestiones in artem medicinalem Galeni quae vulgo Techni appellatur quam emendatissime [...]*, apud Iuntas, Venetiis, 1547.
- Deneire 2014: Tom B. Deneire (ed.), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Language and Poetics, Translation and Transfer*, Brill, Leiden, 2014.

⁸⁴ W: princeps illustrissime.

- Duranti 2008a: Tommaso Duranti, *Mai sotto Saturno: Girolamo Manfredi, medico e astrologo*, CLUEB, Bologna, 2008.
- Duranti 2008b: Tommaso Duranti, *Due trattati sulla peste di Girolamo Manfredi*, in Manfredi 2008, pp. XI-XLVIII.
- Federici Vescovini 2006: Gabriella Federici Vescovini, *The "Expositio succincta problematum" of Peter of Abano*, in Pieter De Leemans, Michèle Goyens (eds), *Aristotle's "Problemata" in Different Times and Tongues*, Leuven University Press, Leuven, 2006, pp. 55-70.
- Folena 1991: Gianfranco Folena, *Volgarizzare e tradurre*, Einaudi, Torino, 1991.
- Foresti 1988: Fabio Foresti, *Il lessico medico e il volgare nel "Perché" di Girolamo Manfredi*, in Manfredi 1988, pp. 41-51.
- Frosini 2014: Giovanna Frosini, *Volgarizzamenti*, in *Storia dell'italiano scritto. II. Prosa letteraria*, a cura di Giuseppe Antonelli, Matteo Motolese e Lorenzo Tomasin, Carocci, Roma, 2014, pp. 17-72.
- Gaza 1473: Theodore Gaza [transl. of Aristotle, *Problemata*] in Aristotle 1473.
- George of Trebizond 1962: George of Trebizond, [transl. of *Problemata*, XI] in Aristotle 1962, pp. 124-135.
- George of Trebizond 1967: George of Trebizond, *In perversionem Problematum Aristotelis a quodam Theodoro Cage editam et problematicae Aristotelis philosophiae protectio*, in Ludwig Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist, und Staatsmann: Funde und Forschungen*, Scientia, Aalen, 1967, III, pp. 274-342.
- Kraye 1995: Jill Kraye, *The Printing History of Aristotle in the Fifteenth Century*, «Renaissance Studies», IX (1995), 2, pp. 189-211.
- Lawn 1963: Brian Lawn, *The Salernitan Questions: An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1963.
- Malagola 1888: Carlo Malagola (ed.), *Statuti delle Università e dei Collegi dello Studio bolognese*, Zanichelli, Bologna, 1888.
- Manfredi 1474: Girolamo Manfredi, *Liber de homine*, Ugo Rugerius et Doninus Bertochus, Bologna, 1.VII.1474.
- Manfredi 1988: Girolamo Manfredi, *Liber de homine, Il perché*, a cura di Anna Laura Trombetti Budriesi e Fabio Foresti, Edizioni Luigi Parma, Bologna, 1988.
- Manfredi 2008: Girolamo Manfredi, *Tractato de la pestilentia / Tractatus de peste*, a cura di Tommaso Duranti, CLUEB, Bologna, 2008.
- Monfasani 1976: John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic*, Brill, Leiden, 1976.
- Monfasani 1984: John Monfasani (ed.), *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, Binghamton (NY), 1984.
- Monfasani 1999: John Monfasani, *The Pseudo-Aristotelian "Problemata" and Aristotle's "De animalibus" in the Renaissance*, in Anthony Grafton, Nancy G. Siraisi (eds), *Natural Particulars: Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe*, MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1999, pp. 205-247.
- Monfasani 2006: John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond's Critique of Theodore Gaza's Translation of the Aristotelian "Problemata"*, in Pieter De Leemans, Michèle Goyens (eds), *Aristotle's "Problemata" in Different Times and Tongues*, Leuven University Press, Leuven, 2006, pp. 275-295.
- Morlino 2014: Luca Morlino, *Volgarizzare e trasportare. Una postilla al lessico della traduzione*, «Critica del testo», XVII (2014), 2, pp. 143-157.
- Moss 1994: Ann Moss, *Being in Two Minds: The Bilingual Factor in Renaissance Writing*, in Rhoda Schnur (ed.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis*, Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, Binghamton (NY), 1994, pp. 61-74.
- Nada Patrone 1988: Anna Maria Nada Patrone, *Girolamo Manfredi nella cultura medica e astrologica d'età umanistica*, in Manfredi 1988, pp. 25-40.
- Pesenti 1984: Tiziana Pesenti, *Professori e promotori di medicina nello Studio di Padova dal 1405 al 1509. Repertorio bio-bibliografico*, LINT, Trieste, 1984.
- Pietro d'Abano 1482: *Expositio [...] Petri de Ebano Patavini in librum problematum Aristotelis [...]*, impensa Ioannis Herbort Alemani, Venetiis, 1482.
- Piro 2011: Rosa Piro (a cura di), *"L'Almansore". Volgarizzamento fiorentino del XIV secolo. Edizione critica*, SISMEL, Firenze, 2011.
- Singer 1955: Charles Singer, *A Study in Early Renaissance Anatomy, with a New Text: The "Anothomia" of Hieronymo Manfredi (1490)*, in Charles Singer (ed.), *Studies in the History and Method of Science*, Clarendon Press, London, 1955², I, pp. 79-164.
- Siraisi 1970: Nancy G. Siraisi, *The "Expositio problematum" of Peter of Abano*, «Isis», LXI (1970), pp. 321-339.
- Tavoni 1992: Mirko Tavoni, *Il Quattrocento*, il Mulino, Bologna, 1992.

- Trombetti 2007: Anna Laura Trombetti, *Manfredi, Girolamo* in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 68, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma, 2007, *ad vocem*.
- Ventura 2008: Iolanda Ventura, *Translating, Commenting, Re-Translating: Some Considerations on the Latin Translations of the Pseudo-Aristotelian "Problemata" and their Readers*, in Michèle Goyens, Pieter De Leemans, An Smet (eds), *Science Translated: Latin and Vernacular Translations of Scientific Treatises in Medieval Europe*, Leuven University Press, Leuven, 2008, pp. 123–154.
- Ventura 2015: Iolanda Ventura, *Pietro d'Abano*, in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 83, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma, 2015, *ad vocem*.

