

Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*

Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition
of Mustio's *Gynaecia*

Micaela Brembilla



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Dissertation presented at Uppsala University to be publicly examined in Humanistiska teatern, Engelska Parken, Thunbergsvägen 3C, Uppsala, Friday, 19 December 2025 at 13:15 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The examination will be conducted in English. Faculty examiner: David Langslow (University of Oxford).

Abstract

Brembilla, M. 2025. Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*. 193 pp. Uppsala: Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University. ISBN 978-91-506-3151-7.

The *Gynaecia* of Mustio is a medical treatise written during the second half of the 6th century in the Roman province of Africa. The author adapted the Greek *Γυναικεῖα* of Soranus of Ephesus into Latin in order to provide a comprehensible manual to contemporary midwives ignorant of Greek. The didactic aim of Mustio is a driving force clearly detectable in the text, executed through a simplified language, a specific speech of midwives called *muliebria uerba*, a question-and-answer structure and explicative drawings of *foeti in utero*. The first and, so far only, critical edition was produced by Valentin Rose in 1882, for the Teubner series. In this work, Mustio's *Gynaecia* is considered a mere translation of the Greek model, and the reconstructed language conforms to the Classical Latin norms more than what seems plausible for such a Late Antique text.

The principal aim of this dissertation is therefore to provide the reader with the criteria and the methods to be applied in a future new critical edition. This edition takes into consideration the didactical nature of the *Gynaecia*, as an original element of Mustio and a fundamental aspect for the correct reconstruction of the text, and it presents a Late Latin more aligned with the dating and the production of the text.

Keywords: Mustio, Soranus, Gynaecia, Ancient Gynaecology, History of Medicine, Classical Philology, Palaeography

Micaela Brembilla, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Box 635, Uppsala University, SE-75126 Uppsala, Sweden.

© Micaela Brembilla 2025

This publication is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No-Derivatives (CC BY NC ND) license.

ISBN 978-91-506-3151-7

URN urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-570579 (<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-570579>)

A mio "Padre,
se anche tu non fossi il mio
Padre, se anche fossi a me un estraneo,
per te stesso egualmente t'amerei."

Camillo Sbarbaro

"Once, a guy came in because he had dreamed a record, the whole thing, melody, title and artist, and when I found it for him (it was an old reggae thing, "Happy Go Lucky Girl" by The Paragons), and it was more or less exactly as it had appeared to him in his sleep, the look on his face made me feel as though I was not a man who runs a record shop, but a midwife, or a painter, someone whose life is routinely transcendental."

Nick Hornby, *High Fidelity*

Acknowledgements

This thesis would have not been possible if one October day in 2018, Gerd Haverling had not accepted the request made by Paola Moretti – then my supervisor at Università Statale di Milano – and myself, for a research period at Uppsala University during my master’s thesis. The autumn months of 2019 marked the beginning of my interest in Mustio, and led me to apply for the PhD one year later. Thank you therefore to Gerd, for the support, guidance and the many teachings over these years, and to Paola as well. Secondly, I would like to thank Arsenio Ferraces Rodriguez, my second supervisor at Universidade da Coruña, for his constant availability and warm welcome, which he has always shown me and continues to show, and for being a model of honest research, more interested in truth than in appearance.

My gratitude goes also to Ghent University, especially to Simon Aerts and Giovanbattista Galdi at the Department of Linguistics, and to the Ghent Centre for Late Antiquity, with Lieve Van Hoof: the visiting period that I spent there had a huge impact on my research, and on my way of thinking about Mustio and his *Gynaecia* in general.

I thank Uppsala University, and especially the department of Linguistics and Philology. Thanks to my colleagues of Latin, Carl Erixon and Christer Henriksén, and to Dagmar Lagerberg, Ingela Pehrson Berger, Josef Eskhult and Marianne Wifstrand Schiebe, who have always been to my seminars, and given me helpful feedbacks. Thanks also to Tuomo Nuorluoto and Sam Douglas; to the latter, my special gratitude for welcoming me in the office, and for sharing with me lunches, books and espressos, and having always had a minute to listen to my struggles as a new PhD student. I thank also my colleagues

in Greek and Bizantine Studies, first of all Ingela Nilsson, for her precious encouragement and her helpful presence, and then David Westberg, Emilie Hallenberg, Eric Cullhed and Yves Diop. A huge special thanks to Lilli Hölzlhammer, Milan Vukašinić and Myrto Veikou, who now are not just colleagues but dear friends that I wish to keep in my life. Thanks to Armin Chiochetti, Anita Andrés, Corinne Imboden Hedlund, Filippo Lepori, Konstantina Daravigka and Neshe Pacaci: your presence at work makes a great difference for me. Thanks also to Ahmed Ruby and Emil Lund, with whom I shared the office in these years.

I would like to thank my friends all over the world: I'm very lucky to have so many amazing people in my life. Any attempt to list you will exceed the acceptable dimensions for this section, and therefore I'll limit myself to the people in Uppsala and Stockholm, who have shared with me the daily joys and burdens of this work. My special gratitude goes to Carla, for so many things. Thanks then to Anika, Anna H., Bea V., Laura, Francesca and Filip. Thanks to all my friends in Stockholm, especially to Anja, Anna and Gio, Bessy, Cate, Irene and Guido, Iris and Alessio, Marta and Enrico, Michele, Silvano, and also to Bianca, Celeste, Damiano, Emil, Maddalena and Marco, who are my kids-of-hearth – I am so grateful that you exist in this world.

Questa tesi è dedicata alla mia famiglia, specialmente nella persona di mio padre, Luciano, che mi ha insegnato il coraggio, ma anche a mia madre Ebe, che mi insegna la libertà, e mia sorella Marica, che mi insegna la tenerezza.

Contents

1. Introduction	13
1.1 Mustio, the Methodists and the <i>Gynaecia</i>	16
1.1.1 <i>Mustio</i>	16
1.1.2 <i>The Methodists</i>	18
1.1.3 <i>The relationship with Soranus of Ephesus</i>	21
1.2 The manuscripts and the editions	26
1.2.1 <i>The manuscripts</i>	27
1.2.1.1 Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15	32
1.2.1.2 Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1, and the relationship with the manuscript tradition of Celsus' <i>De medicina</i>	38
1.2.1.3 Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4	44
1.2.1.4 A short note on the relationship between the manuscripts	48
1.2.2 <i>The editions and the philological works</i>	48
1.2.2.1 Rose	48
1.2.2.2 Medert	49
1.2.2.3 Bolton	51
1.3 The purpose of this work	52
2. The text	55
2.0 On the relationship between the three main manuscripts	57
Criteria for the edition	64
Sigla	65
2.1 The introduction of the <i>Gynaecia</i>	66
2.2 Questions I–XVIII	79
2.3 <i>Explicit liber primus. Incipit liber secundus</i>	104
2.4 <i>De difficili et laborioso partu</i>	118
2.4.1 <i>The drawings</i>	139
3. The Language of the <i>Gynaecia</i>	146
3.1 Orthography	147
3.2 Morphology	148

3.3 Syntax	151
3.4 Mustio's Latin.....	154
3.5 Further issues: the use and function of <i>ita ut</i>.....	157
3.6 The <i>Muliebria Verba</i>.....	160
3.6.1 <i>The Greek Medical Loanwords</i>	162
3.6.2 <i>The Lexicon of Remedies</i>	166
3.6.3 <i>The Nursery Terms</i>	173
3.6.4 <i>Conclusions</i>	176
4. <i>Summary and Conclusions</i>.....	178
<i>Bibliography</i>.....	183
Primary Literature.....	183
Secondary Literature	184

Abbreviations

B	Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15
B'	reviser of B
C	Cambridge, Saint John's college, D.4.
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
H	Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4.
L	Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1
L'	reviser of L
LLT	Library of Latin Texts
P	Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal lat 1304.
ThLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae

1. Introduction

Mustio's medical treatise *Gynaecia* has long been the focus of scholarly debate. Due to its late composition and its nature as a technical treatise, the text presents numerous problematic aspects concerning its composition, purpose and language.

First of all, this Latin text appears to be an adaptation of the Greek *Γυναικεῖα* of Soranus of Ephesus. This can be deduced from a comparison between the contents of the two texts, and from the explicit mention of Soranus in one of the principal manuscript witnesses of the *Gynaecia*. However, the precise nature of the relationship between the Latin and the Greek texts remains unclear, especially due to the difficulties not only in defining Mustio's sources, but also in establishing the correct spelling of the names, or titles, mentioned by the author in his introduction. This uncertainty regarding the sources of the *Gynaecia* is reflected also in the uncertainty about the internal structure of the text, which can be clearly divided in two sections based on differences in content and organisation, but whose division is explicitly marked in only one of the main manuscripts, and in a very suspicious passage.

The *Gynaecia* was then composed with a clearly defined purpose, which is described in detail by Mustio in the introduction mentioned above: the author tells us that he aimed to produce a text accessible to contemporary midwives, who lacked knowledge of Greek and were therefore unable to read the existing literature written in that language. This didactical intent is not merely a literary declaration for the sake of the introduction, but rather a genuine goal, achieved by the author through two main tools evident throughout the entire *Gynaecia*: explicative drawings and the use of *muliebria uerba*. The first tool consists of

a series of illustrations of the different foetal positions in the uterus, where anatomical realism is evidently at service of didactical clarity, and the representation of the uterus itself, described in all its parts. The second tool is a special lexicon of midwives, mentioned by Mustio himself at the end of the introduction, where he also describes the language used in the *Gynaecia* as deliberately simplified – a statement that offers us valuable insights into the Latin expected in the *Gynaecia*, as well as guidance for its philological restoration.

The purpose of this dissertation is to lay the groundwork for a future critical edition of the entire *Gynaecia*. Accordingly, it is called “prolegomena” and addresses a selection of philological problems in order to illustrate the methods that I propose and the reasons behind them, together with the implications of the new approach for reconstructing both the structure and, especially, the language of the text.

In this introductory chapter, I will first provide the reader with information about the author Mustio, his historical and theoretical context, and his relationship with Soranus’ *Γυναικεῖα*. I will then examine the manuscript tradition of *Gynaecia*, notably complicated due to the technical and didactical nature of the *work*, since the frequent use of the illustrated sections has led to the internal variation among the manuscripts and to a set of codices in which the chapters with the drawings have been transmitted without the rest of the *Gynaecia*. Special attention will be given to the three main witnesses of Mustio’s text: the codex Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15 (B), the codex Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1 (L) and the codex Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4 (H). Finally, I will review the history of philological studies on Mustio’s *Gynaecia*, starting from the first and, so far only, critical edition of Valentin Rose, published in 1882 in the Teubner series, under the title *Sorani Gynaeciorum Vetus Translatio Latina*. The second major contribution to the philological studies on the *Gynaecia* was made by another German scholar, Hans Medert, with his master’s thesis in

1911, and then with his later work, published posthumously in 1997 by his student and friend Helmut Hess. The third and most recent study is the doctoral dissertation of Lesley Annette Bolton, *An Edition, Translation and Commentary of Mustio's Gynaecia*, dated to 2015, where the Canadian scholar proposed a new edition of the text starting from a perspective quite different from that of Rose and Medert.

1.1 Mustio, the Methodists and the *Gynaecia*

1.1.1 *Mustio*

We have limited biographical information about the author of the *Gynaecia*, besides what he tells us in the introduction to the treatise itself.¹ In this section, the author identifies himself as *Mustio* or *Muscio*, declares his acquaintance with contemporary midwives and states his intention to translate for their sake Soranus of Ephesus' *Γυναικεῖα* into Latin; he also claims to have already translated other works by the Greek physician.

Valentin Rose, while adopting in his 1882 edition the form *Muscio*, *Muscionis* as found in the majority of manuscripts, declares that the variant *Mustio*, *Mustionis* found in B was a common name in Numidia and Mauretania, with variations such as *Mustiosus*, *Mustiolus*, *Mustacus*, *Mussius* and *Mussiosus*.² Rose further connects *Muscio*/*Mustio* to the Punic name *Mustumbal*, with variants like *Mutthumbal*, *Muthumbal*, *Muthunus*, *Muttun*, *Mettun*, *Mottun*.³ Hans Medert decided to adopt *Mustio*, *Mustionis* in his master thesis of 1911, and he justified his choice by pointing to the frequent confusion between the syllables <ti> and <ci> in Latin manuscripts, due to the fact that in the early Middle Ages they were both pronounced as [tsi].⁴ In his *Appendix uerborum notabilium*, he then reported possible etymologies for the name, ultimately all connected to the word *mustum* 'must', either as a liquid to drink or to wash newborns.⁵

Rose's research attempted not only to address the text and its philological problems, but also to shed light on Mustio himself and the production of the *Gynaecia*, trying to hypothesise a *stemma codicum*, and also to place the author and the text in space and time. He proposed a dating for the treatise in the

¹ SORAN. 3.

² ROSE (1882, VIII).

³ ROSE (1882, XVIII).

⁴ MEDERT (1911, 18).

⁵ MEDERT (1911, 77).

second half of the 6th century AD, and suggested its origin in the Roman province of Africa. This hypothesis was based on the presence of three terms in the text identified as African, which are *ginga*, ‘henbane’, *boba*, ‘mallow’ and *zenzur*, ‘knotgrass’;⁶ starting from these studies, James N. Adams later identified two additional African words, *dida*, ‘breast/nipple; wet-nurse’ and *ubuppa*, a sort of little glass jar with a hole on top to suck liquids, like a feeding bottle.⁷

The proposed dating to the second half of the 6th century AD was based on the absence of any reference to the *Gynaecia* in the *Oribasius Latinus*, which is dated to the beginning of that century. Even though I do not consider the arguments suggested by Rose as an irrefutable proof, it is nonetheless plausible to place the production of the *Gynaecia* within the period that David Langslow has called “the Golden Age of ancient Latin medical compendia”, i.e. the 4th, the 5th and the 6th centuries AD.⁸ During this time, the Roman Africa saw the activity of writers like Theodorus Priscianus and Caelius Aurelianus, among others, who adapted the major Greek medical works of antiquity for Latin-speaking audiences, fearing that the knowledge of Greek was destined to disappear in the Roman world, or seeing that it was already inaccessible in some degrees. The period was marked by significant upheaval. In 429 AD, the Vandals crossed the Strait of Gibraltar and occupied Africa, capturing Carthage, the most important city of the province, in 439 AD, and keeping these territories for almost a century, until finally defeated in 534 AD by the Eastern Roman Empire. However, although the invasion of the Vandals brought raids in the countryside and the military conquest of cities, Roman infrastructure, and Latin as the official language were preserved.⁹

Another of the most important authors of this period was Vindicianus, who was not only a writer of medicine, but also a practitioner of this *ars*. In a letter

⁶ ROSE (1882, IV); ANDRÉ (1954, 54).

⁷ ADAMS (2007, 529); for a detailed analysis of these terms, see section 3.6.3.

⁸ LANGSLOW (2000, 63).

⁹ CILLIERS (2019, 21).

to the emperor Valentinianus II, quoted by Marcellus Empiricus in his *De medicamentis*, Vindicianus lamented the poor preparation and knowledge of his fellow physicians.¹⁰ The letter also reveals that Vindicianus was the *comes* of a college of physicians established in Rome by Valentinian I in 368 AD. The flourishing of translations and adaptations of medical texts might then reflect a broader effort, advocated especially in the person of Vindicianus, proconsul in Africa, to improve the education of physicians.

The *Gynaecia* reflects these same cultural and intellectual currents. As Mustio explicitly states in his introduction, he decided to translate the *Γυναικεῖα* of Soranus of Ephesus for contemporary midwives, who were ignorant of Greek and therefore could not have had access to the knowledge written in that language. This intention may be viewed in light of the constitution of the Emperor Justinian in 530 AD, in which female practitioners of medicine, the *medicae*, were formally recognised as legitimate physicians.¹¹ The decision of Mustio to write for a female public may thus be understood against the background of this more inclusive intellectual environment, adding further support to the hypothesis that the *Gynaecia* was indeed composed in the second half of the 6th century. While this evidence might not be conclusive, it is nonetheless reasonable to consider Mustio's work within in a cultural environment that was actively engaged in such reflections.

1.1.2 The Methodists

The *Gynaecia* of Mustio takes as its model the *Γυναικεῖα* by Soranus of Ephesus. This is acknowledged by the Latin author himself in the introduction to his work, and is further confirmed from the comparison of the contents of the Latin and the Greek treatises. Soranus is widely regarded as one of the most important physicians of antiquity, and a leading figure of the Methodic school

¹⁰ MARCELL. med. 21–25.

¹¹ CILLIERS (2019, 104). The author says that reference is in KUDLIEN (1970, 35).

of medicine; the principles of this school are applied in his work of gynaecology – the *Γυναικεῖα* – the only one of his vast medical writings to survive in a nearly complete form. Originally from Ephesus, Soranus later practised in Rome;¹² according to Pliny the Elder, Hellenistic medicine was introduced in the city around 219 BC by the practice of Archagathus, but it was Asclepiades of Bithynia, almost one century later, at the end of the 2nd century BC, who successfully adapted the Hellenistic theoretical approaches so new for the Romans to the more pragmatic Latin medical tradition.¹³ Pliny's account of Asclepiades is ambivalent. While he describes him as lacking formal medical training and therefore more interested in using good sense and practical approaches than in debating medical theories, he also portrays him as an innovator and a mediator, who was able to adapt his personal knowledge, and his *sagax ingenium*,¹⁴ to the audience he was dealing with. Asclepiades translated into medical practice the theories of Democritus and Epicurus, especially the idea that body is composed of atoms and voids, a theory later fundamental to the Methodists. One of his students, Themison of Laodicea, systematised his master's writings between the 2nd and the 1st century BC, as Celsus tells us in the *proemium* to his *De medicina*: from his work, continues Celsus, the Methodic school was born.¹⁵

The name *Methodici* ('Methodists') derives from their emphasis on the importance of a codified system of treatment, i.e. a method, *μέθοδος*. According to their theory, the body is made of channels and atoms and health is defined as balance between these two elements. When we are in front of any ailment or disease, it means that this balance has been disturbed; the first thing to do then is to diagnosticate the nature of the disturbance, i.e. the commonality (*genus* in Latin, *κοινότης* in Greek) to which the problem belongs. These commonalities are three: the first is *στέγνωσις*, or *genus adstrictum*, and occurs

¹² HANSON, GREEN (1994, 981).

¹³ PLIN. nat. 29, 6; 26, 7–8.

¹⁴ PLIN. nat. 26, 7.

¹⁵ CELS. proemium, 11; 54–57.

when the channels in the body are too narrow and/or the atoms too big; secondly, we have *ῥύσις* or *genus fluens*, when the channels are too broad and/or the atoms too small; finally, the third category is *ἐπιπλοκή* or *genus mixtum*, i.e. a mix of the other two.¹⁶ Once the appropriate commonality is identified, a first, more delicate, phase of treatment begins, which consists of diet and exercise, baths, fumigations, application of compresses and poultices. These remedies are chosen to counteract the nature of the problem: *genus adstrictum* is treated with soothing and relaxing remedies, while *genus fluens* with drying and astringent ones. If the first cycle of remedies proves ineffective, more aggressive interventions are required, such as scarification, leeching, phlebotomy, medical cups and induction of vomiting using specific plants like hellebore, very dangerous in the wrong dosage. In this second phase, surgical procedures are contemplated: in the field of gynaecology, these include for example the surgical removal of an excessively large clitoris¹⁷ or the use of a hook to extract a foetus that is dead or cannot be delivered alive without endangering the mother.¹⁸

Mustio's *Gynaecia* does not contain any explicit theoretical exposition of the Methodist doctrine,¹⁹ which might be attributed to its nature as a practical manual, where the author limits the passages about theoretical explanation, etymologies and debates among scholars that are abundant in Soranus. However, the therapeutic prescriptions in the *Gynaecia* closely mirror those found in Soranus and reflect the *μέθοδος* outlined above.

¹⁶ MAZZINI (1997, 202).

¹⁷ SORAN. 106, 1–106, 9.

¹⁸ SORAN. 90, 1–94, 10.

¹⁹ I refer the reader to section 2.3, which might contain traces of a theoretical explanation; however, the passage analysed in it is highly damaged by a gap in the whole tradition, and it is difficult to express any certainty.

1.1.3 The relationship with Soranus of Ephesus

As previously discussed, the relationship between Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα* and Mustio's *Gynaecia* can be regarded as firmly established. The question that remains, however, concerns the actual sources of Mustio, and it originates in the highly problematic introduction to his *Gynaecia*; I report here the text as edited by Rose:

Cum frequentius nobis in muliebribus obstetrix fuisset necessaria, nullam inuenimus studiosam quae litteras graecas adtigisse uideretur, quodsi et habuisset omnia in latinitate sibi translata gynaecia, posset rationem lectionis scire. Ego uero Muscio quia multa iam uideor quomodocumque transtulisse, ueritate rationis potius nisus quam structa oratione uel diligentius polita usus, sicut in ophtalmico et chirurgumeno filiatro et boethematico legisti, placuit mihi haec quoque gynaecia in latinum uertere sermonem, licet etiam maximam partem triacontados ad integrum tenorem secutus Soranum transtulerim. Sed cum uidissem corpus futurum et posse muliebres animos hac ratione cito prae magnitudine lassari, placuit cateperotianorum breuitatem fuisse secutus, ut omnia dicere uidear et non grande corpus perfecisse. Quibusdam uero capitulis multum breuiter dictis, quaedam et triacontados addidi, ut ex omnibus collectus commentarius sufficiens esse possit. His autem multo simplicius uolui loqui et ut uerius dicam muliebribus uerbis usus sum, ut etiam inperitae obstetrices licet ab altera sibi lectam rationem facile intellegere possint.²⁰

‘Since we often had the need of a midwife for our gynaecological practice, we never find a well-educated one, who seemed to have studied Greek, that if she had the gynaecia translated into Latin, she could have learned that knowledge. So, because I, Mustio, happened to have translated many texts this way, using the truth of reason rather than a complex and too much embellished speech, as you could read in the *Ophtalmicus* and *Chirurgumenus*,

²⁰ SORAN. 3, 1–3, 21. See section 2.1 for my edition of the passage.

even the *Philiatrus* and the *Boethematicus*, I decided to turn into Latin also these *Gynaecia*, and I translated most of the text of the *triacontados*, following the style of Soranus. But when I realised that the book was going to be huge and for this reason, i.e. its dimension, it could have tired the feminine spirits, I wanted to follow the shortness of the *cateperotiana*, so to say everything without producing a big work. But then, since those chapters were very briefly written, I added some information from the *triacontados*, so that the finished commentary could be complete. I wanted to write them in a very simple way, and, to tell the truth, I used the words of the midwives, so that even ignorant midwives could easily understand the text read to them by another one.’

The introduction is the section in which the relationship between Mustio’s text and Soranus’ is explicitly acknowledged. Even though only H among the three main manuscripts contains the name *soranos* – emended by Rose in *Sorranum* – a comparative analysis of the two texts clearly confirms that the *Γυναικεῖα* served as the model of the *Gynaecia*.²¹ However, complications arise when examining Mustio’s description of the process of production: in the text edited by Rose, *cateperotiana* is what Mustio follows when he realises that his text might exhaust women, and *triacontados* is what he adds in order to make the content of his *Gynaecia* complete. In this context, both terms seem to denote sources consulted by Mustio during the composition of the text, and to suggest some kind of division in two parts of the material in the Latin treatise. Such a division is indeed observable in the *Gynaecia*, first through differences in structure and content, and second because it is actually reported by one of the three main manuscripts, H, which explicitly refers to a *liber primus* and a *liber Secundus*. The situation, however, is complicated by a gap at the point where the transition between the two books should occur, and even the material in H appears incomplete.²² Nevertheless, a clear shift in both structure

²¹ Cf. PRENNER (2012).

²² I refer the reader to section 2.3, for a more exhaustive discussion of the passage.

and subject is evident before and after the gap. Before the gap, the text is organised in a question-and-answer structure, focusing on topic such as the anatomy of the female apparatus, the qualities of the best midwife and all the situations that are consequences of the correct natural functions of the female apparatus but nevertheless produce a lack of balance, and therefore discomfort, in the female body (the so called *causae secundum naturam*), like for example the menstrual cycle, conception, pregnancy, delivery and breastfeeding. After the gap the material is organised in short and medium essays, each one addressing a pathological condition or dysfunction of the female reproductive system, like for example miscarriage and difficult labour, various situations that indicate problems in the functioning of the female body. This thematic division mirrors the one illustrated by Mustio himself in the first question of the *Gynaecia*:

I. In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet uniuersam mulierum traditionem? In duas, unam quae de obsetrice tractat, alteram quae de omnibus obsetricibus occurrentibus constat; hanc ipsam iterum diuidimus <in duas>: secundum naturam occurrentes causas et praeter naturam.²³

‘I. In how many and which parts do we divide the gynaecological knowledge?’

In two, one that discusses about the midwife, another that consists of all that might occur to a midwife; and this one again we divide in two: conditions according to nature and conditions against nature.’

Even though the internal division of the *Gynaecia* is actually between “midwife and ailments according to nature” versus “ailments against nature”, I still believe that this can be considered evidence of the division in two sections, even books, which I therefore accept as valid.

The actual meaning of the terms *cateperotiana* and *triacontados* in the edition of Rose remains uncertain, as the editor does not provide a commentary

²³My edition, see section 2.2; cfr. SORAN. 5, 1–5, 6.

clarifying his interpretation of the terms. What we can say is that he followed the reading of manuscript H, which has *cateperocianorum* and *triacontadis/triacontadas*, versus the readings of B and L, that are *catapianorum* and *triacontraduos*, and *ext pianecum* and *diatriaer contrado*, respectively. Medert accepted Rose's editorial choices, publishing the terms with initial capital letters (*Cateperotiana* and *Triacontados*) and interpreting them as titles of works by Soranus himself.²⁴ The theory of titles is the most widely accepted among scholars. Ann E. Hanson and Monica H. Green,²⁵ in their chapter about Soranus in the ANRW, suggest that *Triacontados* might be a mistaken reference to the *Γυναικεῖα* itself, while *Cateperotiana* could denote a reduced essay, named after a Greek expression like *κατ'ἐπερωτησιν* 'according to inquiry',²⁶ likely produced by a later epitomist rather than Soranus himself. In contrast, Danielle Gourevitch considers it plausible that Soranus wrote a shortened version of the *Γυναικεῖα*, citing as evidence a set of ten gynaecological questions contained in the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 2153.²⁷

A dissenting opinion is offered by Lesley Annette Bolton of Calgary University, who, in her doctoral dissertation, worked on a new critical edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*.²⁸ In her introductory chapter, Bolton outlines her objections to the theory of titles. First, she notes that there are no references to something entitled *cateperotiana* or *triacontados* in any other text of Soranus, despite his frequent self-referencing, nor any kind of short version is mentioned in the *Γυναικεῖα* itself. Second, she observes that known titles of Soranus' works typically give some information about the subject matter, whereas neither *cateperotiana* nor *triacontados* offer such indication. Finally,

²⁴ MEDERT (1911, 9); HESS (1997, 203).

²⁵ HANSON, GREEN (1994, 968–1075).

²⁶ The interpretation of *cateperotiana* as related to the Greek expression [*Τά*] *κατ'ἐπερωτησιν* is first mentioned by INGERSLEV (1909, 15) as a suggestion of J. L. Heiberg; see also HANSON, GREEN (1994, 1029), KIND (1927, 1118) and IERACI BIO (1995, 192).

²⁷ GOUREVITCH 1999, 206–211.

²⁸ BOLTON (2015, 52–67).

she argues that the brevity required for catechetical manual is uncharacteristic of Soranus' *usus scribendi*. However, Bolton does not seem to take into consideration the possibility that these texts may have been written by someone other than Soranus. The scholar then proposes her own editorial solutions, based on the readings of B and L. She adopts the forms *catapotia* and *triacontaduos*. *Catapotia* is a Greek loanword from *καταπότιον*, referring to a remedy to be swallowed, which in the plural may also denote a written collection of such recipes, whose brevity would have been inspiration for Mustio's concise style. *Triacontaduos* is the Greek number thirty-two in an uncommon yet not impossible formation,²⁹ which Bolton correlates to the actual number of chapters of the second section of the *Gynaecia*.

While Bolton's approach is intellectually stimulating, it is not entirely convincing in its execution, especially since she, like Rose, relies on a selective use of the manuscript tradition – though she prefers different ones. Bolton's wish to dissociate these words from Soranus' corpus is based on her intention to demonstrate the originality and innovation of Mustio's work: if the author's independence from other sources than the official *Γυναικεῖα* can be established, then the summarisation and adaptation of the content must be attributed solely to him.

While I agree with Bolton about the importance of Mustio's innovative contribution, I do not believe that his originality is diminished by acknowledging his use of multiple sources. As I will elaborate in section 2.1, where I present and analyse my edition of the introduction, I have reconstructed the terms as *Cata Gynaecion* and *Dia Iatrimon* in place of *cateperotiana/catapotia* and *triacontados/triacontaduos*. While the reading of L proved to be the most useful, I considered all three principal witnesses in order to reach a satisfying hypothesis.

²⁹ As Bolton herself reports (page 65), the more traditional way to form numbers in ancient Greek would have been *ἄλλο καὶ τριάκοντα*, but there are also a few occurrences of *τριάκονταδύο*.

I believe that the context in which these terms are employed strongly suggests that they refer to titles of the sources used by Mustio: a shortened version of Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*, chosen for its brevity, and a miscellany of medicine, like a *liber medicinalis*, containing a gynaecological section derived from Soranus' material. Even in this scenario of multiple sources, in which the content of the *Γυναικεῖα* have already been adapted by someone else, the originality of Mustio's work and his intentions remain intact. First of all, the main reason why Mustio wanted to write a Latin text of gynaecology was to make Greek medical knowledge accessible to contemporary midwives who were unable to read this language – this goal remains valid regardless of whether he translated directly from Soranus or from intermediary sources. Secondly, Mustio's didactical interest towards his audience is reflected in the concrete tools he employed to enhance clarity and usability. These tools are examined in details in sections 3.6 and 2.4.1, and are the specific speech of midwives that the author calls *muliebria uerba*, and the presence of explicative drawings, as mentioned before.

1.2 The manuscripts and the editions

The history of the studies on the *Gynaecia* began with the work Conrad Gesner, who aimed to publish a compilation of Late Antiquity gynaecological texts, following his 1555 publication *De chirurgia scriptores optimi quique ueteres et recentiores*.³⁰ After Gesner's death, the project was taken up by Caspar Wolf, who ultimately published the two volumes of the *Libri Gynaeciorum* in 1566.³¹ Within this work, Mustio's text appears twice. One instance is in the second volume, under the title *Περὶ γυναικειῶν παθῶν*, a Greek text now recognised as a byzantine translation of Mustio's Latin original, but that Gesner and Wolf considered the original composition of an author called

³⁰ GESNER (1555).

³¹ WOLF (1566).

Moschion, who they thought had summarised Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*. They also assumed that the Latin version attributed to Mustio – known to them through a manuscript not yet identified but likely related to codex H – was not the original but merely a translation of Moschion's Greek text.³² The Latin text was used by Wolf as the foundation of the *Harmonia Gynaeciorum*, a collation of Late Antique gynaecological treatises published in the first volume. In this context, the *Gynaecia* was integrated with material from other sources – and this is then the second occurrence of Mustio's text in the *Libri Gynaeciorum*. It was not until the publication of F. O. Dewey in 1793 that the true relationship between the Greek and the Latin versions of the *Gynaecia* was clarified. The scholar published the Greek translation of Mustio's text found in manuscript Wien, Nationalbibliothek, med. gr. 39 Ness, which preserves the introduction in its complete version, with the explicit mention of Mustio's intended audience – midwives ignorant of Greek – thus confirming that the original version was indeed the Latin one.³³

1.2.1 *The manuscripts*

The manuscript H previously mentioned is not the oldest manuscript in our possession. The codex Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1 (L) and the codex Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15 (B) are both dated from the second half of the 9th to the beginning of the 10th century AD.³⁴ Even though scholars remain uncertain about the precise dating of L, the two manuscripts are nearly contemporaneous but, even if their readings and content indeed suggest closer connection between them, no precise relationship has been yet established. Following a chronological order, we arrive at the aforementioned manuscript H, dated between the 11th and the

³² For a detailed analysis on the manuscripts used by Wolf see SCIMONE (2023).

³³ INGERSLEV (1909, 13).

³⁴ RADICCHI (1970, 249; 250); see also sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.2.

12th centuries AD.³⁵ This manuscript has been recognised as the model of many other manuscripts, among which Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal lat 1304 (P) and Cambridge, Saint John's college, D.4 (C), collated by Rose for his edition and referred as Pal. and Cant. respectively. P, now at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, is dated to the 13th century AD, contains the entire text of the *Gynaecia* and, although a *descriptus*, it is very useful because its writing is clearer and sometimes more comprehensible than that of H; C, preserved at St. John's College Library, is dated to the 15th century AD, but Rose considered the section containing the *Gynaecia* to be older, possibly dating to the 12th century AD.

In addition to these five manuscripts used by Rose in his critical edition, Ann Hanson and Monica Green, in the appendix to their study on Soranus of Ephesus, identified eight further codices preserving the complete text of the *Gynaecia*:³⁶

- the manuscript New York, New York Academy of Medicine, SAFE, date to 1230–1250;
- the Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 4234, dated to the 13th century AD³⁷;
- the Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 671, dated to the 13th century AD;
- the Vicenza, Biblioteca Civile Bertoliana, 287, dated to the 13th century AD;
- the San Candido-Innichen, Biblioteca della Collegiata (Kapitelbibliothek), VIII D9, dated between the 13th and the 14th century AD;
- the Bonn, Universitätsbibliothek, S 481, dated between the 15th and the 16th century AD;
- the Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat 6337, dated to the 16th century AD, *descriptus* of L.

³⁵ RADICCHI (1970, 252).

³⁶ HANSON, GREEN (1994, 1072).

³⁷ This manuscript should be listed among those with only excerpts of the *Gynaecia*, as Hanson and Green say that it "riarranges and omits many capp. of Book I".

The eighth manuscript mentioned by Hanson and Green is the codex Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3244, dated to the 15th century. However, this manuscript is not found in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. Prior to the work of Hanson and Green, Rino Radicchi compiled a list of all the available manuscripts with the *Gynaecia*'s text, both complete or in excerpts.³⁸ While his section of the manuscripts transmitting the entire work of Mustio features only six codices against the thirteen of Hanson and Green, he mentions the manuscript Wien, Nationalbibliothek, lat. 2504. This codex can be found in the library's catalogue – even though not in a digitalised form – and it features a *Tractatus de aegritudinibus mulierum in excerptis* of Moschion. The description of this manuscript matches that of ms. 3244 done by Hanson and Green. It is likely that the two scholars made a mistake in compiling their list, and the Wien, Nationalbibliothek, lat. 2504 mentioned by Radicchi must be considered genuine in the *Gynaecia*'s witnesses list.

The manuscripts listed by Hanson and Green continue with a group of codices containing excerpts from the text and no drawings:³⁹

- the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7028, placed by some scholars between the 10th and the 11th century AD, by other in the 16th century AD;
- the Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat 5951 (V),⁴⁰ generally dated to the 9th century AD, but the text of Mustio, dated to the 12th century AD;
- the Leiden, Bibliotheken der Rijks-Universiteit, lat. Q. 9, 13th century AD
- the München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 756, 15th century AD.

³⁸ RADICCHI (1970, 249–259); the manuscripts listed by the scholar are the five used by Rose (i.e., B, L, H, C and P), the Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat 6337 and the mysterious Wien, Nationalbibliothek, lat. 2504.

³⁹ HANSON, GREEN (1994, 1072–1073).

⁴⁰ We will discuss this manuscript in section 1.2.1.2, in connection with manuscript L.

All four manuscripts are also mentioned by Radicchi.⁴¹ In this group, Hanson and Green record again manuscript C, which in addition to the entire *Gynaecia* at ff. 153r–170v, repeats also excerpts from the second book at ff. 176v–177r, and therefore counts as another witness for this section.

Finally, a group of manuscripts containing the illustrations of the *Gynaecia* is recorded; some of them report illustrations alone or connected to works other than the *Gynaecia*, not always in Latin, while others retain some of the original Latin text.⁴² They are as follows:

- the manuscript Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Thott 190.2, dated between the 12th and 13th century AD, with only the foetal illustrations;
- the Paris, Bibliothèque National, lat. 7056, dated between 1240 and 1260, with foetal illustrations added by a later hand below the text of the *Genecia Cleopatrae*;
- the Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmole 399, dated to 1292, with foetal illustrations and Latin text;
- the Budapest, Eötvös Loránd Tudomány Egyetem Könyvtára, lat. 15, dated between the 13th and the 14th century AD, with only the foetal illustrations;
- the München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 161, dated between the 13th and the 14th century AD, with foetal illustrations and Latin text;
- the Paris, Bibliothèque National, héb. 1120, dated to the 14th century AD, with foetal illustrations linked to the Hebrew treatise “On Difficulties of Birth”;
- the Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. Lat. 320 (1937), dated to the 14th century AD with coloured foetal illustrations;

⁴¹ (RADICCHI, 1970, 261–264; 269).

⁴² HANSON, GREEN (1994, 1073); see also RADICCHI (1970, 262–274): his list is shorter, but features manuscripts transmitting translations of the *Gynaecia*, like for example the München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, gr. 511 (M), used by Wolf as source for the *Περὶ γυναικειῶν παθῶν* (see section 1.2).

- the Dresden, Der Dresdner Königliche Bibliothek, lat. P. 34, 78, dated to the 15th century AD, with foetal illustrations;
- the Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, B 33, dated to the 15th century AD, with coloured foetal illustrations following a German translation of the ps-Albertus Magnus *De secretis mulierum*;
- the Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1192, dated to the 15th century AD, with foetal illustrations;
- the London, British Library, Sloane 2463, dated to the 15th century AD, with foetal illustrations linked to the Old-English text *The Sekenesse of Wymmen version 2*;⁴³
- the London, Royal College of Surgeons, 129 a.i.5, dated to the 15th century AD, with foetal illustrations linked to the Old-English text *The Sekenesse of Wymmen version 2*;
- the Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 724, dated to the 15th century AD, with foetal illustrations;
- the Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, X.118, dated to 1412, with foetal illustrations and Latin text;
- the London, Wellcome Institute Medical Library, 49 (50000), dated to 1420, with the foetal illustrations and Latin text, and a uterine drawing with a baby in it;
- the München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cgm 597, dated to 1485, with foetal illustrations and Latin text;
- the London, British Library, Sloane 249, dated to the 16th century, with foetal illustrations linked to the Old-English text *The Sekenesse of Wymmen version 2*;
- the Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, H 277, dated to the 15th century AD, with foetal illustrations and Latin text;

⁴³ For an exhaustive list of medieval gynaecological texts, see GREEN (2000).

- the Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, B 200, dated to 1524, with coloured foetal illustrations and a birthing chair.

I refer the reader to section 2.4.1 for a more detailed analysis of the drawings and their presence in these manuscripts. Here I would like to point out how evident it is that we are dealing with a text that was widely read, studied and, in various ways reworked, resulting in a highly complex manuscript tradition.

Given the preliminary nature of this study and its limitations in resources and time, I have conducted a detailed analysis only of the three main witnesses of Mustio's *Gynaecia*, i.e. B, L and H, that I had the possibility to read and study in person. Consequently, only these three codices have been used in the samples of critical edition presented in chapter 2, The complete edition of the *Gynaecia* that will follow this thesis will, of course, include a comprehensive review of all the witnesses of Mustio's text; nevertheless, the status of B, L and H as the main manuscripts of the tradition established by Rose in 1882 remains convincing and therefore I do not anticipate that other codices will apport transformative insights to the edition.

1.2.1.1 Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15

The manuscript Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15 (B) is dated to the late 9th or early 10th century, and was likely produced in southeastern France.⁴⁴ It is written in Caroline minuscule, using brown ink for the main text and red ink for the questions and the paragraph headings, where capital letters are frequently employed. We find the hand of a reviser, called B' in the critical apparatus. The manuscript is a large but relatively thin object, measuring 27.2 x 19.7 cm. The text is arranged in a single column with lateral margins of 1.2

⁴⁴ RADICCHI (1970, 249).

cm. It comprises a collection of various medical texts, and the *Gynaecia* of Mustio goes from f. 15r to f. 31v.

As previously noted, B is illustrated at f. 16v with a drawing of the uterus. This drawing accompanies the question in which Mustio discusses the anatomical structure of the uterus, explicitly mentioning the inclusion of a diagram with labelled parts, to make its description and study easier for the readers.⁴⁵ Further illustrations are found from f. 26v to f. 28v, depicting twelve different positions of the baby in the uterus, corresponding to the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*. Most of these illustrations accurately reflect the content of the chapter; however, in some occasions they are more entertaining than didactic, like for example in the case of the depictions of twelve foetuses withing a single uterus at f. 28v. All illustrations are drawn in brown ink, while the uterine cavity is filled in terracotta red and the hair of the babies in a darker brown.

Particularly interesting is the condition of f.18. This *folium* is torn in its inferior external corner, resulting in the loss of more than a quarter of the page. If we attempt to read the text in f.18r, we see that a significant portion of the text is missing, as confirmed by logical reconstruction and comparison with other manuscripts. Here are the first two lines in correspondence of the lacuna:

MENSE QUAE FACIENDAE SUNT iosio uersu laxius obuoluere superioris
partes didas
amplius istringere ut proximante partu ad infer
exire. Locis etiam ipsis laxamentum praeparare incatisma
anserinus et medulla ceruine constat digit⁴⁶

From the collation of the other two main witnesses, and the comparison with the Greek *Γυναικεῖα*, we see that some content is missing, lost with the tear, as it can be read in Rose's edition:

⁴⁵ See sections 2.2. and 3.3.

⁴⁶ This passage does not conform to the text's layout because it replicates the manuscript's line division.

46. In nono mense quae faciendae sunt?

Iosum uersum laxius obuoluere, superiores uero partes sub didas amplius stringere, ut proximante partu inferiora **loca exponantur, ut illuc infans possit celerius** exire. Locis etiam ipsis laxamentum praeparare encathismatibus, **etiam lauacro uti et pessariis quae ex adipibus** anserinis et medulla ceruina constant. Digito **etiam peruncto orificium matricis leniter aperire.**⁴⁷

In contrast, f.18v presents a very different situation: there is no content missed between the last complete line and the first three lines affected by the lacuna:

[...] XLVIII DUO LECTI AD QUID PRO SUNT. Unum uero quod est
durius strato ubi parturientem collocamus
frequentius enim et iacentes pariunt. In illum autem
qui mollius est stratus post laborem fetam collocamus.

The collation of the two other witnesses and Soranus' text show us that, for the entire gap in f.18v, the lines lack a very small portion of text, from only one letter to a couple of syllables; see for comparison Rose's edition:

62. Duo lecti ad quid prosunt?

Uno uero qui est durius stratus ibi parturientem collocamus: frequentius enim et iacentes pariunt. In illum autem qui mollius est stratus, post laborem fetam collocamus.

63. Quomodo parturientem collocare debemus?

Iacente ea supina in lecto **qui** durius stratum habet, conduplicatis illic pedibus **et** apertis, cum corion ad magnitudinem oui in **orificio** matricis inuenerimus, ad sellam eam leuamus. Nam **si** ita fuerit lassa ut in lecto **parere** debeat, ibi pariat. Si uero sella obstetricalis non est, in fortis mulieris femora sedere debet ut illic pariat.

64. Antequam ad sellam parturientem **collocemus** quid facere oportet?

⁴⁷ SORAN. 17, 13 – 18, 2.

Oportet dolores illos omnibus calefactionibus uaporare, **oleo** etiam calido et sucis loca ipsa inrigare. **Deambulare** etiam eas et lauari et cibos accipere **antiqui** iuebant. Nos uero non permittimus haec **fieri**, quia ambulatio infantem prope foris **positum** premit et matricem quassat, lauacrum uero **et uires** minuit et digestum corpus mulieris inrigidat, cibus autem qui in frigore datur corrumpitur **et non** nutrit.

65. Ministrae cum **obstetrice** quot sunt necessariae?

Tres enim necessariae sunt, ex quibus duae dextra **laeuaque** ad latera stare debent, in quas incumbere **possit**, tertia uero a dorso eam teneat, ut **occurrentibus** doloribus non se in latus inclinet, **hortantes** eam ut fortiter sustineat.⁴⁸

This discrepancy suggests that the copyist, while using the entire space in f. 18r, was on the contrary aware that a quarter of the page was not available for writing in f. 18v even before the tear occurred. Given this apparent foresight, and considering that B contains illustrations in other passages of the *Gynaecia*, it is plausible to hypothesise that another drawing was cut away from f. 18v. This page contains a description of the *sella obstetricalis*, a special chair with an halfmoon shaped seat, to facilitate the delivery of the baby in a sitting position – an ideal object for an illustration. Even though no other surviving manuscript presents this drawing, it appears in several midwives' manuals of the 16th century, such as Eucharius Rösslin's *Rosegarten*, a text that has Mustio's *Gynaecia* as a model, at least for the drawings of the foetuses. The presence of the *sella obstetricalis* in Rösslin's text gives further plausibility to the hypothesis that a similar image may once have existed in f. 18r of the manuscript B.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ SORAN. 21, 17 – 23, 3.

⁴⁹ I thank Anna Maria Urso for bringing to my attention that the same conclusion has been reached by Francesca Marchetti in her 2017 contribution "*Figura ita est: origine e uso delle illustrazioni dei manuali di ostetricia dalla tarda antichità al Medioevo*", in the volume "*Nascere. Il parto dall'antichità all'età moderna*" edited by edited by A. Foscati, C. Gislon Dopfel and A. Parmeggiani.

The Latin found in B is late, and it exhibits the highest degree of orthographic and morphological uncertainty among the three main witnesses of the *Gynaecia*. Nevertheless, the language cannot be classified as excessively vulgar. Diphthongs are sometimes preserved, sometimes simplified into monophthongs, especially for the diphthong <ae>, found as <e>, like in *preter pro praeter* in the expression *praeter naturam* at question I (1 in Rose, see section 2.2) or in *greci pro graece* in question V (6 in Rose, see section 2.2); here, a general confusion about vowels is also registered, for <i> pro <e>, like in other situations as *uirginis pro uirgines* in question XIV (14 in Rose, see section 2.2) or *pingues pro pinguis* in paragraph II of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 54 in Rose, see section 2.4).

Instances of a more general phonetic confusion include two cases of beta-cism, in both directions, i.e. pro <u> in *cerbis pro ceruis* in question XI (11 in Rose, see section 2.2), and <u> pro in *laui pro labi* in question V of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (5 in Rose, see section 2.4). The writing of the final consonants has some uncertainties as well, especially regarding the final <-m>, in cases like *ratione pro rationem* in the introduction (see section 2.1), *ea pro eam* and *difficultate pro difficultatem* in paragraph II of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 54 in Rose, see section 2.4); we find one example of the opposite phenomenon, i.e. *eam pro ea*, in paragraph VI of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 57 in Rose, see section 2.4), which might be connected to the confusion regarding the use of cases, as for example in *retentio pro retentionem* in question IX at the beginning of book II (question 145 in Rose, see section 2.3), or *lapidem pro lapis* and *retencionem pro retencio* – the opposite case than before – in paragraph II of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 54 in Rose, see section 2.4); systematic in this sense is the writing of *orificio* pro *orificio* in expressions like *in orificio* or *ab orificio*, in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4).

Some confusion about gender is also registered, even though in some cases it might overlap with vowel uncertainty, like *qui pro quae* in question VIII at the beginning of the second book (question 142 in Rose, see section 2.3), *alias pro alios* in in paragraph I of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 53 in Rose, see section 2.4); other cases are more clearly due to uncertainty about the gender of the term, like *hanc ipsum* instead of *hanc ipsam* (*pars*) in question I (1 in Rose, see section 2.2), *omnem corpus pro omne corpus* in paragraph III of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 53 in Rose, see section 2.4), *solutum sit pro solutus sit* (*partus*) in paragraph VII of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 56 in Rose, see section 2.4).

Verbal forms also show irregularities. We find some cases of the simple future instead of the present indicative, like *erit pro est* in question IV (4 in Rose, see section 2.2) and in question VII of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (question 7 in Rose, see section 2.4), and cases of the present subjunctive instead of the present indicative, like *infigat pro infigit* and *conetur pro conatur* in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4); we have also a few cases of the third person plural instead of the third person singular, like in *efficiant pro efficiat* in question V (6 in Rose, see section 2.2), and of the active instead of the passive voice, due maybe to the loss of the diacritic sign for <-or/ur>, like in *uideo pro uideor* in the introduction (see section 2.1).

Manuscript B also contains a range of anomalous spelling, that goes from the addition of a letter like in *mutactionis pro mutactionem* in question V (6 in Rose, see section 2.2) to changes of syllables like in *linior pro leuior* in question VIII (9 in Rose, see section 2.2) or *generaliter pro generalia* in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4), to the systematic *in divisum pro in divexum* in various parts of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (see section 2.3), to less comprehensible things like *cdia pro alba* or *abematr* after *pulposa* in question VIII (9 in Rose,

see section 2.2); some words after *abematr* are unintelligible, as happens in some other passages of B, where the ink has vanished, or it has been erased, and the text cannot be read or does not make sense in what is left.

1.2.1.2 Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1, and the relationship with the manuscript tradition of Celsus' De medicina.

The manuscript Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1 was produced in Northern Italy and is currently at the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence. According to the Bischoff's catalogue,⁵⁰ the manuscript consists of two sections: the first one extends from f. 2r to f. 143r., and the second from f. 143v to f. 222r, each written by a different hand. Mustio's *Gynaecia* is preserved in the second section, from f. 191v to f. 216v, and it is written in Caroline minuscule. A revising hand, L' in the critical apparatus, is also identifiable. While Rose considered L a production of the 11th century AD, Bischoff attributed both sections to the 9th century, the first part to mid-century and the second to its third quarter. In this case, the codex L would be the oldest extant witness of the *Gynaecia*'s manuscript tradition, a distinction traditionally assigned to B based on Rose's chronology. Even Radicchi, who placed L between the 9th and the 10th centuries, considers it later than B.⁵¹ Although I cannot offer a definitive judgment on this matter, I am inclined to consider Bischoff's dating as more accurate, particularly in light of the Latin found in L. However, this issue is still in need of further research.

The note of ownership on f. 222v provides some information about the history of this manuscript. Unfortunately, the excessive use of gall-nut during the 18th century AD by Angelo Maria Bandini, custodian of the Florentine library at the time, rendered the text almost illegible to the naked eye. The visible portion reads as follows:

⁵⁰ BISCHOFF (1998).

⁵¹ RADICCHI (1970, 250).

[] SANCTI
[] OSII MEDIOLANENSIS

However, Giuseppe Billanovich had the possibility to use UV radiation on the text, and was able to recover the full inscription, published in his contribution for the *Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, in 1975:⁵²

LIBER MONASTERII SANCTI
AMBROSII MEDIOLANENSIS

The connection of this manuscript to the monastery of Saint Ambrose in Milan is noted also by Bishoff in the aforementioned catalogue, and confirmed by Mirella Ferrari, who conducted a detailed study on the monastery's library.⁵³

Like codex B, codex L is a collection of various medical texts. A list of these texts was written after the aforementioned ownership note at f. 222v; the list does not precisely reflect the order of the contents in L, but both the list and the manuscript begin with the *De Medicina* by Cornelius Celsus. This text is particularly noteworthy in this context because the manuscript traditions of Mustio's *Gynaecia* and of Celsus' *De Medicina* present a strange and still unexplained overlap; the fact that they share a common witness is therefore of considerable significance. For clarity, I will now briefly overview the manuscript tradition of the *De Medicina*. In addition to L, two other manuscripts are the most important witnesses: the codex Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat lat 5951 (V)⁵⁴, produced during the 9th century AD in the Modenese abbey of Nonantola, and the so called "Sieneese Celsus" (S), a manuscript known through descriptions of Humanists but now lost. However, we have a very important *descriptus* of the Sieneese Celsus, the manuscript Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.7 (J). Friedrich Marx, the first editor of

⁵² BILLANOVICH (1975, 323).

⁵³ BISCHOFF (1998, 262); FERRARI (1988).

⁵⁴ As we will see further on in this chapter, this is the same manuscript mentioned in the list of the witnesses of Mustio in section 1.2.1.

the *De Medicina* from 1915, used L, V and J for his work, and also the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7028 (P). The tradition of Celsus is considered bipartite, with a branch represented by L and V from a common *antigraphus*, and the other by S, in the text transmitted by J.

The Renaissance philologists extensively studied Celsus's manuscripts and, thanks to their correspondence, we are aware of the contamination that their research brought to the codices of the *De Medicina*. For example, additions from a humanistic hand are found in V, apparently derived from the comparison with L,⁵⁵ or we know that in mid-15th century AD the bishop of Reggio Emilia, Battista Pallavicino, used S to correct L, as he notes on f. 140r:

correxī ego et emendavi manu propria melius quam potui B. Marchio Palauicinus episcopus Regiensis.

'I corrected and emendated by my own hand the best I could B. Marchio Palavicinus bishop of Reggio.'

The puzzling relationship between Mustio's *Gynaecia* and Celsus' *De Medicina* is first evident in V. At ff. 65r and 66v, a blank section goes from the second half of the left folium to the first half of the right one; in this blank space, a passage from the first questions of the *Gynaecia* was copied, written by a different hand than the one of Celsus' text, in a less formal Caroline and with a lighter brown ink. The passage does not occupy the entire blank space: some lines from Mustio are erased at the beginning, and some empty lines are left at the end, before the manuscript resumes with Celsus' text. In the margin, a third hand has added the note *non est de testu Cornelii*, 'it is not from the text of Cornelius [Celsus]'.

This passage of Mustio appears precisely at the most problematic point in Celsus manuscript tradition, where a gap considered for centuries irreparable is found. In book IV, both branches of the tradition – so V+L and S (J) – present the first paragraphs of chapter XX, concerning diseases of the soft intestine, up

⁵⁵ BILLANOVICH (1975, 333).

to to *manus imponere*⁵⁶ in the period *si nihil tumet, duas manus imponere oportet*. Only J then preserves the following portion of the text, from *oportet* to *subiacenda sunt* in chapter 27, in the sentence *Si maligna purgatio est, subiacenda sunt [...]*⁵⁷. A lacuna follows in the entire tradition, shorter though in V and L, which resume the text at *et coeuntia*,⁵⁸ still in chapter 27. J present a more extensive lacuna and resumes the text after *conquiescat*,⁵⁹ at the end of chapter 29. Thus, there is then an initial portion of text transmitted only by J and a final portion transmitted only by V and L. Renaissance philologists realised that the gap could be partially healed by combining the two branches, but they also noticed that there was still a portion of text missing in all the manuscripts – between *subiacenda sunt* and *et coeuntia*. In the 18th century, the physician Giovanni Battista Morgagni from Padua, studying the index of book IV of the *De Medicina*, identified the subject of the missing portion in two chapters about the diseases of the bladder and the bladder stones.⁶⁰ Finally, in the 1970s, these two missing chapters were found in the humanistic manuscript Toletanus 97-12 (T) by the U. Capitani and D. Ollero Granados.⁶¹ In their independent and almost contemporary articles, the scholars based the identification mainly on Celsus' *usus scribendi*. Capitani further supported this thesis with a second point of intersection between Celsus' and Mustio's textual traditions: in the manuscripts B and L of the *Gynaecia*, after chapter VIII of the second book, there is a section entitled *De dolore matricis (post partum)*, considered spurious by Rose and for this reason placed in the appendix to his edition. This chapter had already been recognised by Marx as derived from Celsus, and it precisely corresponds to the missing section then found in T, with, in addition, a few lines from the previous part, the one transmitted only by J. Marx even used Mustio's B and L as witnesses in his edition, for the portion of text that they share with J, and he even

⁵⁶ CELS. 146, 23-24.

⁵⁷ CELS. 154, 6.

⁵⁸ CELS. 154, 8.

⁵⁹ CELS. 156, 20.

⁶⁰ CAPITANI (1974, 163).

⁶¹ CAPITANI (1974); OLLERO GRANADOS (1973).

chose their reading for the final lines,⁶² anticipating the discoveries of Capitani and Ollero Granados.

Although we do not know what conclusions can be deduced from it, I cannot help but notice the extraordinary coincidence of Mustio's presence in this section, in two different ways: first an inserted passage at the site of the most important gap of the *De Medicina* tradition, and then the actual solution of the gap within the *Gynaecia*; moreover, the two traditions share a witness, i.e. manuscript L. At this stage of my research, I can only agree with Billanovich in recognising that

“per intendere pienamente quel brano [cioè quello del manoscritto T] e insieme la tradizione delle due opere occorrerà illuminare a giorno l'intersecarsi, come abbiamo visto succedere nel Vaticano di Nonantola, tra il *De medicina* di Celso e le *Gynaeciae* di Muscione.”⁶³

‘in order to fully understand that passage [i.e. the one of the manuscript T] and together the tradition of the two texts, it will be necessary to illuminate the intersecting, as we have seen happen in the *codex Vaticanus* from Nonantola, between the *De medicina* of Celsus and the *Gynaeciae* of Mustio.’

The Latin found in L closely resembles the one found in B, i.e. clearly late but not extremely vulgar, with more or less the same phenomena observed in the previous manuscript. The uncertainty about the nature of vowels regards the diphthong <ae>, simplified to <e>, like for *preter* instead of *praeter*, in question I (1 in Rose, see section 2.1), or *cause* pro *causae* in paragraph I of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 53 in Rose, see section 2.4) and in one case simplified to <o>, in *profocatio* instead of *praefocatio*, at the beginning of the second book (see section 2.3). A more general confusion around vowel is evident, like <i> pro <a> in *litteris grecis* pro *litteras graecas*

⁶² SPENCER (1948, 448).

⁶³ BILLANOVICH (1975, 339).

or <o> pro <e> per *commontarius* pro *commentarius* in the introduction (see section 2.1), to which also mood variation may be connected, especially between present indicative and present subjunctive, like *emittat* pro *emittit* and *adducet* pro *adducat* in paragraphs IV and V of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraphs 4 and 5 in Rose, see section 2.4).

Other verbal irregularities include two cases of third person plural instead of third person singular, as in B, like *feruntur* pro *fertur* in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4), one case of *erit* pro *est*, in paragraph VI of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 6 in Rose, see section 2.4), and two cases of present participle instead of present indicative, *descendens* pro *descendit*, in question XII (12a in Rose, see section 2.2) and *iacens* pro *iacet* in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4). There is also one case of active pro passive, *uideo* pro *uideor* in the introduction (see section 2.1), as it is found also in codex B – even though it might be connected to the loss of a diacritic sign.

Uncertainty regarding final consonants is also registered, most commonly involving the final <-m>, like in *nulla* pro *nullam* and *breuitate* pro *breuitatem* of the introduction (see section 2.1), a couple of times the final <-s>, in *grandi* pro *grandis* in question XI (11 in Rose, see section 2.2) and *ipsi* pro *ipsis* in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4). We find also some cases of confusion regarding gender, like in *qualis* pro *quale* (*orificium*) in question XIV (question 14 in Rose, see section 2.2), confusion regarding the cases, like *partum* pro *partu* in paragraph I of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (53 in Rose, see section 2.4), and confusion regarding the number in the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (see section 2.4), not found so far in B, like *manusque* pro *manumque*, *omnes corpus* pro *omne corpus* and *eos* pro *eum*.

Some unusual spellings are registered also in L, like *dettam* pro *lectam* in the introduction (see section 2.1), *rumparione* pro *superiore* in question XII

(12a in Rose, see section 2.2) or *uessicula* pro *uesica* in section II of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (section 54 in Rose, see section 2.4), but there aren't many sections where the text is unintelligible or cancelled as in B. One case of betacism is recorded, i.e. *uases* for *bases* in question XVI (16 in Rose, see section 2.2).

Compared to codex B, the frequency of all these phenomena in L is slightly lower. Nevertheless, we notice an increase in their occurrence in the second book of the *Gynaecia*, where they often correspond to the same cases registered in B. Notably, L is also the manuscript which preserved the readings (*ext pianecum* and *diatriaer contrado*) closest to Mustio's original text regarding the two challenging terms that Rose edited as *cateperotiana* and *triacontados*, discussed in depth in section 2.1, to which I refer the reader.

1.2.1.3 Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4

The manuscript Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4 is written in Beneventan script and was produced at the abbey in Montecassino. Within the abbey's archives, an annotation dated to 945 AD records all the donations made to the institution. Among these, a Latin *Genicia* donated by the Molisan priest Leo of Larino is mentioned, and the same source notes that a copy of this *Genicia* was made in 1070 AD.⁶⁴ We can therefore reasonably assume that the *Genicia* in question is Mustio's *Gynaecia* and that the manuscript copied in the 11th century AD is the one identified as H.

The manuscript measures 21.3 x 13.8 cm at the cover, with a thickness of 7.3 cm, and comprises 217 *folia*. It is a small and modest object, with a dense handwriting usually not divided in columns. It presents notes and corrections in the margins and it lacks decorations and colours except for some red and yellow inks to mark internal divisions, like questions or titles of chapters. At

⁶⁴ GREEN (2017, 2).

the end of the codex, at ff. 219v and 220r, many ownership notes are recorded, the earliest of which was written by a brother Thomas, in 1054 AD.⁶⁵ The manuscript is a miscellany of medical texts, including works of Oribasius and Galen, and an anonymous herbarium. Mustio's *Gynaecia* occupies f. 3r to f. 25v; in this section, each page contains 38 lines, written in a very tiny Beneventan handwriting, with a dark brown ink which fades into beige in some areas; a very similar ink is used by the reviser of H, referred to as H' in the apparatus, who occasionally adds words or entire sentences in the margins or above the lines, in a slightly larger script. Chapter titles, incipits, explicits, and the initial letters of most of the answers are written in capitals letters, slightly more elegant but still not miniated. Questions and chapter titles are highlighted in a faint yellow ink not easy to see, sometimes along with the initial letter of the following text.

Manuscript H is among those that include drawings in the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*. They are collected in *folia* 17r to 19v, generally two per *folium*, for a total of 15 pictures; the text is arranged in two columns above and below the drawings. The uterus is consistently represented within a frame of two concentric circles, and its shape resembles a light bulb, with a thick border indicating membrane layers, and a big and open orifice. Inside, the foetus is represented as a miniature adult and with no genitals, shown in the various positions described by text. The empty space between the foetus and the uterine walls features some sort of representation of the umbilical cord. The pictures are executed in fine dark ink lines, without colour, in a sketch-like fashion. Each picture is accompanied by a caption in capital letters identifying the foetal position.

As in the rest of Mustio's manuscript tradition, the introduction is the most complex section, made even more difficult to read in H due to the condition of the parchment. F. 3 is darker and more worn, protected only by two

⁶⁵ In the note of possession, the date is *ab mundo creatione 4815*, following the Jewish calendar, which placed the creation of the world 3761 years before the incarnation of Christ.

flyleaves, and the ink is faded and illegible in many passages. The introduction comprises nineteen lines, followed by ten lines at the bottom of the *folium* containing question 11, concerning the anatomy of the uterus. This question is separated from the preceding text by a blank space and it does not appear anywhere else in the codex, nor in the position assigned to it by Rose in his edition, based on the rest of the manuscript tradition. I suggest that this blank space was intended to be filled in by a diagram of the uterus labelled with letters, similar to the one found in manuscripts B in correspondence to the same question. Supporting this hypothesis is the fact that in the opening sentence of the introduction – *Cum frequentius nobis obsetrix fuisset necessaria* – the initial <c> of *cum* is missing, and the text below is indented by a few millimetres, as if the space was reserved for a miniature capital letter.

The Latin found in manuscript H exhibits various characteristics of late Latin, but to a lesser extent than in the other two manuscripts. Confusion regarding the use of cases is one of the most frequent phenomena, with examples such as *in latinitatem* pro *in latinitate* and *usu* for *usus* in the introduction (see section 2.1), *semen* pro *semine*, *sucus* pro *suco* and *uentrem* pro *uentre* at the end of the first book (see section 2.3), *retensione* pro *retentio* and *clusuras* pro *clusurae* at the beginning of the second book (see section 2.3) and *in orificium* pro *in orificio* at paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 4 in Rose, see section 2.4).

Verb usage also shows inconsistencies, including cases of variation between indicative and subjunctive, like *iacet* pro *iaceat* in question V (6 in Rose, see section 2.2), *inueniatur* pro *inuenitur* and *habent* pro *habeat* in paragraphs III and IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (55 and 4 in Rose, see section 2.4), and between the simple future and the present indicative, like *dabimus* pro *damus* at the end of the first book (see section 2.3), *occurrent* pro *occurrunt* and *occurrent* pro *occurrit* at the beginning of the second book (see section 2.3). We also register the use of the gerundive

parturiendi instead of the present participle *parturientibus* in paragraph VI of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (section 57 in Rose, see section 2.4).

There are also several peculiar spellings, like *lacioni* pro *lectionis* in the introduction (see section 2.1), or *obsetricum* and *obsetricam* for *obsetricibus* and *obsetricem* in questions I and II (1 and 2 in Rose, see section 2.2); we have two occurrences of the voiced dental plosive instead of the voiceless, like in *transdulerimus* pro *transtulimus* at the end of the first book (see section 2.3), and *capud* pro *caput* in paragraph IV of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (4 in Rose, see section 3.4); Greek capital letters are used for the words *delfis* (*AEACY*) in question V, and *pterigomata* (*ΠΘεΡΥΓΩΗΑΥΑ*) and *landica* (*ΑΑΝαΥΚΑ*) in question XII (questions 6 and 12a in Rose, see section 2.2).

Only one instance of uncertainty regarding final consonants is registered, *secundum natura* pro *secundum naturam* at paragraph V in the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (paragraph 5 in Rose, see section 2.4); regarding the nature of vowels, the diphthong <ae> is systematically closed in <e>, and once also the diphthong <oe> in *ceperit* pro *coeperit*, in question V (6 in Rose, see section 2.2). Confusion of gender exists, like in *duobus* pro *duabus* (*tunicis*) in question VIII (9 in Rose, see section 3.2).

As noted, manuscript H occasionally displays a different arrangement of material, and at times includes additional or variant content, especially in passages where the text of B and L seems more problematic. It also omits words that do not add information to the text, resulting in a text that often feels cleared and more concise to the reader. These textual differences will be addressed case by case in the samples of the critical edition presented in the following chapter.

1.2.1.4 A short note on the relationship between the manuscripts

Manuscript H differs from B and L not only in its frequent transmission of “different readings, but in its use of a different form of Latin, which seems more classical and normative not just in the choices of language, but also in the cohesivity of the sentences: where B and L occasionally exhibit a more vulgar and less understandable Latin, H provides a clearer and more linear reading.

A comparative analysis of manuscripts B and L reveals that these two codices are related much more closely to each other than to H. The affinity is indicated already in Rose’s and Bolton’s *stemmata codicum*.

For a more exhaustive examination of the relationship among the manuscripts and their implications for the edition of the *Gynaecia*, I refer the reader to chapter 2 in general, and to section 2.0 in particular.

1.2.2 The editions and the philological works

1.2.2.1 Rose

In 1882, the German scholar Valentin Rose published the first – and to date, the only – critical edition of Mustio’s *Gynaecia*, as part of the Teubner series, under the title *Sorani Gynaeciorum uetus translatio Latina*. The Latin text of Mustio is considered a translation of Soranus’ *Γυναικεῖα*, which is also included in the volume. Rose’s edition was made possible by the discovery of other Latin manuscripts, among which the codex Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15 (B) and the codex Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1 (L) were used to establish a proper collation and construct a *stemma codicum*.⁶⁷ Additionally, Rose consulted two *descripti* of manuscript H: the codex Cambridge, Saint John’s college, D.4 (C) and the codex Città del Vaticano,

⁶⁶ ROSE (1882,2); BOLTON (2015, 102).

⁶⁷ ROSE (1882, 2).

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal lat 1304 (P). In Rose's stemma, the manuscripts are designed as b, l, h, Cant. and Pal., with b^c referring to the reviser of B. According to Rose's stemma, the three main manuscripts represent three distinct branches of the textual tradition. For manuscript L, Rose hypothesised the existence of an intermediate copy between the manuscript and the archetype, an *antigraphus* that he labelled y and that he also identified as the source used by the reviser of B.

Rose's editorial choices suggest that the scholar privileged the readings of H over those of B and L, especially in cases where this manuscript preserves more extensive material than the other two. He also standardised the spelling of both Greek loanwords – whose forms vary across the manuscripts, as discussed in the previous paragraphs – and the Latin term for the midwife, found in the manuscripts in the late Latin form *obsetrix*, but always edited by the scholar as *obstetrix*. In the introduction to his edition, Rose explains that he adopted *obstetrix* from the manuscript C, the only one using it, which he interprets as evidence of the copyist's higher level of education.⁶⁸

1.2.2.2 Medert

The edition of Rose was the starting point for the philological work of another German scholar, Hans Medert⁶⁹ who in 1911 defended and published his master's thesis on the *Gynaecia* of Mustio in Classical and Modern Philology at the university of Giessen. Medert's thesis constitutes a philological commentary to Rose's edition, offering critical discussion of problematic passages and proposing new emendations, akin to a critical apparatus. However, the revised Latin text itself was not included in the 1911 thesis, but was only published in 1997 by Helmut Hess, one of Medert's former students and later a close

⁶⁸ ROSE (1882, IX).

⁶⁹ MEDERT (1911).

friend.⁷⁰ The volume – an English version of which was published the following year – opens with a long introduction detailing Medert’s life and the work, it continues with a German translation of the *Gynaecia* and of Eucharius Rösslin’s *Rosegarten*, and it finally ends with Mustio’s Latin text. From the introduction,⁷¹ we learn that Medert continued his research on the *Gynaecia* until his death in 1973, although he was not able to publish a new edition himself. Evidence of this ongoing work is found in discrepancies between the 1911 philological commentary and the 1997/1998 Latin text: certain words and readings in the latter are not addressed in the earlier commentary, suggesting they were later conjectures. For example, the answer to the question 29, book 1, regarding whether menstruation is useful for women, appears as follows in Rose’s edition:

Sanitati autem earum gloria est, si quidem et cito eas senescere facit et insuper, uacuo partu, forte periclitari. Et anus quae <non> purgantur sanae sunt.⁷²

Medert’s version, however, is different:

Sanitati earum noxia est, siquidem et anus quae non purgantur sanae sunt.⁷³

This passage in Rose’s edition presents some difficulties in its understanding, particularly due to the presence of the term *gloria*, which seems contextually incongruous. Medert’s emendation to *noxia* clarifies the meaning and since this reading is not found in any manuscript nor commented by the scholar in 1911, it must be considered a later conjecture. Additionally, the passage *et cito ... periclitari* is omitted in Medert’s edition, and it is instead moved into the answer to the following question, on whether lifelong virginity is healthy – in this case though, the relocation is explained in the 1911 commentary.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ HESS (1997); the English version is HESS (1998).

⁷¹ HESS (1997, 16–18).

⁷² SORAN. 13, 5–13, 10.

⁷³ HESS (1998, 206).

⁷⁴ MEDERT (1911, 27); HESS (1998, 206).

Medert explicitly declared to consider B as the most authoritative manuscript of the *Gynaecia*'s tradition, primarily due to its antiquity.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, his Latin text is not the transcription of only this manuscript, but rather a critical edition based on the collation of the same manuscripts used by Rose.⁷⁶

1.2.2.3 Bolton

The most recent philological study on Mustio's *Gynaecia* is the doctoral dissertation by the Canadian scholar Lesley Annette Bolton, from 2015. This dissertation is entitled *An Edition, Translation and Commentary of Mustio's Gynaecia*.⁷⁷ Building upon Rose's work, Bolton proposed her own critical edition of the *Gynaecia*, based on a new *stemma codicum* that prioritises manuscripts B and L. She considers H too revised by its copyist, and therefore problematic for establishing the original text.⁷⁸

Bolton consistently prefers the readings and the content of B and L, referring to manuscript H only in instances where its readings are essential for textual comprehension. She does not include in the edition the sections transmitted solely by H, as for example for the complicated passage between *liber primus* and *liber secundus* previously discussed. On the contrary, she incorporates material found only by B and L which likely has to be considered a later addition rather than part of Mustio's original text, like for example the index reported before the *Gynaecia*'s introduction, or a mysterious recipe for an amulet found at f. 16v in B, adjacent to the illustration of the uterus.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ MEDERT (1911, 13).

⁷⁶ HESS (1998, 201–202).

⁷⁷ BOLTON (2015).

⁷⁸ BOLTON (2015, 102).

⁷⁹ BOLTON (2015, 108–135; 146–147); see section 2.2.

1.3 The purpose of this work

As stated at the beginning of this introductory chapter, the aim of this dissertation is to provide a sample of a new critical edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*, together with the analysis of the main problems of the text – both philological and linguistic. My intention is to emphasise the interdependence of these two dimensions, and to exemplify new methodologies that can be employed to address and solve such issues more effectively.

Even though this is neither an official nor complete critical edition, I believe it is important at this point to clarify the reasons behind my conviction that a new critical edition of the *Gynaecia* is now necessary. In section 1.2.2, I have reviewed the three main philological contributions to the study of Mustio's *Gynaecia*: Rose's edition from 1882, Medert's work, divided between 1911 and 1997, and, finally, Bolton's doctoral dissertation from 2015. Rose's edition constitutes the seminal work on the text, not only because his work was the first complete critical edition, but also because it attempted to situate the author and his production within an historical and geographical context. He was also the first to use other manuscripts besides H, and especially B and L that now, together with H, are recognised as the main witnesses of the text. However, his approach towards B and L is marked by caution, due to their more vulgar nature, as we have seen for example in Rose's choice of *obstetrix* over the more common *obsetrix*.⁸⁰ As will become clear in comparison with my own edition, Rose tends to prefer the readings from H not only when this manuscript evidently preserves the correct reading, but also when the text in H reflects a revised reading, while B and L preserve a more authentic one. H is also privileged in Rose's treatment of passages transmitted only by one witness: any material found in H is accepted as authentic by the editor, and therefore published in the edition.⁸¹

⁸⁰ See section 1.2.2.1.

⁸¹ See for example the edition in section 2.2.

Johannes Medert, almost thirty years later, demonstrated more awareness for the value of B and L's contributions, explicitly declaring to consider B the primary reference manuscript. While he does make editorial choices that differentiates his work from Rose's – especially in determining which passages to consider authentic – he does not seem to significantly outdistance himself from the text of the previous editor, nor to have undertaken a fresh collation of the manuscripts. This may be due to the nature of Medert's work, which started as a philological commentary to Rose's. While in his work a great knowledge of the manuscript tradition is displayed, not a critical apparatus nor a new Latin edition are provided; as already mentioned, the latter was only published posthumously, more than twenty years after the death of the philologist, without much additional notes. This fragmentary nature of Medert's work limits its utility as a comprehensive critical edition, though it nonetheless offers valuable insights.

More recently, in 2015, Lesley Bolton completed a doctoral dissertation on Mustio's *Gynaecia*, presenting a new critical edition of the text, introduced by an extensive study of the relationship between Soranus and Mustio. The scholar's approach to the manuscript tradition is in contrast to that of Rose. As previously observed, Bolton fully acknowledges the importance of B and L, and she not only privileges their readings over those of H, but also includes the material transmitted solely by these two witnesses. However, this editorial stance leads her to incorporate passages that can be proved to be inauthentic.⁸² Her scepticism towards H's reliability as a witness of the *Gynaecia* results in a language that is not just a late variety of Latin – as we indeed expect – but at times an excessively vulgar one, which seems inconsistent with Mustio's intellectual profile and the actual content of the *Gynaecia*.

Within my research, I have adopted an approach of synthesis between the two opposite positions of Rose and Bolton – while Medert's stance fluctuates

⁸² See for example section 2.2.

between the two. I believe that H's contribution to the reconstruction of the *Gynaecia*'s original text is both trustworthy and fundamental, and I will demonstrate in various sections of chapter 2 how the most plausible solution to many problems can be found in the reading of H, whose intelligent copyist corrected with awareness of the style and the content of the *Gynaecia*. At the same time, the contributions of B and L are equally indispensable, not only because they preserved the late and technical Latin one would expect from a 6th century manual for midwives, but also because they retained the authentic readings of some difficult passages, that have remained static but problematic for centuries due to the overreliance on H's readings.

The four samples of my critical edition presented in chapter 2 deal with particularly challenging problems of philology and linguistics. In editing them, I aim to exemplify and apply the methods and the criteria that I have selected for the new critical edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*. Chapter 3 will then explore how the linguistic analysis is closely connected with philological inquiry, especially in the case of this text, where it concerns not only the differences in the Latin of the manuscripts, but also the possibility to shed light on the level and type of Latin known and employed by the author. Finally, chapter 4 provides a summary of the issues addressed in the dissertation, the possible solutions proposed, and the conclusions drawn, together with the numerous questions that remain open for future research.

2. The text

This chapter presents a selected sample from my new critical edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*, for which the present dissertation serves as prolegomena. I have selected four passages, each exemplifying emblematic philological and linguistic challenges inherent in the text. The passages selected are first the introduction to the *Gynaecia*, then the initial questions regarding the anatomy of the female apparatus, the transitional section between the first and the second book and, finally, the beginning of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*, specifically the description and analysis of the various causes of complications during childbirth.

The introduction to the *Gynaecia* has been selected due to its particularly complex manuscript tradition, where textual and philological issues are deeply intertwined – especially in light of the difficulties in interpreting the Greek sources named by Mustio as models for his Latin treatise. The chapter then proceeds with the edition of the first group of questions in book I, where manuscript H preserved a different order and sometimes even different material than the codices B and L. The third passage then marks the transition between the first and the second book: although shifts in style and stricture support the division of the *Gynaecia* in two books, as mentioned before, only H explicitly records a conclusion to book I and an opening to book II, and the discrepancies among the three main witnesses in this passage suggest a substantial gap in the textual tradition. Lastly, the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* is of particular interest for its pedagogical intent, as evidenced by the presence of the drawings of foetal positions. The editorial challenge here lies in the fact that, while the three main manuscripts generally agree on the core content,

they also contain additional material shared only between pairs, with a third witness lacking these additions.

Each section begins with the suggested new edition of the text, together with its critical apparatus, followed by a translation. Then the same passage in Rose's edition is provided, to give the reader the possibility to compare the two versions of the text. Finally, each section is concluded by a philological and linguistic commentary.

2.0 On the relationship between the three main manuscripts

The manuscript H differs from B and L not only in its frequent transmission of variant readings, but also in its use of a different form of Latin, which seems more classical and normative. The distinction is evident not just in the lexical choices, but also in syntactic cohesion: where B and L occasionally exhibit a more vulgar and less intelligible Latin, H often provides a clearer and more linear reading. Sometimes it is clear that the reading preserved in H must be accepted in the edition as the most authoritative one, like for example in the case of the first question of the first book. The text of the three manuscripts is presented in the table 1, followed by my edition of the passage:

tab. 1

B	L	H
In quod uel quas partes diuidere omnia mulierum traditionem in duas unam obsetrice tractata est altera quo ¹⁰ est de omnibus obsetricibus solacium occurrent constat autem hanc ipsum iterum diuidimus secundum naturam occurrentes causa et preter natura.	In quot uel quas partes diuidere omnia mulierum traditione in duas una quae obsetrice tractata est altera quae in omnibus obsetrices solacium occurrat constata est/constat autem hanc ipsam iterum diuidere secundum naturam occurrentes causas et preter natura	In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet uniuersam mulierum traditionem In duas unam quae de obsetrices tractat. Altera quae de omnibus obsetricum occurrentibus constat. Han ipsam iterum diuidimus secundum naturam occurrentes causas et preter naturam.

I. In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet uniuersam mulierum traditionem? In duas, unam quae de obsetrice tractat, alteram quae de omnibus

obsetricibus occurrentibus constat; hanc ipsam iterum diuidimus <in duas>: secundum naturam occurrentes causas et praeter naturam.⁸³

In other instances, however, the text of B and L proved to be more suitable for the edition, despite their initial opacity, as seen in several passages of the introduction. The manuscripts readings are displayed table 2, followed by my edition:

tab. 2

B	L	H
placuit mihi hanc quoque genechia in latinum uertere sermonem licet etiam maximam partem ad integrum tenore secutus transtuli ut possim mulieres animum hanc rationem exilarare	placuit mihi hancquoq genechia in latinum uertere sermonem licet etiam maximam partem ad integrum tenore secutus transtula ut possim mulieris animum hanc ratione exhilarare.	placuit et haec quoque genechia in latinum uerteremus sermonem. Licet iam maximam partem triacontadis ad integrum tenorem secutus soranum transtulerim. Sed cum uidisset grandem corpus futurum et posse muliebris animos cito prae magnitudine laxare.

Placuit mihi haec quoque gynaecia in latinum uertere sermonem, licet etiam maximam partem ad integrum tenorem secutus Soranum transtuli, ut possim mulieris animum hac ratione exhilarare; [...]⁸⁴

A comparative analysis of the manuscripts B and L reveals a significantly closer relationship between them than with H, suggesting a bipartite manuscript tradition for the *Gynaecia*, with a branch represented by B&L and another by H. Although the precise relationship between the manuscripts and

⁸³ See section 2.2.

⁸⁴ See section 2.1.

especially between B and L remains unresolved, it is nonetheless useful, given the prolegomenic nature of the present study, to collect and examine the most noteworthy passages from the edited sections, that demonstrate connections between B and L. For each case, I will report the text of the two manuscripts along with a brief commentary.

I.

tab. 3

B	L
[...] ut possim mulieres animum hanc rationem exilarare placuit nobis catapianorum breuitate fuisse secutus ut omnia dicere uidear et non grande corpus perfecisse quibusdam et capitulis multum breuiter fuisse secutus dictis quendam dia triacontraduos addidit ut ex omnibus collectus commentarius sufficiens esse possit. His autem multum simplicius uolui loqui ut uerius dicam mulieribus actis uerbis usum ut etiam inperite obsetrices scilicet ab altero sibi relicta ratione facile intellegere possit.	[...] ut possim mulieris animum hanc ratione exhilarare? Placuit nobis ut ext pianecum breuitate fuisse secutus ut omnia dicere uidear et non grande corpus perfecisset quibusdam uero capitulis multum breuiter fuisse secutus dictis quendam diatriae comrndo ut omnibus collectus commontarius sufficiens esse possit his autem multo simplicius uoluui loqui ut uerius dicam muliebrium accis et uerbis usum ut etiam imperita obsetricis licet ab altera sibi dectam rationem facile intellegere possit.

Table 3 illustrates an example from the introduction to the *Gyanecia*.⁸⁵ The phrase *breuitate fuisse secutus* is a reading shared by H as well, but only B and L include the second instance of *fuisse secutus*, following *breuiter*. I believe that this error can be explained with a process similar to the *saut du même au même*, albeit in reverse: the copyist, influenced by the word *breuitate* a couple of lines above, repeated *fuisse secutus* also after *breuiter*, which is

⁸⁵ See section 2.1.

contextually inappropriate. It is highly improbable that such errors were made by two independent copyists in two separate manuscripts. This therefore suggests a shared source between B and L or a relationship *antigraphus descriptus* still to be determined. In the same direction points the second problematic element of the passage, the word *actis* in B /*accis* in L. In L the term is integrated into the text, while in B it appears as an interlinear addition, on the final line of the *folium* between *mulieribus* and *uerbis*. This addition seems to have been made post-composition, likely by the corrector B', as indicated by the ink matching the one used by this hand in other occasions.

II.

There are then sections in which the texts of B and L differ markedly from that of H, as though they were transmitting distinct material. One such example occurs at the beginning of the first book, where definitions of midwifery and the perfect midwife are provided.⁸⁶ Here B&L share some portions of text with H, but also include unique material, making H the sole witness of alternative material. Table 4 present the readings of B and L, preceded by the text of H, with the non-shared portions highlighted in bold:

Obsetricalis enim ratio quidem muliebri differt quod pars ab uniuerso. Obsetricalis enim pars est muliebrum rationis. **Que est aptissima que obsetricam facere potest. Principaliter quae litras nouit et habet ingenium praesentem memoriam et studiosa munda uniuerso iam corpore integra fortis et laboriosa.** [...] Quid est obsetrix muliebrum causarum docta etiam medicinali exercitatione perita. **que est melior medicina que exercitata est medicinalibus actionibus cum prudentia iustissima et communis et quod urget prouidentem horum diligentiam coniunges quae pore adunatim possit. et per partes diuidere et accidentiam mitigare propter insecutione cause non iracunda nec turbulenta compatiens solida pudica arguta quieta prudens animosa nec auara.**

⁸⁶ See section 2.2.

tab. 4

B	L
<p>Obsetricale parata esse ratio quidam est ut muliebri differa enim quod ad ipsa obsetrice exerceatur quae scit mulieris ratione cognoscere. EXPLICIT PROLOGUS. QUID ERIT OBSETRIX. [...] Feminam omnium mulierum causarum docta etiam medicinali exercitatione perita quae possit universarum ualitudines competenter curare. Ita ut non sit turbulenta nec uerbosa nec auara sed sapiens et sobria et taciturna. Et superstitiosa quae sua sollicitudine mulieres in partu gubernet.</p>	<p>Obsetricale parata esset ratio quedam est ut mulieres _____ quod ab ipsa obsetrice _____ causa et tales esse debet ut mulieris ratione cognoscere pussit. EXPLICIT PROLOGUS MUSCIONIS. INCIPIT GENEZIA EIUSDEM. [...] Quid est obsetrix Femina omnium mulierum causarum docta et iam medicinali exercitatione perita quae possit universarum ualitudines competententer curare ita ut non sit turbulenta nec uerbosa nec auara sed sapiens et sobria et taciturna et superstitiosa quae sue sollicitudine mulieres rui gubernat.</p>

This passage suggests a shared source for B and L, and possibly a gap in the tradition. I refer the reader to section 2.2 for the complete analysis of the problem.

III.

As previously noted, Mustio's text can be divided in two sections based on differences in style and content, and on the presence of question 1. However, the formal division in *liber primus* and *liber secundus* is problematic, because it is attested only in manuscript H.⁸⁷ After the phrase *Ad tussiculam eorum quid damus?*, shared by all the witnesses, H continues on f. 9v with a response concerning the possible remedies to children's cough, followed by two

⁸⁷ See section 2.3.

additional questions addressing other neonatal ailments, mirroring the chapters of the Greek text of Soranus:

Ad tussiculam uero eorum quid dabimus. **Semen lini, amigdalidis, succus gliquiritie et draganto utimur elactuariis ex melle. Quid est ualitudo que apud infantes sitiasis appellatur. Cerebris est feruor cum miningis ita ut occipitium infantis concauum fiat cum igneis et feruentissimis febribus. Si uero uentrem infas quid facemus. Si ad huc lactat omnia que adstringere possunt et nutrici eius damus epythima de palmulis et lenticula constat. Inducimus si uero lurimius diebus non fierit asellatum mulsa et olera que uentrem mollire possunt etiam mamme dabimus.**

The passage concludes with the author's summary of his work, his reasons for the content and structure of the second section, and a conventional *explicit/incipit* transition:

Acteni de ateperotianis transdulerimus et quam omnium ualitudinum speciales curas non habent quas uel maxime obsetrices nosse conuenit. Placuit ut ad Genecia triaconitadas conferamus. Inde enim plena omnium um causarum cura insinuari potest. Explicit liber primus. Incipit liber secundus. De retentione menstruarum. Que sunt ergo ualitudines mulierum que per stricturam fieri solent.

By contrast, B&L share little to no textual overlap with the text of H, as shown in table 5:

tab. 5

B	L
22R [...] CXXIII AD TUSSICULA eorum quid damus edima scilicet quod constat aut per fluxum uentris specialiter tamen habent sicuti i est uuluæ praefocatio et sanguinis	220V [...] CXXII Ad Tussicula eorum quid damus? Eglima scilicet quod constat ut per fluxum uentris aut per os digerat. Specialiter tamen habent. Sicuti est uuluæ

<p>fluxus licet haec generalibus illis praedictis abscribi debent. CXXIII QVAE SUNT ERGO VALITUDI- NES mulierum qui per scriptura fieri solent.</p>	<p>profocatio et sanguinis fluxum. CXXIII Quae sunt ergo ualitudines mulierum quae per strictura fieri solet?</p>
---	---

B&L have instead an almost identical reading, significantly shorter and notably obscure, – probably the result of a textual gap that occurred in this branch of the manuscript tradition. Some elements of this reading can be compared to the text of H, like in the case of *edima/eglima scilicet quod constat*, while some others are understandable only from the direct comparison with Soranus’ text. For a comprehensive philological analysis of the passage, I refer the reader to section **2.3**.

Criteria for the edition

The following samples of the future critical edition aim to demonstrate the significance of all the three principal manuscripts in the reconstruction of the original text of Mustio. For this reason, I do not privilege any one of codices over the others, nor do I consider any of them less important for the editorial process. All symbols used both in the text and the critical apparatus are explained in the following section entitled “Sigla”.

The apparatus employed here is primarily negative, i.e. it only records the variants that were not adopted in the text. However, in cases where ambiguity or risk of confusion may arise, I have used a positive apparatus, which also include the reading selected for the edition.

I have chosen to register in the apparatus all the orthographic variants found in the codices, in order to provide the reader with all the necessary data for Chapter 3, where differences regarding orthography, morphology and syntax among the manuscripts are discussed. This decision will not be carried over in the future critical edition of the entire *Gynaecia*, where a more concise apparatus will be preferred.

In the apparatus, when a word is followed by a square parenthesis, this indicates that the word serves as reference term for what follows the parenthesis, and it is used in case of gaps, variants and wherever there is the risk of confusion in the apparatus.

Sigla

B	Bruxelles, Biliothèque Royale, 3701-15, 9 th –10 th century AD.
B'	B post correctionem
H	Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4, 11 th century AD.
L	Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1, 9 th century AD.
L'	L post correctionem
<>	inclusae sunt quae addenda uidentur
[]	inclusae sunt quae delenda uidentur
† ... †	locus desperatus
add.	addidit
codd.	codices
corr.	correxi; correxit
del.	deleui; deleuit
om.	omisit
suppl.	suppleui; suppleuit
transp.	transposui; transposuit

2.1 The introduction of the *Gynaecia*⁸⁸

1. Cum frequentius nobis in muliebribus obsetrix fuisset necessaria nullamque inueniremus studiosam quae litteras Graecas adtigisse uideretur, <arbitratus fui> quod si adtignisset omnia in latinitate sibi translata gynaecia posset rationem lectionis scire. 2. Ego uero Mustio multa iam uideor quomodocumque transtulisse ueritate rationis potius quam instructa diligentius polita usus, sicut in Ophthalmico Cyrurgimeno Philiatro et Boethematico legimus. 3. Placuit mihi haec quoque Gynaecia in Latinum uertere sermonem, licet etiam maximam partem ad integrum tenorem secutus Soranum transtuli, ut possim mulieris animum hac ratione exhilarare; placuit nobis et Cata gynaecion breuitatem fuisse secutus, ut omnia dicere uidear et non grande corpus perfecissem; quibusdam uero capitulis multum breuiter dictis quaedam ex Dia iatrimon tractatu addidi ut de omnibus collectus commentarius sufficiens esse possit. 4. His autem multo simplicius uolui loqui, ut uerius dicam, muliebribus uerbis usus sum ut etiam imperitae obsetrices licet ab altero sibi lectam rationem facile intellegere possint.

INCIPIT GENECHIAE MUSTIONIS AUCTORIS *B* INCIPIT GENECIA
MUSCIONIS AUCTORIS INCIPIT PROLOGUS *L* INCIPIT PROLOGUS
MUSCIONIS *H* 1. muliebribus *corr.* *Rose* mulieribus *BL* mulieribus causis *H*
| fuisse *H* | nulla *BL* | -que *corr.* quae *BL om. H* | inueniremus *corr.* inuenerimus *BL* inuenimus *H* | stodiosa *BL* | qui *H* | litteris *L* | Graecas *corr.*
Rose grecas *BH* grecis *L* | adtigi uideretur *B* adtegissee uideatur *L* | *post* adtignisset *add.* omnes etiam diceret *H* | arbitratus fui *suppl.* | quod et si *B* quod si et *L* | adtegissee *L* habuisset *H* | latitate *B* latinitatem *H* | sibi *BL om. H* | genechiae *B* geneciae *L* genecia *H* | posse *BL* | lationis *H* 2. muscio *L* | multam *B* multa *L* qui *H* | iam *LH om. B* | uideo *BL* | quomodo *B* | *post*

⁸⁸ cf. ROSE (1882, 3–5)

transtulisse *add.* et *BL* | ueritatem *BL* | ractionis *B* | potius ... polita usus] prius nisus quam instructa ratione uel diligentius polyta usu *H* | instructa *scripsi ex H* structa *BL* | usus *corr.* Rose usu *H om. BL* | obtalmico *B* optalmico *L* opthalmico *H* | cirorgimeno *B* gyrorgumeno *L* cyrorgumeno *H* | filiatro *BL* | et *BH om. L* | boetrimatico *B* theotematico *L* boethematicis *H* | legisti *H 3. mihi*] et *H* | hanc *BL* | genechia *B* genecia *LH* | uerteremus *H* | iam *H* | *post partem add.* triacontadis *H* | tenore *BL* | soranum *om. BL* | transtula *L* transtulerim *H* | ut possim ... exhilarare] sed cum uidisset grandem corpus futurum et posse muliebris animos cito prae magnitudine laxare *H* | mulieres *B* | rationem *B* | exilarare *B* | nobis *om. H* | et *corr.* ut *LH om. B* | Cata Gynaecion *corr.* catapianorum *B* ext pianecum *L* ext pianorum *L'* cataperocianorum *H* | breuitatem *corr.* Rose breuitate *BLH* | dicerem *H* | uidear *om. H* | perfecissem *corr.* perfecisse *B* perfecisset *L* effecissem *H* | et capitulis *B* capitibus *H* | multum *non legitur in H* | *post* breuiter *add.* fuisse secutus *BL* | quaedam *corr.* quendam *BL* quando *H* | *ex corr.* et *H* | Dia iatrico tractatu *corr.* dia triaecontraduos *B* diatriaer contrato *L* et triacontadas *H* | addidit *B om. L* | ex omnibus *B* omnibus *L* | commontarius *L 4. hic H* | tamen *H* | multum *B* | uolui *L* | *ante* ut *add.* et *H* | mulieribus uerbis *BH* mulieribus actis uerbis *B'* muliebrium actis et uerbis *L* | imperitae *corr.* Rose inperite *B* imperita *L* imperite *H* | obsetricis *L* | scilicet *B* | altera *L* | relicta *B* dettam *L* | ratione *B* | possit *BL*

Translation:

1. Since we have very often needed a midwife in situations regarding female health, and since we could not find an educated one that seemed to read Greek, I thought that, if she could have had access to all the gynaecological knowledge translated in Latin, she could have learned the doctrine of the text.
2. I, Mustio, happened to have translated many other things, using more the truthfulness to the doctrine than a perfectioned and dutifully refined content,

as we can read in the *Opthalmicus*, in the *Cyurgimemus*, in the *Filiatrus* too, and in the *Boethematicus*. **3.** I fancied to translate into Latin also these texts about gynaecology here, and I followed for the major part the proper style according to Soranus, in order to elevate the mind of women with this content; I fancied then to follow the shortness of the *Cata gynaecion*, in order to say everything but not to create a huge text; since then some chapters were still too briefly written, I added some information from the treatise *Dia iatrica*, in order for the commentary to be complete, composed of everything. **4.** I wanted to write these things as simple as possible and, to tell the truth, I used the words of midwives, in order for the uneducated midwives too to be able to easily understand the content read to them by someone else.

Rose (1882, 3–5):

Cum frequentius nobis in muliebribus obstetrix fuisset necessaria, nullam inu-
enimus studiosam quae litteras graecas adtigisse uideretur, quodsi et habuisset
omnia in latinitate sibi translata gynaecia, posset rationem lectionis scire. Ego
uero Muscio quia multa iam uideor quomodocumque transtulisse, ueritate ra-
tionis potius nisus quam structa oratione uel diligentius polita usus, sicut in
opthalmico et chirurgumeno filiatro etiam et boethematico legisti, placuit mihi
haec quoque gynaecia in latinum uertere sermonem, licet etiam maximam par-
tem triacontados ad integrum tenorem secutus Soranum transtulerim. Sed cum
uidissem corpus futurum et posse muliebres animos hac ratione cito prae mag-
nitudine lassari, placuit cateperotianorum breuitatem fuisse secutus, ut omnia
dicere uidear et non grande corpus perfecisse. Quibusdam uero capitulis mul-
tum breuiter dictis, quaedam et triacontados addidi, ut ex omnibus collectus
commentarius sufficiens esse possit. His autem multo simplicius uolui loqui
et ut uerius dicam muliebribus uerbis usus sum, ut etiam inperitae⁸⁹ obstetrices
licet ab altera sibi lectam rationem facile intellegere possint.

⁸⁹ I believe this to be a typing error of Rose; the correct I spelling, also according to the manu-
script tradition, is *imperitae*.

Commentary:

The introduction to the *Gynaecia* has been much discussed in the previous chapters of this study. In this section, the author outlines the process of production of his work, identifies his sources and his intellectual relationship with Soranus, and expresses his intention to write for contemporary midwives using clear and accessible language. Several significant editorial changes have been made to this passage, which, I believe, contribute to better understand its meaning. We begin from the first paragraph, *cum frequentius [...] lectionis scire*. Although the general sense of this passage has long been understood – i.e. Mustio’s realisation that contemporary midwives could have benefitted from the Latin translation of the Greek literature about gynaecology that they were not able to read – the grammatical structure of the passage has remained somewhat obscure. This is particularly due to the presence of *quod si*, which seem to introduce a clause that might be misread as denying women the ability to understand even Latin. The suggestion to insert a *uerbum cogitandi* before *quod* might finally illuminate the passage, allowing us to reconstruct the scene more precisely:⁹⁰ whenever Mustio had to work with midwives, realising that none of them could read Greek, he thought that, had they access to the material in Latin, they could have easily and effectively understood it. The material here is called *omnia gynaecia*, ‘all the knowledge about gynaecology, about female situations’. The term *gynaecia* parallels the Latin *muliebria*, which appears in the opening sentence of the introduction and again as an adjective modifying *uerba* at the end. While both terms refer to gynaecology, the Greek *gynaecia* seems to denote more specifically the literary and scholarly tradition, while the Latin is more generally used for practical and experiential aspects of women’s health. In the second paragraph, Mustio provides further background, noting that he has already translated medical texts, probably by Soranus, with a focus on fidelity to the subject rather than on stylistic refinement

⁹⁰ I thank professor Arsenio Ferraces Rodriguez who first made this suggestion.

(*ueritate rationis potius quam instructa diligentius polita usus*). In the third paragraph, these two strands of information converge: he now intends to translate *haec quoque Gynaecia*, for the education of women. This expression, *haec quoque Gynaecia*, might hide a subtle wordplay: Mustio refers to the *omnia gynaecia* mentioned before – those texts and material about gynaecology that would have been useful for the midwives to possess translated into Latin; he will then start from a specific text before him right now, this collection of ‘things of women’, these *gynaecia*, which happens to be actually called *Gynaecia*, the *Γυναικεῖα* of Soranus of Ephesus. He will translate the *G/gynaecia* he has at hand – namely, the *Γυναικεῖα*. This third paragraph is also structured in a tripartite form, marked by the parallel expressions *placuit mihi* and *placuit nobis*, followed by *quibusdam uero capitulis*. These correspond to the three stages in the production of the Latin *Gynaecia*: the translation of Soranus, the decision to adopt a concise style (*breuitas*) and the addition of supplementary chapters. Each of these three sections concludes with a final subordinate introduced by *ut*, which clarifies the reason behind each editorial choice. Finally, in the fourth paragraph, Mustio discusses also his linguistic strategy: he chooses to write in a simple style and to use *muliebria uerba* – words related to the sphere of gynaecology – so that also those unable to read might understand the content when it is read out loud to them. This paragraph too presents the structure of declaration + final introduced by *ut*; I have chosen to separate it from the rest of the paragraph only for the sake of clarity, since its focus on language will be the central topic of chapter 3.

frequentius – Mustio exhibits the tendency to use the comparative form of adverbs where the positive form will suffice. In the passages edited for this critical edition, examples include *frequentius*⁹¹ (instead of *frequenter*) and *uerius*⁹² (instead of *uere*); *tardius*⁹³ (instead of *tarde*) may be considered part

⁹¹ SORAN. 3, 1; 80, 3; see also section 2.4.

⁹² SORAN. 3, 19.

⁹³ SORAN. 80, 7; see also section 2.4.

of this pattern. As Hofmann and Szantyr note, the confusion between positive and comparative forms among adjectives and adverbs is a common feature of late Latin.⁹⁴ In the present case, the semantic difference between *frequenter* and *frequentius* is minimal, since both imply an increased frequency: *frequenter* already means ‘more often than usual’. This semantic overlap, together with the general late Latin preference for more substantial words forms, may explain the choice for the longer form in *-ius* instead of the one ending with *-e/-er*. The influence of adverbs like *melius* may also have contributed to this tendency, potentially extending to pairs such as *uere/uerius*, where the semantic distinction between the positive and the comparative forms is more pronounced.⁹⁵

muliebribus – it is the suggestion of Rose, while B and L have *mulieribus*, and H *mulieribus causis*. I support the addition of the first and therefore the writing *muliebribus*, with the meaning of ‘in situations regarding female health’, specifically those requiring the intervention of a midwife.

obsetrix – it is the reading of all the three manuscripts. Rose edits *obstetrix*, and systematically corrects every occurrence in Mustio’s text with the classical form. However, I prefer to accept the later version of the word, *obsetrix*, as done by both Medert and Bolton.

nullamque inueniremus – the manuscripts read *nulla quae inueniremus* BL and *nullam inuenimus* H. Accepting *nullamque* in the text, the verb must then be adjusted in the imperfect subjunctive *inueniremus*, as required by the *cum* clause.

adtigisse – the passive form transmitted by B is not preferable. The vowel <i> is supported by both B and H.

⁹⁴ HOFMANN, SZANTYR (1972, § 100).

⁹⁵ See for example SVENNUNG (1935, 279–280).

arbitratus fui – the completive clause introduced by *quod*, which contains a hypothetical construction, necessitates the presence of a *uerbum cogitandi*. The *usus* of Mustio suggests a perfect indicative constructed with the form *fui* (cf. *fuisse secutus* later in the introduction). B&L lack any element introducing *quod*, while H has *omnes etiam diceret* before it. However, the presence of *diceret* seems to me one of the minor adjustments that make H's version of this difficult passage somehow more cohesive, likely attributable to the copyist of H rather than to Mustio himself. Nevertheless, the addition of an entire verb constitutes a significant interpolation, and it is worth noting that constructions involving *uerbum cogitandi* + *quod* are not common in Mustio. This point, therefore, remains open to further analysis.

uideor – it is the reading of H and the choice of Rose and Medert; B&L have *uideo*. The *actiuus pro passiuo* is an acknowledged phenomenon of vulgar Latin, and it is attested, albeit infrequently, in Mustio's text. However, this construction typically occurs with verbs with a reflexive meaning, and therefore its applicability here is uncertain.

ex [ueritate] – B and L have *et* instead of *ex*, while H omits the preposition entirely. The suggested reading *ex* does not reflect the classical use of *utor* + ablative, but the extension of prepositional functions with the ablative is a well-documented trait of late Latin. In addition, this reading clarifies the use of *usus*, which then can be interpreted as a *participium coniunctum* linked to the main clause with *uideor*.

ueritate rationis potius quam instructa diligentius polita usus – while the meaning of the sentence is clear, the manuscript tradition is less so. I propose accepting the ablative *ueritate* as found in H, connected via *ex* to *usus* – the participle edited by Rose on the basis of *usu* in H. I also accept *quam* (H) instead of *quae*, establishing a parallel between *ueritate rationis* and *instructa diligentius polita*. In the latter element, I understand *ratione* to be implied but

not explicitly stated, having already appeared in the first part. Though somewhat unusual, the omission might be preserved as a form of *uariatio*.

Ophthalmico; Cyrurgimeno; Filiatro; Boethematico – My editorial approach towards Greek loanwords is to retain or restore forms closest to the original Greek, after having considered all the problems of loanwords' adoption and assimilation. This decision is based on Mustio's evident familiarity with Greek, as demonstrated by his ability to translate at least the *Γυναικεῖα* into Latin. One cannot exclude that these titles were even written in Greek in the text.

licet [...] *transtuli* – it is the reading of B, while L has *transtula*, and H *transtulerim*. Rose adopts H's version, while I follow Medert in accepting *licet* with the indicative, a construction also found in Theodorus Priscianus and other late authors.⁹⁶ Bolton likewise edits *transtuli*.

hac ratione – the term *ratio* in this passage has often been interpreted as 'for this reason', especially in comparison with the variant transmitted by H, *cito prae magnitudine*. Rose, for instance, edits both readings together, *hac ratione cito prae magnitudine*. Medert argues that the editor needs to choose between the two options, and, thinking that that B and L have a corrupted tradition, he favours *cito prae magnitudine*.⁹⁷ However, *ratio* is used two other times in Mustio's introduction – three if we consider the implicit implication in *instructa diligentius polita* – and in each case it refers to the content of the Greek manuals Mustio wanted to translate, i.e., the gynaecological knowledge. Thus, in this passage as well, *hac ratione* might be understood as 'with this content, with this knowledge' – that has been translated into Latin by Mustio.

exhilarare – this is the reading of B&L (B has actually *exilarare*). H has *lassare*, which Rose adopts in a negative final subordinate meaning 'in order

⁹⁶ MEDERT (1911, 19).

⁹⁷ MEDERT (1911, 26).

not to tire the women'. *Exhilarare* in a positive sentence can be accepted, with the sense of 'to cheer' or 'to improve'. Although other occurrences of this meaning have not yet been found, the verb is sometimes associated with brightness and enlightenment, as registered in the ThLL, suggesting a possible interpretation of *exhilarare* as 'to enlighten'.⁹⁸ Additionally, in the chapter *De homine* of the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, a rare use of *hilaritas* is recorded, referring to relief from eye pain following treatment.⁹⁹ This instance may support a similar interpretation of *exhilarare* in the *Gynaecia*, even though it remains a very peculiar usage and it would benefit from further corroborating examples.

Cata gynaecion – the readings of the manuscripts are *catapianorum* in B, *ext pianecum* in L (corrected then in *ext pianorum* by L') and *cataperocianorum* in H. Rose decides to edit the text of H (in *cateperotianorum*), considering the readings of B and L progressively corrupted versions of this form. As discussed in the introduction, the term has been linked to the Greek expression *κατ'ἐπερωτήσιν*, 'according to questions', which may refer to a source employed by Mustio characterised by a question-and-answer structure – present also in the first section of the *Gynaecia*.¹⁰⁰ For this reason, scholars such as Medert have opted to capitalise the term, suggesting it functions as the title of a written work, probably a summarised version of Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*. Bolton, by contrast, suggests an alternative reading, applying the opposite editorial principle to Rose, by taking into consideration only B and L, and editing *catapotiorum*, a technical Latin term referring to a list of recipes for preparing *catapotia*, 'pills'. In her interpretation, *catapotia* is not the title of a specific work but rather an illustrative reference to the kind of style that Mustio aims

⁹⁸ K.-M. (1939). *exhilaro* (*-io* ? , v. l. 13), -āūī , -ātum , -āre . In *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online*, 5(2), 1436-1437. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. https://tll.degruyter.com/article/5_2_9_exhilaro_v2007.

⁹⁹ Ferraces Rodriguez (2023, 88).

¹⁰⁰ See section 1.1.3.

to emulate, suggesting that his *Gynaecia* will employ the same *brevitas* as a list of medicinal preparations.

Although I do not agree with Bolton's theory regarding *catapotia*, I share her methodological approach in treating the readings of B and L as the starting point for reconstructing Mustio's original text. In particular, L's reading *ext pianecum* is especially intriguing, as *pianecum* may be a corrupted form of the word *gianecum*, for the Greek genitive plural *gynaecion*, with the sign for <g> confused with the sign for <p>. If we accept *cata* as the correct preposition – then misread in *ext* – we arrive at *Cata gynaecion*, which could plausibly be the title of a summarised version of Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*. The reading of B might be a parallel corruption or a further development of L's variant, especially after the correction of L' (*ext pianorum*). The reading of H appears to be a more deliberate attempt to rationalise the reading in B and L.

grande corpus – this is the reading of B and L, while H transmits *grandem*. The noun *corpus* is treated as masculine in other passages of the *Gynaecia*, especially when paired with the adjective *omnem* instead of *omne*, and more often in manuscripts B and L (with H presenting only this one such instance). As Väänänen,¹⁰¹ among others, explains, gender fluctuation between masculine and neuter forms is a well-established phenomenon in Latin from Plautus onwards, it is especially prevalent in vulgar Latin. Typically, neuter nouns are reclassified as masculine (or occasionally feminine) due to the gradual weakening of the tripartite gender system. In the case of *corpus*, however, the gender confusion between masculine and neuter throughout the *Gynaecia* seems more likely connected to contextual influences – see for example the reading in B and in L *corpusque omnem neque nimis durum neque ualde digestum [habentes]*¹⁰² – or, more broadly, the copyists' uncertainty in Latin grammar, rather than Mustio's own *usus*.

¹⁰¹ VÄÄNÄNEN (1971, 182).

¹⁰² SORAN. 14.

ex – this is my emendation of the H’s reading *et*. Since Mustio is clearly referring to a source from which he has drawn material, the use of the preposition is both syntactically and semantically appropriate.

Dia iatrimon tractatu – this correction corresponds to the readings *dia triaecontraduos* in B, *diatriaer contrado* in L and *triacontadas* in H. Rose decided to edit the form *triacontados* based on H, which also transmits the term in this form another time in the introduction and again in the *explicit* of both books (the *explicit* at the end of *liber primus* is discussed in section 2.3). As noted in the introductory chapter, this term has created considerable challenges for scholars: most subsequent editors have accepted the choices of Rose, interpreting *Triacontados/triacontados* as the title of a source used by Mustio, likely connected to Soranus’ *Γυναικεῖα*. Only Bolton offers a different interpretation, editing *triacontaduo* and considering it a reference to the thirty-two chapters added in the second section of the text.¹⁰³ Even so however, her text remains close to the reading of H and thus to Rose’s edition.

The term *triacontados* is unattested elsewhere in Latin or Greek literature as a title for any kind of compendium. While this absence does not definitively disprove the existence of such a text, I argue that this was not the original term used by Mustio. This conclusion is supported by the readings in B and L, which were considered by Rose greatly corrupted, as in the case of *Cata gynaecion* (*cateperotianorum*). The readings are *diatriaer contrado* for L and *dia triaecontraduos* for B and particularly valuable is that of L which, although more obscure, appears closer to the original. In *diatriaer con* one can discern the title *Dia iatrimon*, and in *trado* the ablative *tractatu*, likely rendered in a tachygraphic form as *tracto* or *tractu*, with <ct> misread as <d>. B’s reading may represent an attempt to make sense of L’s corrupted form, correctly isolating the preposition but generating a new term from the confused rendering of the original. Finally, the tradition represented by H seems to have

¹⁰³ BOLTON (2015, 64).

interpreted *dia* as a grammatical preposition rather than part of a title, translating it as *ex* (which later became *et*), and then tried to rationalise the following word, ultimately producing *triacontados*, which is systematically used in other contexts.

The reconstructed phrase *Dia iatrimon tractatu* would correspond to a Greek equivalent of a *Liber medicinalis*, a term for medical miscellanies, where a section about gynaecology is often found at the end, outside the typical *a capite ad calcem* structure modelled on the male body. This *Dia iatrimon* treatise would have been a collection of medical sections, and a portion from Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα* could have fit perfectly within it – whether in its original form or in an already abridged version. The preposition *Dia* should be integrated in the title, especially given the ending *-on*, which is more plausibly a Greek genitive plural governed by *Dia* than an accusative/nominative singular. It is not uncommon for technical treatises to bear plural titles, as in the case of the *Γυναικεῖα* itself. Both *Cata gynaecion* and of *Dia iatrimon* would gain further credibility if similar titles constructed with the prepositions + genitive were found in other Late Antique medical texts, a possibility that cannot be excluded.

uero – it is the reading of L; B has *et* and H omits the word entirely. A confusion between the tachygraphic signs for *uero* and *et* is plausible, as the two are visually similar, especially in rapid handwriting. However, it is difficult to determine which form was present in the archetype. I choose *uero* based of Mustio's *usus scribendi*, where this adverb frequently introduces additional information that either contrasts with or parallels the preceding statement. See for example:

24. Aequali mensura omnes purgantur?

Non semper modicum, sed a modico incipit purgatio et in modicum finitur.

Nam et aestate parca est, et quotiens sui crementum accipit corpus et post uacuum uitam ad exercitationem mulier accedit, iam necesse est ut

modicum purgetur. Aliis **uero** temporibus et aliis uitae ductibus plurimo sanguine purgantur.¹⁰⁴

‘24. Do all [women] menstruate in the same quantity?’

It is not always a little amount, but the menstruation starts with little and ends with little. Then it is little during summer, and every time the body needs the nourishment of that and when the woman comes back to activities after a sedentary period, it is inevitable that she loses a little blood. During other seasons and other moments of life then, they lose more blood.’

(8.) Omnes ergo has praedictas causas adprehendimus his signis. Si enim naturaliter in totum non purgatur, quod sana sit et sine aliqua querella corporis et matricis uiuat et numquam fuerit purgata. Quae **uero** aetate non purgantur anus et puellae, cum interrogatae fuerint annos suos simpliciter confiteri possunt.¹⁰⁵

‘(8.) So, we recognise these situations from the following signs. If [the woman] does not menstruate at all for natural reasons, [we will recognise it] from the fact that she is healthy and she lives without any ailment nor in her body neither in her matrix and she has never menstruated before. Then, old women and young girls, who clearly do not menstruate because of their age, can easily confirm how old they are once asked.’

muliebribus – neither *mulieribus* (B and H) nor *muliebrium* (L) is appropriate in this context. Rose’s edition of *muliebribus* is preferable, as both attested readings can be considered as a corrupted version of it.

¹⁰⁴ SORAN, 11, 12–11, 18.

¹⁰⁵ SORAN, 49, 3 – 49, 12.

2.2 Questions I–XVIII¹⁰⁶

I. In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet uniuersam mulierum traditionem? In duas, unam quae de obsetrice tractat, alteram quae de omnibus obsetricibus occurrentibus constat; hanc ipsam iterum diuidimus <in duas>: secundum naturam occurrentes causas et praeter naturam.

I. quod *L* | oportet *om. BL* | uniuersam] omnia *BL* | traditione *L* | una *L* | que *H om. B* | de] *om. BL* | tractata est *BL* | alteram *corr. Rose altera codd.* | quae] quo est *B* | in omnibus *L* | obsetrice *L* obsetricum *H* | occurrentibus] solacium occurrent *B (sed solacium add. B')* solacium occurrat *L* | constat] constata est *L* | ante hanc *add. autem BL* | han *H* | ipsum *B* | diuidere *L* | in duas *suppl. (cf. in duas, unam ...)* | causa *B* | preter natura *BL*

Translation:

I. In how many and which parts do we divide the gynaecological knowledge? In two, one that discusses about the midwife, another that consists of all that might occur to a midwife; and this one again we divide in two: conditions according to nature and conditions against nature.

Rose (1882, 5,1–6):

1. In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet muliebrium traditionem. In duas, unam quae de obstetrice tractat, alteram quae de omnibus obstetrici occurrentibus causis. Has ipsas iterum diuidimus in secundum naturam occurrentes causas et praeter naturam.

Commentary:

uniuersam – is the reading of *H*, while *B* and *L* transmit *omnia*. The context requires a feminine accusative adjective to agree with *traditionem*, which would necessitate emending *omnia* to *omnem*. Moreover, Mustio consistently employs *uniuersus* as an adjective or as an adverb to indicate generality in

¹⁰⁶ Cf. questions 1–17 in ROSE (1882, 5,1–10,8).

contrast with specificity, which he expresses with the term *pars/partes* (see for example question II in section 2.4). Although the structure here does not explicitly follow a bipartite division between general and specific, the passage nonetheless introduces a general topic that is subsequently divided into specific *partes*. Therefore, the choice of *uniuersam* is both grammatically and contextually appropriate.

obsetricibus occurrentibus – I think that this passage still needs further clarification. The manuscript readings are *obsetricibus occurrent* in B and *obsetricibus solacium occurrent* in B', *obsetrice solacium occurrat* in L and *obsetricum occurrentibus* in H. The most coherent reconstruction appears to be *obsetricibus* from B and *occurrentibus* from H. However, I believe that the presence of *solacium* in L and B' still needs to be addressed.

II. Obsetricalis ratio quid a muliebri differt? Quod pars ab uniuerso. Obsetricalis enim pars est muliebrum rationis.

III. Quae est aptissima quae obsetricem facere potest? Principaliter quae literas nouit et habet ingenium praesentem, memoriam, et studiosa, munda, uniuerso iam corpore integra, fortis et laboriosa.

IV. Quid est <melior> obsetrix? Femina omnium mulierum causarum docta, etiam medicinali exercitatione perita, quae possit uniuersarum ualitudines competenter curare et causas <quae> ab ipsa obsetrice exercentur, et talis esse debet ut mulieris rationem cognoscere possit, ita ut non sit turbulenta nec uerbosa nec auara, sed sapiens et sobria et taciturna, <non> superstitiosa, quae sua sollicitudine mulieres in partu gubernet.

II. Obsetricalis ratio ... muliebrum rationis] obsetricale parata esse ratio quidam est ut muliebri differa enim quod ad ipsa obsetrice exercentur quae scit mulieris ratione cognoscere EXPLICIT PROLOGUS B obsetricale parata esset ratio quedem est ut mulieres [*hic plurima uerba legi non possunt*] quod

ab ipsa obsetrice [*hic plurima uerba legi non possunt*] causa et tales esse debet ut mulieris ratione cognoscere possit. EXPLICIT PROLOGUS MUSCIONIS. INCIPIT GENECIA EIUSDEM L | *ante ratio add. enim H* | quid a *corr. Rose* quidem H | Quae est ... laboriosa] *om. BL* | quae *corr. Rose* que H | obsetricem] obstetricem *corr. Rose* obsetricam H IV. erit B | melior *suppl.* (*cf. SORAN. 1.3.1 B.-G.-M., ἀρίστη*). | feminam B *om. H* | omnium *om. H* | competenter B | quae *suppl.* | ab ipsa obsetrice ... cognoscere possit *in hunc locum transp., post differt exhibent BL (cf. quaest. II)* | exercentur *corr. exercentur BL* | rationem *corr. ratione BL* | quae possit ... gubernet] que est melior medicina que exercitata est medicinalibus actionis cum prudentia iustissima et comuni et quod urget prouidentem horum diligentiam coinunges quae [*hic spatium uacat*]pore adunatim possit et per partes diuidere accidentiam mitigare propter insecutione cause non iracunda nec turbulenta compatiens solida pudica arguta quieta prudens animosa nec auara H | non *suppl.* | in partu B [*hic spatium uacat*]rui L | gubernat L

Translation:

II. How does the obstetrical doctrine differ from the gynaecological one? As a part from the whole. The obstetrical is in fact a part of the gynaecological doctrine.

III. Who is most suitable to be able to become a midwife? Mainly she who knows how to read and write and has a ready mind, memory, and is passionate, clean, of sound limbs in her entire body, strong and a hard worker.

IV. Who is the best midwife? A female expert of all conditions of women and well versed in the exercise of medicine, that can effectively treat diseases of all women and those that specifically are treated by a midwife, and she has to be such that she knows the gynaecological doctrine, making sure she is not violent nor chatty nor avid, but wise and modest and silent, not superstitious, and so to guide women during labour with her care.

Rose (1882, 5, 7–6, 13):

2. Obstetricalis enim ratio quid a muliebri differt?

[Quod pars ab universo. Obstetricalis enim pars est muliebrium rationis] quod ab ipsa obstetrice exerceatur quae scit mulieres ratione cognoscere.

3. [Quae est aptissima quae obstetricem facere possit?

Principaliter quae litteras nouit et habet ingenium praesens et memoriam, studiosa, munda, in uniuerso iam corpore integra, fortis et laboriosa.]

4. Quid est obstetrix?

Femina omnium muliebrium causarum docta, etiam medicinali exercitatione perita.

5. [Quae est melior obstetrix?

Quae exercitata est medicinalibus actionibus cum prudentia iustissima et commune et quod urget prouidens et horum diligentiam coniungens, quae pore adunatim possit et per partes diuidere et accidentia mitigare propter insecutionem causae, non iracunda nec turbolenta, compatiens, solida, pudica, arguta, quieta, prudens, animosa, nec auara.]

Commentary:

Questions II to IV in the *Gynaecia* deal with the division of the material in the treatise and with the qualities of the midwife. However, significant textual variations exist among the three principal manuscripts, as illustrated in tables 6 and 7.

The blue portion of the text is more coherent in manuscript H, where a question regarding the distinction between *obsetricalis* and *muliebris ratio* – along with the relative answer – is recognisable. The tradition preserved in B&L seems to have suffered a gap at this point. This material does not seem to derive directly from Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*, which, in its extensive introductory discussion on the organisation of the text, makes no mention of such a distinction. Nevertheless, given its explanatory nature and its partial

transmission across the three main manuscripts, I see no compelling reason to exclude it as an addition by Mustio.

tab. 6

B	L	H
<p>Obsetricale parata esse ratio quidam est ut muliebri differa enim quod ad ipsa obsetrice exerceatur quae scit mulieris ratione cognoscere. EXPLICIT PROLOGUS. QUID ERIT OBSETRIX.</p>	<p>Obsetricale parata esset ratio quedam est ut mulieres _____ quod ab ipsa obsetrice _____ causa et tales esse debet ut mulieris ratione cognoscere pussit. EXPLICIT PROLOGUS MUSCIONIS. INCIPIT GENEZIA EIUSDEM.</p>	<p>Obsetricalis enim ratio quidem muliebri differt quod pars ab uniuerso. Obsetricalis enim pars est muliebrum rationis. Que est aptissima que obsetricam facere potest. Principaliter quae litras nouit et habet ingenium praesentem memoriam et studiosa munda uniuerso iam corpore integra fortis et laboriosa.</p>

Following the Greek source, we encounter the section *Τίς ἐστὶν ἐπιτήδειος πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι μαῖα*, ('Who is suitable to become a midwife'), represented in table 6 by the red section of H. This section shares content with the Greek text and can be considered authentic.

The pink section of B&L however, although positioned parallel to the red section in H, appears unrelated to the question of suitability for becoming a midwife. Instead, it corresponds more closely to the following one in Mustio's text, *quid est <melior> obsetrix*. I believe that the addition of *melior* is necessary, as this section mirrors the one called *Τίς ἀρίστη μαῖα* in Soranus,¹⁰⁷ as I will elaborate in the following paragraphs. The manuscript tradition of the question is reported in table 7.

¹⁰⁷ SORAN. 1.3.1 B.-G.-M.

tab. 7

B	L	H
<p>Feminam omnium mulierum causarum docta etiam medicinali exercitatione perita quae possit uniuersarum ualitudines competenter curare. Ita ut non sit turbulenta nec uerbosa nec auara sed sapiens et sobria et taciturna. Et superstitiosa quae sua sollicitudine mulieres in partu gubernet.</p>	<p>Quid est obsetrix Femina omnium mulierum causarum docta et iam medicinali exercitatione perita quae possit uniuersarum ualitudines competenter curare ita ut non sit turbulenta nec uerbosa nec auara sed sapiens et sobria et taciturna et superstitiosa quae sue sollicitudine mulieres rui gubernat.</p>	<p>Quid est obsetrix mulierum causarum docta etiam medicinali exercitatione perita. que est melior medicina que exercitata est medicinalibus actionibus cum prudentia iustissima et communis et quod urget prouidentem horum diligentiam coniunges quae pore adunatim possit. et per partes diuidere et accidentiam mitigare propter insecutione cause non iracunda nec turbulenta compatiens solida pudica arguta quieta prudens animosa nec auara.</p>

After the shared green section, the tradition of B&L continues with a list of more specific qualities (highlighted in purple), while H separate the information into a distinct question, *que est melior medicina*, in orange in table 7. Both the purple and the orange sections can be divided into two parts: first, a description of the midwife’s ideal knowledge (*quae possit [...] curare* in BL; *que est [...] cause* in H), and second, a list of attributes concerning her body and her personality (*ita ut [...] gubernet/gubernat* in BL; *non iracunda [...]*

nec auara in H). While the first part in B&L is shorter and different from H, the underlying idea is the same: we want a knowledgeable person capable of managing all situations occurring in her job. In the second part, B&L on the one hand and H on the other share only two adjectives describing the midwife, which are indicated in bold in table 7.

Before examining this new section in detail, we must first conclude the discussion of the preceding material. As noted, I believe that the pink section of B&L may be connected to the discussion of the midwife, based on its thematic alignment to the Greek text. Soranus writes:

Τὰ συμπληροῦντα τὴν ἀρίστην μαῖαν εἰπεῖν ἀναγκαῖον, ἵνα αἱ μὲν ἄρισταὶ γινώσκωσιν ἑαυτάς, αἱ δὲ ἀρτιμαθεῖς ὡς εἰς ἀρχετύπους ταύτας ἀποθλέπωσιν, ὁ βίος δὲ παρὰ τὰς χρείας εἰδῆ τίνας δεῖ μετακαλεῖσθαι. Κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν μὲν οὖν τελείαν φαμὲν τὴν μόνον τοῦ τέλους τῆς ἰατρικῆς ἐπιτυχάνουσαν, **ἀρίστην δὲ τὴν προσειληφυῖάν τι καὶ πρὸς τῇ προστασίᾳ ἐν τοῖς θεωρήμασιν πολύπειρον.**¹⁰⁸

‘It is necessary to describe the best midwife, so that, on one hand, the very best will recognise themselves and, on the other, the beginners will look upon them as models, and the people can call them in case of need. Generally speaking, we call a midwife faultless if she manages just to complete her medical task; **the best if she goes further in it and if she is well versed in the theory, together with her practical expertise.**’

I think that the pink section of B&L reflects an adaptation of the final concept in Soranus’ passage (highlighted above): the best midwife is not only skilled in *causas* <*quae*> *ad ipsa obsetrice exercentur*, but also *talis esse debet ut mulieris rationem cognoscere possit*. Although this pink section appears before the formal question about the midwife – and even before a passage unanimously preserved by all the three manuscripts – it may result from textual dislocation. This portion of B&L, where the pink section is found,

¹⁰⁸ SORAN. 1.3.2 – 1.3.8 B.-G.-M.

seems to reflect confusion, possibly originated from a shared *antigraphus*, in which the *explicit* of the *prologus* and the *incipit* of the *Gynaecia* interrupt the text, leaving misplaced questions after the introduction.

Returning to table 7, Soranus' passage continues with an analysis of the perfect midwife, progressing from her education to a detailed list of physical and physiological characteristics – precisely the structure of the manuscript tradition. The green section, shared by all the manuscripts, should be retained, with the addition of <*melior*> in the question, as the corresponding Greek passage concerns the best midwife. I propose preserving the phrase *quae possit [...] curare* from B&L, and integrating after them the pink section from table 6:

[...] quae possit uniuersarum ualitudines competenter curare et causas <quae> ab ipsa obsetrice exercentur, et talis esse debet ut mulieris rationem cognoscere possit, [...].

This section effectively transitions from general to specific information, following the model of the *Γυναικεῖα*: the perfect midwife is a woman who knows about female nature, has expertise in pharmacology and is capable of preserving general health. More specifically, she can manage situations requiring a midwife, and has theoretical knowledge as well.

Finally, the perfect midwife must possess a defined list of characteristics. Once again, B&L on one hand, and H on the other, preserve two distinct traditions. The comparison with Soranus' Greek text does not clarify which version is closer to Mustio's original text, as the two list of characteristics are complementary.¹⁰⁹ However, editorial selection is facilitated by Mustio's *usus scribendi*. First, as already noted by Hans Medert,¹¹⁰ the question transmitted by H presents, instead of the usual *obsetrix* and *symptomata*, the words *medica* and *accidentia*, that do not appear anywhere else in the *Gynaecia*. Second, in

¹⁰⁹ SORAN. 1.2.3–1.3.29 B.-G.-M.

¹¹⁰ MEDERT (1911, 15).

the text of B&L, the list of characteristics is introduced by *ita ut*, in a particular use frequent in Mustio to introduce descriptive sequences or procedural steps.¹¹¹ For these reasons, I choose to edit the text according to the tradition of B&L.¹¹²

V. Matrix quot nominibus uocatur? Principaliter enim tribus nominibus dicta est; primum quidem ab eo quod mulieres partu suo matres efficiat. Graece etiam ystera appellatur hoc est nouissima siquidem ut nouissima omnibus intestinis iaceat aut quod annis XIII uacua sit apud uirgines <et> post mutationem aetatis effectus suos per partus mulieribus repraesentet; graece etiam delfis dicta est quod fratres efficiat omnes qui ex una nascuntur.

V. quod B | principaliter] Tri[*hic phuras litteras legere non potui*]palmoer L om. H | enim] om. H | nominibus] om. H | post dicta est add. enim matrix H | primum quidem om. H | mulieris H | suo om. H | matris H | effici B | graece corr. Rose greci B grece LH | stera BL | appellata est H | post hoc est add. in BL | ut] et L aut H | omnium L | taceat B iacet H | et suppl. | post mutationis B post mutatione L | ante post mutationem add. nouissime H | suis B | per partus] perfectus B | repraesentet corr. repraesentat B representat L representet H | graece corr. Rose greci B grece LH | delfis] AEACY H | post dicta est add. eo B | efficiant B eficiat H | qui om. H | uno L

¹¹¹ See section 3.5.

¹¹² I thank professor Arsenio Ferraces Rodriguez for having brought to my attention the existence of lists of characteristics of the good doctor, like those collected in Firpo (1972), and dated to IX/X century. The suggestion was to look for any kind of imitation of these lists. However, after some research, I think that the similarity between the tradition of Mustio and the lists evidences nothing more than the obvious opposite relationship: catechistic forms and abbreviations like the *Gynaecia*, where elements are presented in lists with no or little explanation, are at the origin of the medieval lists of characteristics of the good doctor. We are still in need of an explanation for the two different traditions of B&L and H, and the matter needs further analysis.

Translation:

V. By how many names is the matrix called? Mainly by three names; the first by the fact that she makes women mothers through delivery. In Greek is then called *ystera*, which is *nouissima*, since it lies last under all the intestines, or because it is ineffective for 14 years among young girls and then after the development of age it shows her activity to women through delivery; in Greek it is also called *delfis*, because it makes those who are born from the same one brothers.

Rose (1882, 6, 14–7, 3):

6. Matrix quot nominibus uocatur?

Principaliter enim tribus nominibus dicta est, primum quidem ab eo quod mulieres partu suo matres efficit. Graece etiam *ystera* appellatur hoc est *nouissima*, siquidem ut *nouissima* omnibus intestinis iaceat aut quod annis quattuordecim uacua sit apud uirgines et *nouissime* post mutationem aetatis effectus suos per partus mulieribus repraesentat. Graece etiam *delfis* dicta est quod fratres efficiat omnes qui ex una nascuntur.

Commentary:

Matrix – this is the most frequently used term for ‘uterus’ in the *Gynaecia*. Although the Latin word *uterus* also appears, it is reserved exclusively for the pregnant abdomen perceived externally,¹¹³ the internal organ is consistently referred to as *matrix*. According to the ThLL, the primary meaning of *matrix* is that of *mater* or *auctor*, particularly in reference to living beings and personified things (*de animantibus et de rebus personatis*); in Late Latin medical texts, however, *matrix* comes to denote the uterus specifically.¹¹⁴ This semantic shift likely originated from the choice of *matrix* as a translation of the

¹¹³ SORAN. 24, 6 – 24, 11: [...] *debet obstetrix [...] illos temptare quando se matrix aperit, et non conari quando se concludit, ne feruore aut sanguinis fluxus aut ipsius matricis adductio emergat. <A> lateribus uero ministrae sine quassatione manibus apertis in deorsum uterum deducant.*

¹¹⁴ BULHART. 1939. *mātrīx*, *-īcis* f. Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1939, Vol.8. 0, pp. 481–483. Available from: https://tll.degruyter.com/article/8_0_4_matrix_v2007.

Greek *μήτρα*, which has always meant ‘uterus’. Thus, the original meaning of *matrix* – referring to the mother or origin – was narrowed to the anatomical organ, in a process of synecdoche. *Matrix* may therefore be considered not a direct loanword from the Greek *μήτρα*, but rather a semantic calque. Both *matrix* and *μήτρα* belong to the same semantic field and derive from the same Indo-European root **méh₂tēr*.¹¹⁵

ystera; *delfis*; *nouissima* – the first two terms are Greek loanwords, while *nouissima* is a Latin semantic calque on *ystera*. The term *hystera* is attested in Dioscorides and in Irenaeus.¹¹⁶ B&L have *stera*. H transmits the word *AEACY*, likely is a misspelling of *delfis* in Greek capital letters (*ΔΕΛΦΙΣ*). *Nouissima* is the unanimous reading across all three principal manuscripts. For a detailed analysis of uterine terminology, I refer the reader to section 3.6.1.

repraesentet – it is the reading of H, while B has *repraesentat* and L *reprezentat*. With the insertion of <et> before *post mutationem aetatis*, the verb is governed by *quod* alongside *sit*, and thus should be in the subjunctive mood like the latter.

VI. Ubi iacet ipsa uulua? Intra duas coxas intus, quod est sub se habens longanem et uesicam desuper.

VII. Natura qualis est ipsa matrix? Magis neruosa; contexta est arteriis uenis pulpis et neruis.

VIII. Quot tunicis constat matrix? Duabus scilicet tunicis: una foris leuior est et alba, durior et neruosa; intus uero alia aspera, rubra, mollis, pulposa.

¹¹⁵ BEEKES (2010, 948).

¹¹⁶ RUBENBAUER. 1942. *hystera*, -ae f., Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1942, Vol.6. 3, pp. 3163-3164. Available from: https://tll-degruyter-com.ezproxy.its.uu.se/article/6_3_17_hystera_v2007.

VI. *post ubi add. enim H | ipsa om. H | Intra ... desuper] intus inter duas coxas inter uesicam et longaeonem sub iacet aut uesice superiacet longaeoni H | intrus B | longaeone L | uesicam corr. Rose uisica B uesica L VII. Natura ... matrix?] Qui naturalis est matrix H | matrix] matrices B | magis] om. BL | neruosae B | *post neruosa add. quidem L | decontexta est B constat H arteriis ... neruis] pulpis etiam neruis et uenis multis BL (cf. SORAN. 1.4.75 B. G.-M. οὐκ ἐκ νεύρων μόνον, ἀλλὰ ἐκ φλεβῶν καὶ ἀρτηριῶν καὶ σαρκός) VIII. Quot ... matrix?] om. B | tunicas L | constat] habet L | duobus H | scilicet tunicis om. H | *post tunicis add. sunt BL | leuior] linior B que lenior L | est om. H | alba] cida B | *post alba add. et L | *post neruosa add. et pulposa abematr (intra abematr et quibus rebus (q.IX) rasuram exhibet codex) B et pulposa est L | uero alia om. H | *post pulposa add. est L******

Translation:

VI. Where does the uterus lie? Inside between the two thighs; which is so to have the rectum below and the bladder above.

VII. What is the nature of the matrix? Mostly sinewy; it is composed of arteries and veins, flesh and sinews.

VIII. How many membranes does the matrix consist of? Two membranes; the one outside is smoother and white, harder and sinewy; the other one inside, rougher, red, softer and fleshy.

Rose (1882, 7, 4–13):

7. Ubi iacet ipsa uulua?

Intra duas coxas intus, quod est sub se habens longaeonem et uesicam desuper.

8. Natura qualis est ipsa matrix?

[Magis] neruosa quidem, contexta est pulpis etiam et arteriis et uenis multis.

9. Quot tunicis constat matrix?

Duabus. Scilicet una foris leuior est et alba durior et neruosa, intus uero alia aspera et rubra et mollis et pulposa.

Commentary:

Magis neruosa – the adverb *magis* is transmitted only by H, but I follow Rose and Medert in adopting it, as Medert has noted that it translates the Greek *κατὰ τὸ πλειστοδυναμοῦν* found in Soranus.¹¹⁷

quot tunicis constat matrix? – this is the text transmitted by H, while L has *tunicas habet* and B has the symbol % in place of the question, with *tunicas* written in the margin. It is unclear whether this marginal note is meant to supplement the absent question or to correct the second occurrence of the term a few words later. However, the presence of *duabus* in the answer suggests that the question originally employed an ablative construction, as required by the verb *constat*. I therefore follow Rose in adopting the reading of H.

lēuior – the two membranes are described with two contrasting lists of adjectives: the external membrane is white, harder and sinewy, while the internal is red, softer and fleshy. Given that the latter is described as *aspera*, ‘rough’, the appropriate adjective for the former membrane is *lēuior*, ‘smoother’, and not *lenior*, ‘more delicate’. The term *lenior* refers to the degree of force or intensity of an action, while *lēuior* pertains to texture and tactile quality. Both Rose and Medert edit *leuior*, while Bolton chooses *linior* (B), and she also retains the repetition of *et pulposa* found in B and L among the characteristics of the first membrane, although this repetition appears illogical and does not correspond to the Greek text of Soranus.¹¹⁸

IX. Quibus rebus inter se omnia continentur ut inhaereant matricis tunicae?
Tenuissimis membranis et neruis.

X. Quali positione figurata est matrix? Principaliter sicut formata est cucurbita medicinalis.

¹¹⁷ SORAN. 1.4.73 B.-G.-M.; see MEDERT (1911, 23).

¹¹⁸ BOLTON (2015, 143).

XI. Quae singulae partes eius? Ut cognoscantur et facillime intellegere possint eius angula, uolui eam impingere et singulis partibus eius singulae litterae appositae sunt. Ubi ergo est apposita A, orificium dicitur; [quid est ante partum pulposum et molle post partum uero callosum et spatiosum est] ubi uero est B collum dicitur; ubi est C ceruix dicitur; omnis autem horum concursus caula dicitur; ubi uero post angustias in rotunditate dilatate incipiunt et est ibi D umeri dicuntur; ubi autem est E latera dicuntur; ubi uero rotunditas concluditur et est ibi F fundus appellatur; intus uero ubi est G basis grandis dicitur; omnisque inanitas illa quae est in medio uenter et sinus appellatur.

IX. quibus rebus ... membranis et neruis *om.* H | inter se *corr.* Rose a se B in se L | continentur *corr.* Rose continent BL | ut inhaereant] utereant B | tunice B | tenuissimis *corr.* Rose tenuissime BL **X.** postione H *om.* B | ante principaliter *add.* ex H | sicuti L *om.* H | formata est *om.* H | concurbita B concurbita H **XI.** ante quae singulae *add.* singulae partes eius quid uocantur H | que B | partas B | eius *scripsi ex H* (*cf.* singulis partibus eius) | ut] ita H | poss-t B | eius angula ... partibus eius] *om.* L | uolui *corr.* Rose uel ubi BH | et singulis] ex singulis B in singulis H | eius singulae] enim singulae L | littere BH | adponens B appostae sunt H | Ubi ... A] ubi ergo e appositum B ubi ergo A posita H | quid est ... spatiosum est *del.* | mollem L | B *om.* B | ante est C *add.* ergo L | inter collum dicitur *et omnis solum C legi potest in H* | ceruix *corr.* Rose cerbis B ceruis L | omnes L | autem BL | ante angustias *om.* post H | angustias *corr.* Rose congustias BL congustas H | in *om.* B | dilactere B | et est ibi D ... latera dicuntur *om.* B | umeri *corr.* Rose humeri LH | conclu[*hic pluras litteras legere non potui*] H | F *om.* B | apellatur B nominatur H | ante est G *add.* ergo B | G *om.* B | grandi L | quae est in medio] in medio quod est B que est in medio L | uentris sini H | dicitur B appellantur H

Translation:

IX. By what things is everything kept together so that the matrix membranes stay in place? By very thin membranes and sinews.

X. In which position is the matrix placed? It is mainly shaped like a cupping vessel.

XI. What are its specific parts? To make them recognisable and so that all its corners could be easily studied, I wanted to draw it, and letters are placed on each part. Where there is an A, is called orifice, [which is fleshy and soft before the delivery, but after the delivery it is callous and wide]; where there is a B, is called neck; where there is a C, it is called cervix; the meeting point of all of them is called stem; where it starts to open in a rounded shape after the narrowness, and there is a D, is called shoulders; where there is E, they are called sides; where the rounded shape closes and there is an F, is called bottom; inside then, where there is a G, is called great basin; the entire passage than is in the middle is called belly or gulf.

Rose (1882, 7, 14–8, 13):

9a. *Quibus rebus inter se continentur ut inhaereant matricis tunicae?*

Tenuissimis membranis et neruis.

10. *Quali positione figurata est matrix?*

Principaliter sicut formata est cucurbita medicinalis.

11. *Singulae partes eius quid uocantur?*

Quae singulae partes ut cognoscantur et facillime intellegi possint eius anguli, uolui eam inpingere et in singulis partibus eius singulas litteras adponere. Ubi ergo est A posita, orificium dicitur. Ubi uero est B, collum dicitur. Ubi est C, ceruix dicitur. Omnis autem horum concursus caula dicitur. Ubi uero post angustias in rotunditate dilatare incipiunt, et est ibi D, umeri dicuntur. Ubi autem est E, latera dicuntur. Ubi uero rotunditas concluditur, et est ibi F, fundus

appellatur. Intus uero ubi est G, basis grandis dicitur. Omnisque inanitas illa in medio quae est, uenter et sinus appellatur.

Commentary:

Quae singulae partes eius? – All three manuscripts transmit the phrase *quae singulae partes*, and I have added *eius* from the text of H, which also includes an additional question preceding this one – *singulae partes eius quid uocantur* – accepted by Rose. However, I believe that the shared text of all three manuscripts constitutes already a complete question, and there is therefore no need to include the additional material of H.

inter se – it is the conjecture of Rose. H omits the question, B reads *a se* and L *in se*, while Medert (and Bolton) chooses *ad se*, arguing that it is a better translation for *πρὸς ἀλλήλους* in Soranus.¹¹⁹ However, I find Rose's suggestion more accurate, as it better expresses the reciprocal nature of the connection among the various layers and parts, which are linked by *tenuissimis membranis et neruis*.

angula – it is the text of B and H. Rose corrects it in the masculine form *anguli*, aligning with Classical Latin usage, while Medert (followed by Bolton) retains the neuter plural *angula*, noting that such gender variation is not uncommon in Late Latin.¹²⁰ Manuscript L presents a gap between *intellegere possint* and *singulae litterae*, with only *enim* appearing between them, possibly a corruption of *eius*, as found in the other two manuscripts. This gap might be the result of a *saut du même au même*, where the copyist went from the first *eius* (in L, *enim*), followed by *angula*, to the second *eius*, followed by *singulae*, visually and phonetically similar to the first word. While this does not definitively confirm the presence of *angula* in the original text of Mustio, it does suggest its presence in the shared manuscript tradition.

¹¹⁹ MEDERT (1911, 24); BOLTON (2015, 142).

¹²⁰ MEDERT (1991, 24); on this matter, see also for example VÄÄNÄNEN (1971, §§ 213–229, especially §§ 227–228); BOLTON (2015, 144).

uolui – manuscripts B and H read *uel ubi*, which is nonsensical in this context. I therefore accept Rose’s emendation *uolui*, which fits syntactically and is easily corrupted in transmission.¹²¹

appositae sunt – it is the reading of L; B has *adponens* and H has *apostae sunt*. Rose, followed by Medert and Bolton, edits *adponere*, as an infinitive governed by *uolui* like the previous *impingere*. However, I see no compelling reason to reject the finite verb form, and I therefore adopt the reading of L.

Ubi ergo est apposita A – this is the reading of L; B has *ubi ergo e appositum* and H has *ubi ergo A posita*. Rose (followed by Medert) edits the text of H adding the verb *est* before *A*. I prefer the reading of L, which is syntactically complete and does not need emendation, and I retain the verb *apponere* as in the preceding line.

orificium dicitur – Following these words, B and L share a brief passage describing the nature of the orifice. However, this material corresponds to the content of the subsequent question, and it appears to be either an interpolation or a gloss. I therefore follow Rose and Medert in omitting it from the text, although it is included in Bolton’s edition.¹²²

ubi est C – it is the reading of B. L has *ubi ergo est*, while the text in H, at f. 1v, is heavily damaged and difficult to decipher. Although the initial U of *ubi* is visible, the remaining pen strokes cannot be clearly interpreted and they do not seem to correspond to Rose’s reading of H, but more to *ubi est uero*.

ceruix – B has *cerbis*, L has *ceruis*, H is illegible, though an initial <c-> might be discerned. Rose, in his critical apparatus, records *ceruix* as the reading of H, likely based of its derivation from *descriptus C*. I accept <u> over

¹²¹ I thank professor Anna Maria Urso for bringing to my attention that the recent collation of the manuscript Vicenza, Biblioteca Civica Bertoliana, MS 287 has made possible to consider *uolui*, and also *deuerginatae* at question (section 2.2 at page 108) as reading of this codex. V will be integrated in the complete edition of the *Gynaecia*, as all the other manuscripts of the tradition. See URSO (2020).

¹²² BOLTON (2015, 144).

, but <x> over <s>, not only because *ceruis* is unattested in Latin, but also because the character <x> is consistently preserved in other words (e.g., *matrix*) throughout the manuscript tradition.

angustias – the reading *congustias* (BL)/*congustas* (H) appears in only two other Late Antique texts, but is frequently found in manuscripts as variant of the form *angustia*, as noted by Arsenio Ferraces Rodriguez. The likely cause is a palaeographic one: the letter <a>, especially when written with open strokes by a rapid hand, can easily be misread as the syllable <co>.

quae est in medio – this is the reading of H; B has *in medio quod est* B and L *que est in medio*. Rose, Medert and Bolton all choose *in medio quae est*. However, since H preserves a grammatically sound reading, nearly identical to that of L, I prefer to retain the transmitted form.

Question **XI** corresponds to the drawing of the uterus found in B. Adjacent to the drawing, at f.16v, the following recipe for an amulet can be found¹²³:

Ad partum eiciendum has characteres facis in crusta de pane et ligas ad coxam dextera, ⊙ X H, et cum se liberaverit cicius dissoluis.

‘To achieve the delivery, you write these characters on a crust of bread and you tie it to the right thigh¹²⁴, ⊙ X H, and after she has delivered, you unloose it quickly.’

Among the editors of *Mustio*, only Bolton includes these lines as part of the *Gynaecia*.¹²⁵ However, I do not believe that this annotation must to be considered as original of *Mustio*’s text, for four reasons. First, the recipe is not integrated into the main body of the text, but occupies the blank space beside the illustration of the uterus in f. 16v; it bears no connection to the content of that *folium*, which contains the initial questions of the *Gynaecia*,

¹²³ See also MARCHETTI (2017, 20).

¹²⁴ For the late meaning of *coxa* as ‘thigh’, see for example ADAMS (2007, 483–484) and ADAMS (2013, 788).

¹²⁵ BOLTON (2015, 146–147).

concerning the midwife's qualifications and the anatomy of the uterus. Second, at a closer examination of the manuscript, particularly concerning the vowels <a> and <e>, the text of the recipe can be recognised as written by a different hand than the one responsible for copying Mustio's text. Third, the use of *de* + ablative (*de pane*) to specify the material of the crust does not align with the *usus scribendi* of Mustio, which consistently employs the genitive in such contexts, like in *sucum alicae, fomentatio olei calidi, suco faeni greci, etc...* Finally, neither Mustio nor Soranus includes amulets or magical practices in their medical prescriptions; on the contrary, they make a point in distancing themselves from the superstitions of the *antiqui*, advocating instead for rational and empirical approaches. The inclusion of an amulet recipe in the text, without any commentary, would therefore be incongruous with the tone and content of the *Gynaecia*.

XII. Ubi ergo iacet orificium matricis? In medio sinu mulieris.

XIII. Quod ipse sinus? Membrarum neruosum maioris intestini simile est. Intus autem est spatiosissimus, foris uero angustus; in quo coitus uirorum et usus uenerius efficitur; quem uulgus connum appellat; cuius foris labia graece pterigomata dicuntur latine pinnacula dicta sunt et a superiore parte descendit in medio landica.

XIV. Quantum a pinnaculis recessit et retro est orificium matricis? Non omnibus quidem aequaliter sed per differentiam aetatis et naturae; uerum tamen quinque uel sex digitis.

XII. orrificium *L non legitur in B | sinum BL XIII.* quia *B | membrarum B membrarorum L | simile corr. Rose similes B similis L simili H | est om. B | spatiosissimuo B spatiosissimis L | fors L | angustus corr. Rose congestum BL coniunctum H | quo om. BH | quae B que H | cunnum L | uulgo H | appellant BH | ante cuius foris add. quid est enim signis muliebris H | graece corr. Rose*

greci *B* grece *LH* | pterigomata *corr. Rose* epterigomata *B* epter-g-mata *L*
 ΠΘεΡΥΓΩΗΛΛΗ *H* | dicunt *B om. H* | latini *B* a latini *L* | dicti *B* | superiore]
 rumparione *L* | descendit *corr. descend B descendens LH* | -n medi- *L* |
 ΛΑΝαΥΚΛ (*i.e. landica*) *H* dicta est laudica *B* landica dicta est *L* | *post* landica
add. ipsa B XIV. Quantum ... sex digitis] om. L | quantum ... matricis] unium
 a pinnacular [*hic plurima uerba legere non potui*] *B* | *post* quantum *add. ergo*
H | *ante* pinnaculis *suppl. a Rose* | equaliter *H* | differentia *B* | etatis *H* | nature
H | uerum] uel *H*.

Translation:

XII. Where does the orifice of the matrix lie? In the middle of the vagina.

XIII. What is the vagina? It is a sinewy membrane, similar to the high intestines. It is very wide inside, while very narrow outside; in there take place male ejaculation and intercourse; the people call it *cunnum*; its external labia are called *pterigomata* in Greek and *pinnacula* in Latin and the clitoris comes down from the top of it towards the middle.

XIV. How far inside from the labia in the matrix' orifice? It is not the same in everyone but according to variation of age and nature; however, usually five or six fingers.

Rose (1882; 8, 14–9, 11):

12. Ubi ergo iacet orificium matricis?

In medio sinus muliebris.

12a. Quid ipse sinus muliebris?

Membranam neruosum maioris intestini simile. Intus autem est spatiosissimus, foris uero angustus, in quo coitus uirorum et usus uenerius efficitur. Quem uulgo cunnum appellant. Cuius foris labra graece pterigomata dicuntur, latine pinnacula dicta sunt, et a superiore parte descendens in medio dicta est landica.

13. Quantum a pinnaculis recessit et retro est orificium matricis?

Non omnibus quidem aequaliter, sed per differentiam aetatis et naturae, plerumque tamen quinque uel sex digitis.

Commentary:

Membranum – it is the reading of H, while B records *membrarum* and L *membranorum*. According to the citations listed in the ThLL, the term seems to be highly technical, usually referring to a bodily membrane in the body and occasionally to parchment; even if the feminine form *membrana*, *-ae* is more commonly attested, the neuter form *membranum*, *-i* also appears in later Latin.¹²⁶

descendit – this is my emendation; L&H read *descendens* and B *descend*. Accepting the present participle in conjunction with the verb *dicta est* (as found in B&L and as adopted by Rose) creates only an apparent parallel with the preceding verb *dicta sunt*, since the parallelism is already established in the rather fixed construction *graece vs latine*. I suggest restoring the present indicative *descendit*, which better corresponds with the spatial indication provided by *a superiore parte*.

sinu – it is the reading of H; B and L have *sinum*. Rose edits *sinus*, while both Medert and Bolton adopt the reading of H. I follow their decision, as in the other passages of the *Gynaecia* where the expression *in medio sinu* occurs, all manuscripts consistently support the ablative case.¹²⁷

Quantum a pinnaculis recessit orificium matricis? – The manuscript tradition of this question is highly fragmented. Only H transmits a coherent version: *quantum ergo pinnaculis recessit et retro est orificium matricis*. L does not preserve anything; and B is largely illegible, except for the phrase *unium a pinnacula iuc- - - imm - itmoes t*. I propose reconstructing the first part of the question as *quantum a pinnaculis*, adopting the ablative from H and the

¹²⁶ See HOFMANN 1939. *membrāna*, *-ae* f. (*-um* n.: l. 79). Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1939, Vol.8. 0, pp. 628-631. Available from: https://tll-degruyter-com.ezproxy.its.uu.se/article/8_0_4_membrana_v2007.

¹²⁷ SORAN. 114, 14; 116, 13.

preposition *a/ab* from B. The term *unium* in B may derive from a misreading of *quantum*. The second part is more problematic. B offers no useful material for reconstruction. Starting from the reading of H, *-imm-* in B might correspond to the end and the beginning of *orificium matricis*, with the <i> as a misreading of one of the lines of <u>. There is no trace of *recessit et in retro est* in B. It is evident that a verb indicating movement away from something is needed, and I therefore accept *recessit* from H, while omitting *et retro est*, which appears redundant.

uerum – reading of B; L has no corresponding text and H reads *uel*. The abbreviated forms of *uerum* and *uel* could be easily confused. In Mustio's *usus*, *uel* rarely appears in the correlative structure *uel [...] uel*, while in contrast *uerum* is more frequently employed, sometimes even as a filler word at the beginning of a sentence. I therefore opt to edit *uerum* instead of *uel*.

XV. Quale est ipsum orificium matricis? Apud uirgines quidem quae deuirginatae non sunt pulposum et molle est, apud mulieres autem quae iam pepererunt spatiosius et callosissimum est.

XVI. Qua magnitudine est orificium cum est conclusum? Sicuti est a foris nouissima pars auriculae, ita formatum est.

XV. qualis L | *post est add. enim H* | *orificium non legitur in B* | *uirginis B* | *quidam B om. H* | *que H* | *deuirginatae corr. Rose uirginitate B deuirginitate B'* de uirginitate L *deuirginitate H* | *non om. BH* | *pulposam et mollem H* | *post apud add. autem B* | *qui B que H* | *etiam B tam L* | *pepererunt corr. peperint BL pepereunt H* | *spatiosius corr. Rose spatiosium B spatiosus L spatiosum H* **XVI.** *Qua magnitudine ... formatum est*] *om. H* | *qua corr. Rose quam B quo L* | *magni[hic pluras litteras legere non potui] B* | *est ... conclusum*] in *orificium post conclusionem XL dierum B* | *orificium corr. Rose tecum L* | *sic uti B*

Translation:

XV. How is the matrix' orifice? Among young girls that have not been deflowered it is fleshy and soft, among women that have already given birth it is wide and very callous.

XVI. What is the size of the orifice? From outside it is like the external part of the ear.

Rose (1882; 9, 12–9, 18).

14. Quale est ipsum orificium matricis?

Apud uirgines quidem quae deuirginatae non sunt, pulposum et molle est, apud mulieres autem quae iam pepererint, spatiosius et callosissimum est.

15. Qua magnitudine est orificium cum est conclusum?

Sicuti est a foris nouissima pars auriculae.

Commentary:

pepererunt – the perfect tense is my emendation; the manuscripts have *peperint* (B) *peperint* (L) and *pepereunt* (H). Rose corrected the form to the future perfect *pepererint*.

Qua magnitudine est orificium cum est conclusum? – the manuscript tradition of this question is problematic. Manuscript H omits the passage entirely; B has *quam magni--- in orificium post conclusionem XL dierum*, and L reads *quo magnitudine est tecum cum est conclusum*. Rose edited the text of L, correcting *quo* to *qua* and *tecum* to *orificium*, since the following text in B&L pertain to the dimensions of the matrix orifice. However, the manuscript tradition clearly displays a disruption at this point, indicated by the absence of the passage in H and the discrepancies in the texts of B and L. In particular, the reading *tecum* of L is especially difficult to justify.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ Professor Arsenio Ferraces Rodriguez suggested to read in *est tecum* the word *estericum*, as *ὄστερικόν* 'of the matrix', which will be a variation instead of the regular *matricis* found in Mustio. This does not agree with the *usus* of Mustio: a Greek term in the *Gynaecia* is rather

XVII. Testiculi mulierum ubi sunt positi? Prope ad ceruicem matricis ex utraque parte singuli positi; et sunt rotundi, in aliquantum ad bases suas latiores et graciles, ut cicera.

XVIII. Et spermaticus meatus per quos mulieres semen excludunt ubi sunt positi? Iuxta matricis latera, et per testiculos singulos exeuntes ad uesicae col- lum iunguntur.

XVII. *intra mulierum et positi plurima uerba legere non potui in B | positus H | ad om. H | ceruice H | matric B | partes H om. B | singuli positi om. H | et sunt rotundi ... graciles] Positione uero quales sunt? Rotundi sunt et minores et molliores quam masculi H | uases L | post latiores add. corpore L | ut cicera corr. et thicea B et cyyceas L* **XVIII.** *Spermaticus corr. Rose spatu B sputito L om. H | per om. H | quos corr. quam BLH | ubi] et BL | positi om. H | post latera add. positi sunt H | par L | ante per testiculos add. Que sunt orificia matricis. Orificia H | testiculus singulus B om. H | uesicae corr. Rose uissice B uessice L uessice H*

Translation:

XVII. Where are the women's testicles placed? They are placed at the cervix of the matrix, one for each side; and they are rounded, a bit wider at the base and thin.

XVIII. And where are the spermatic conducts through which females expel the seed placed? Next to the matrix sides, and they come out from a testicle each and are connected to the neck of the bladder.

Rose (1882; p.10, l. 1 – p. 10, l. 8):

16. Testiculi mulierum ubi sunt positi?

explained or, when used without explanation, it is because it's part of the vocabulary that should have been well known by a practitioner of medicine; one might argue that this was the case for *ὄσπερικόν*: however, the construction with *matricis* is the only one used by Mustio in every other occasion, and *esticum*, which will still need *orificium* to be completed, will be the only trace of the occurrence of the expression.

Prope ad ceruicem matricis ex utraque parte singuli positi <sunt>, et sunt rotundi, in aliquantum ad bases suas latiores corpore et graciles.

17. Quid est spermaticus meatus?

Per quem mulieres semen excludunt. Et sunt positi iuxta matricis latera, et per testiculos singulos exeuntes ad uesicae collum iunguntur.

Commentary:

ut cicera – it is my emendation for the manuscript readings, respectively *et ticea* (B) and *et cyceas* (L); H doesn't not preserve the passage. The expression may be interpreted as an exemplification of *rotundi*, 'round as chickpeas', particularly when compared to the Greek text, which reads *ψαθαροὶ καὶ ἀδενώδεις*.¹²⁹ However, the insertion of *in aliquantum ad bases suas latiores et graciles* between *rotundi* and *ut cicera* somewhat disrupts the comparison. I believe that this matter is still in need of further research.

Et spermaticus [...] ubi sunt positi? – Rose, Medert and Bolton consider only *spermaticus meatus* as part of the interrogative, supplementing it with the addition of *quid est*. I propose that the transmitted text can be understood as a complete interrogative, accepting *ubi* from H instead of *et* from B&L. This choice also mirrors the structure of the previous question *Testiculi mulierum ubi sunt positi?* The inclusion of the relative clause *per quos mulieres semen excludunt* does not appear problematic, as Mustio is introducing the term *spermaticus meatus* for the first time and wants to clarify its meaning for the readers. Although the manuscripts uniformly read *quem*, I correct it to *quos*, since *meatus* is plural in this context.

spermaticus – is Rose's correction. Manuscript H omits the term, while B and L contain *spatu* and *sputitu* respectively. *Spermaticus* can be reconstructed through the comparison with Soranus' Greek text, which uses

¹²⁹ SORAN. 1.4.90 B.-G.-M.

σπερμᾶτικός, ‘seminal’, adjective of πόρος, here translated as *meatus*, a term also found in H.

2.3 *Explicit liber primus. Incipit liber secundus*¹³⁰

I Ad tussiculam eorum quid damus? Semine lini, amygdalis, suco gliquiritiae et draganto utimur electuariis ex melle.

II Quid est ualitudo quae apud infantes siriasis appellatur? Cerebri est feruor cum miningis, ita ut occipitium infantis concauum fiat cum igneis et feruentissimis febribus.

III Si uero uenter infantis <fuerit solutus> quid facimus? Si adhuc lactatur omnia quae adstringere possunt ei et nutrici eius damus, epythima scilicet quod de palmulis et lenticula constat inducimus. Si uero plurimis diebus non fuerit assellatus, mulsa et olera quae uentrem mollire possunt etiam mammae dabimus.

IV Hactenus de Cata gynaecion transtulimus et, quoniam omnium ualitudinum speciales curas non habent quas uel maxime obsetrices nosse conuenit, placuit ut ad gynaecia <ex> Dia iatrico conferamus. Inde enim plena omnium causarum cura insinuari potest.

Explicit liber primus.

I CXXIII AD TUSSICULA *B* CXXII Ad Tussicula *L* | *post* tussiculam *add.* uero *H* | dabimus *H* | Semine ... Explicit liber primus] edima scilicet quod constat aut per fluxum uentris specialiter tamen habent sicuti i est uuluae praefocatio et sanguinis fluxus licet haec generalibus illis praedictis abscribi debent *B* eglima scilicet quod constat ut per fluxum uentris aut per os digerat. Specialiter tamen habent. Sicuti es uuluae profocatio et sanguinis fluxum. *L* | semine *corr.* Rose semen *H* | suco *corr.* Rose sucus *H* | electuariis] edima *B*

¹³⁰ Cf. ROSE (1882, 45,9–48.7).

eglima *L* (cf. *SORAN. 2.22.13 ἐκλείγμασιν*) **II** quae] que *H* | cerebris *H* **III**
 uenter *corr.* uentrem *H* | fuerit solutus *suppl.* | lactatur *corr.* lactat *H* | asel-
 latum *H'* | que *H'* **IV** Acteni *H* | *Cata Gynaecion corr. (cf. praef.)* catepero-
 tianis *H* | transdulerimus *H* | genecia *H* | *post gynaecia suppl. ex* | *Dia iatri-*
con corr. triaconitadas *H (cf. Dia iatrica tractatu in praef.)* | omnium um *H*.

Translation:

I. What do we give them for coughs? We use emollient cough drops made honey, with flaxseeds, almonds, liquorice juice and dragon lily.

II. What is the disease of babies that is called siriasis? It is an inflammation of the brains together with the meninges, so that the nape of the baby gets concave, with burning and very high fevers.

III. What do we do if the bowels of the baby are loose? If it is still breastfed, we give to its wetnurse all the things that have an astringent action, and we apply for sure compresses that are made of dates and lentils; if it has not defecated for several days, we will give to the wetnurse water with honey and the vegetables that can lose the bowels.

IV. Until here we have translated according to the *Cata Gynaecion* and, since they don't have all the special treatments for all the diseases that it is fundamental for the midwives to know, I wanted to turn to the gynaecological sections of the *Dia iatrica*. From them in fact the complete treatment of all conditions can be added.

Rose (1882, 45, 9–46, 8):

139. Ad tussiculam eorum quid damus?

[<Ex> semine lini amygdalis suco gliquiritiae et draganto utimur electuariis et melle.

140. Quid est ualitudo quae apud infantes siriasis appellatur?

Cerebri est feruor cum miningis, ita ut occipitium infantis concuum fiat, cum igneis et feruentissimis febribus.

141. Si uero uentrem infans soluerit quid faciemus?

Si adhuc lactat, omnia quae adstringere possunt et nutrici eius damus] epithima scilicet quod constat [de palmulis et lenticula inducimus. Si uero plurimis diebus non fuerit assellatum, mulsam et omnia quae uentrem mollire possunt etiam mammae dabimus.

Hactenus de cateperotianis transtulimus. Et quoniam omnium ualitudinum speciales curas non habent, quas uel maxime obstetrices nosse conuenit, placuit ut ad gynaecia triacontados conferamus. Inde enim plena omnium cura insinuari potest.

EXPLICIT LIBER PRIMUS.

Commentary:

A part from the interrogative *Ad tussiculam eorum quid damus?* which is shared by all three manuscripts, the rest of the text of the questions I–IV is transmitted only by H. Questions I, II and III are related the material found in Soranus; however, while I and II appear to be abridged versions of the corresponding chapters in the Greek text, question III expands upon the content of the *Γυναικεῖα*, incorporating remedies not found in the Greek source. Question IV corresponds to the *explicit* of the first book, and it is particularly complex for two reasons: it is the only ambiguous reference of the existence of a *liber primus* and a *liber secundus*, and it includes terms edited by Rose as *cateperotiana* and *triacontados*. For a detailed discussion on these terms, I refer the reader to section 2.1, which addresses the introduction to the *Gynaecia*.

Instead of questions I–IV found in H, B&L transmit a different and shorter text: *edima scilicet quod constat aut per fluxum uentris specialiter tamen habent sicuti i est uuluae praefocatio et sanguinis fluxus licet haec generalibus illis praedictis abscribi debent* in B and *eglima scilicet quod constat ut per fluxum uentris aut per os digerat. Specialiter tamen habent. Sicuti es uuluae profocatio et sanguinis fluxum* in L. My impression is that a gap affected the branch of the tradition represented by B&L, and that the confused text preserved by these manuscripts is the remnant of what survived the lacuna. I do not believe it to be the result of a copyist's attempt to fill the gap with new

material, as the passage lacks internal coherence and logical progression. Nonetheless, some conclusions can be drawn regarding the different components of this section. The portion *edima/eglima [...] constat* may have an equivalent in the text of H, as discussed further in the commentary. The expressions *aut per fluxum uentris* (B) and *ut per fluxum uentris aut per os digerat* (L) may relate to the section in Soranus concerning air in the infant's bowels, titled *Περὶ ῥευματισμοῦ κοιλίας*, which can be translated as *De fluxu uentris*; this Greek section corresponds to question III - *Si uero uenter infantis <fuerit solutus> quid facimus?* – a text transmitted only by H in a more complete form than the two brief excerpts in B and L. Moreover, H's version includes additions not found in the Greek *Γυναικεῖα*, suggesting that textual corruption may have occurred even before the gap in B&L, or that it actually affected the entire tradition of the Latin text at an earlier stage, prior to the bifurcation into the B&L and H branches. It is possible that the two manuscript groups preserve either different passages or distinct portions of the same, now lacunose, one.

Regarding the following sections in B (*specialiter tamen habent [...] abscribi debent*) and in L (*Specialiter tamen habent. Sicuti es uuluae profocatio et sanguinis fluxum*), I suggest that they may be linked to the opening section of book III in Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*, where the author reports the ongoing discussion on whether or not women suffer from conditions specific to their own sex, *Εἰ ἔστιν ἴδια πάθη γυναικῶν*.¹³¹ In this introductory chapter, Soranus presents the opinion of medical authorities who affirm the presence of conditions peculiar to women – such as the Empiricists, Diocles, Demetrius of Apamea et alii – and those who deny it, including Herophilus and the Asclepiadeans and, eventually, himself, thinking that women, having the same nature of men, and the same structure of atoms and channels, even in their peculiar functions

¹³¹ SORAN. 3.1.

are affected by the same general conditions, showing only different and specific symptoms:

ὅσον μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναβεβηκόσι, κοινῶς τοῖς ἄρρεσι νοσεῖ τὸ θῆλυ στεγνοπαθοῦν καὶ ρευματιζόμενον ὀξέως ἢ χρονίως τὰς τε αὐτὰς τῶν καιρῶν διαφορὰς ὑπομένον καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς νόσου καὶ τὴν ἀτονίαν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις, ἔλκεσί τε καὶ τραύμασι, διαφορὰς; ὅσον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς κατὰ μέρος καὶ εἰδικὴν ἔχουσι τὴν παραλλαγὴν, ἰδίως κέχρηται πάθεσι, τουτέστιν συμπτωμάτων χαρακτηρησι διαφόροις. ὅθεν καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν κατὰ γένος ἄγεται θεραπείαν, ὅπερ πλατύτερον διὰ τῶν ἐξῆς ῥηθησομένων ἔσται κατανοῆσαι.¹³²

‘For about the general conditions, the female suffers from the same diseases as the male, from constriction or flux, acutely or chronically, she submits to the same changings of the seasons, and to the gradation of the disease and to lack of energies, and to all the differences in external bodies and sores and injuries; only when there are specific and peculiar variations, she is subjected to conditions peculiar to her gender, i.e. different sets of symptoms. For this reason, she receives a treatment of the same type [as males], which will become clearer with the following explanations.’

The readings of B and L may preserve a fragment of a section that sought to report Soranus’ position, especially his concluding remarks, which acknowledge the existence of some peculiar conditions in women (*specialiter tamen habent*), exemplified through the mention of two different diseases (i.e. *uuluae praefocatio/profocatio* and *sanguinis fluxum*), but ultimately reported to the general therapeutic dichotomy of *strictura* and *fluxum*, subtly evoked by the choice of a condition associated with constriction (uterine suffocation) and one with flux (blood discharge). This interpretation may also underlie Rose’s decision to place the aforementioned passage of B&L at the beginning of the second book – a placement that I follow. Medert likewise considers it

¹³² SORAN. 3.1.91–3.1.100.

the beginning of *Gynaecia*'s second book, and appears to view it as contrasting with the passage *Quoniam ergo [...] sumere*, found only in H before the first chapter of the second book, *De retentione menstruarum*. Although the Latin edition published in 1997 by Hess includes both passages, a footnote at the end of the text defines them as 'transitional recapitulation' transmitted solely by H, a manuscript where 'the mutilated beginning of Book two is missing'.¹³³

After this brief overview on the tradition of the final passage of book one, we can more confidently assert that a textual gap occurred at this point – possibly at a very early stage in the transmission. On the one hand, B&L do not register a proper division in *liber primus* and *liber secundus*, but may preserve traces of the initial discussion about conditions peculiar to women, that Soranus wrote at the beginning of the book dealing with what Mustio considers *causae praeter naturam*. On the other hand, the tradition represented by H does report a division in two books, and offers a faithful summary of the final sections on infant care, but lacks the introductory analysis found in Soranus.

Semine [...] ex melle – in manuscript H, the passage contains the nominatives *semen* and *sucus*, and *et melle* at the end. Rose, followed by Medert, emends to the ablatives forms *semine*, *amygdalis*, *suco* and *draganto*, and connects them adding the preposition <ex>. While I agree with the use of the ablative, I consider the addition of the preposition superfluous: the ablative alone may suffice to denote the ingredients involved in the preparation of emollient cough drops called *ἐκλείγματα*, described by Soranus:

Βήσσοντος δὲ τοῦ βρέφους, τοῖς διὰ στροβιλίων καὶ ἀμυγδάλων φρυκτῶν
καὶ λινοσπέρμου καὶ γλυκυρρίζης χυλοῦ καὶ πιτυῖδων καὶ τραγακάνθης καὶ
μέλιτος σκευαζομένοις ἐκλείγμασιν χρώμεθα [...].¹³⁴

¹³³ HESS (1997, 257); *Diese überleitende Rekapitulation wird nur von der jüngsten Hs h überliefert, in der dafür der verstümmelte Anfang des II. Buches fehlt.*

¹³⁴ SORAN. 2.22.10 – 2.22.14.

‘When the baby coughs, we use emollient compresses made of pine cones and almond nuts and flaxseeds and liquorice juice and pine seeds and tragacanth and honey [...].’

However, the situation of *melle* is distinct. The preposition *ex*, as transmitted by H, should be retained: comparative analysis with other Latine recipe collections reveals that honey is not merely one interchangeable ingredient among others, but rather the essential binding agent, the foundational substance of the cough drops.

Rose’s Latin edition has *electuariis* as the translation of *ἐκλείγματα*, following the reading of H, the sole witness to this part of the text. However, in manuscripts B and L – although the overall text is incoherent – appear the terms *edima* and *eligma* respectively, which resemble Latin transliterations of the Greek *ἐκλείμμα(τα)* found in Soranus. These may be considered variant readings as corresponding to the passage in H. According to the ThLL, the term appears in medical texts as *ecclima, -atis*.¹³⁵

si uero uenter infantis fuerit solutus [...] – H reads *uentrem* followed by a lacuna where the verb should appear. Rose, followed by Medert, emends the phrase to *uentrem infans* and inserts *soluerit*. However, the active construction *uentrem soluere* is rare, and it does not seem to recur, in medical and technical texts, with the patient as the subject (here, the *infans*), but rather with the agent, e.g. a remedy. For example Pliny writes *sucus decocti [cichorii] uentrem soluit*¹³⁶ and the *Mulomedicina Chironis* states *haec potio et excaefacit et cibum dabit et uentrem soluit*.¹³⁷ I suggest to correct *uentrem* in *uenter*, a plausible scribal confusion akin to *infans* vs *infantis*, to retain *infantis* as a genitive connected to *uenter*, and to use a passive form for *soluo*, particularly *fuerit solutus*, which aligns with Mustio’s preferred construction for the

¹³⁵ Rubenbauer (1931). *eccligma, -atis* n. In Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, 5(2), 47–48. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. https://tll.degruyter.com/article/5_2_1_eccligma_v2007.

¹³⁶ PLIN. nat. 20,74.

¹³⁷ CHIRON. 3,217.

passive future perfect.¹³⁸ Even if this exact sequence is not attested elsewhere, passages like *uentem debet solui* in Celsus¹³⁹ and Vegetius¹⁴⁰ support its plausibility. If a substance can *uentrem soluere*, it is only logical that then *uentem solutus fuerit* by something.

lactatur – the active form of *lactat* with *infans* as subject does not occur in Mustio's text. Instead, we find constructions such as *Si alia [mulier] lactauerit* or *infans lactari debet*.¹⁴¹ The passive form is therefore preferable, and may be explained by the omission of the tachygraphic sign for *-tur* in the manuscript tradition.

scilicet quod [...] constat – manuscripts B&L preserve only the phrase *scilicet quod constat*, which may correspond to this section in H. Rose seems to consider *edima* (B) and *eglima* (L) as part of this passage, as alternative readings for *epythima* in H. However, as previously noted, *ecglima* is a synonym for *electuaria*, found in the question concerning *tussicula*, and the readings in B and L might be more appropriate situated there.

assellatus – manuscript H reads *asellatum*, in the left margin of the f. 9v, but given that *infans* is always masculine in the *Gynaecia* I prefer the emendation *assellatus*, also adopted by Medert.¹⁴²

olera – it is the reading of H, which includes the marginal addition *asellatum mulsa et olera que uentrem mollire possunt* in the right margin of f. 9v. These words are written in a different hand and script (Caroline minuscule rather than Beneventan), suggesting an addition from another hand. Rose corrects *olera* in *omnia*, probably based on the broader range of remedies prescribed by the Greek text in this section. However, *olera*, is well attested in

¹³⁸ See for example *fuerit assellatus* a few lines below.

¹³⁹ CELS. 3, 25.

¹⁴⁰ VEG. mulom. 2,80,1.

¹⁴¹ SORAN. 27, 14; 38, 7.

¹⁴² See for example the occurrences of *infans* in section 2.4; HESS (1998, 220).

medical literature, and, alongside *mulsa*, may represent a specific elaboration added by Mustio.

ad gynaecia – I understand *gynaecia* here as referring to the section of gynaecology of the *Dia iatrica*, the treatise used by Mustio as source of the second book of his *Gynaecia*. For the full discussion about this name, and the other problematic term *Cata gynaecion* (Rose's *cateperotiana*), I refer the reader to the section 2.1 about the introduction to the *Gynaecia*.

V Incipit liber secundus.

[...] Specialiter tamen habent sicuti id est uuluae praefocatio et sanguinis fluxus; licet haec generalibus illis praedictis abscribi debent. [...]

VI Quae sunt ergo ualitudines mulierum quae per stricturam fieri solent? Retentio menstruarum, feruor matricis, tensio et inflatio et tumor, duritia et uuluae praefocatio.

VII Quae sunt quae per fluxum? Ipsius sanguinis fluxus et gonorrhoea.

Quoniam ergo posuimus quod omnes eorum ualitudines aut per stricturam fiunt aut per fluxum et illae priores curandae sunt quae per stricturam occurrunt – hoc est menstruarum retentio uel cum dolore exitus, feruor matricis et tensio, inflatio et tumor, callositas orificii et clusurae, uuluae praefocatio quam ystericen pñiga Graeci dicunt – placuit ab ipsis principium sumere.

De retentione menstruarum

uel quotiens guttatim et cum dolore purgantur.

VIII Quid differt retentio menstruarum ab ea quae guttatim purgatur? Quod in retentione in totum nihil occurrit et in hac modicum.

IX Quid differt ea quae in totum non purgatur ab illa quae retentionem menstruarum habet? Quod haec res ualitudinem ostendit. Non purgari autem et secundum natura occurrere solet.

V. *post* secundus *add.* De retentio menstruarum H | Specialiter ... fluxus *om.* H | sicut L | id *corr.* i B *om.* L | profocatio L | sanguinis fluxum L | licet ... debent *om.* HL VI *ante* quae *add.* CXXIII B CXXIII L | Que sunt H | qui per B que per H | scriptura B strictura L | solet L | retensione H | *post* tensio *om.* et H | *post* inflatio *suppl.* et | duriciae B | profocatio L prefocatio H VII *ante* quae *add.* CXXV B CXXIII L | Que sunt que H | fluxu L | ipsius *om.* BL | flexus B fertur L | et gonorrhea *om.* BL | Quoniam ergo ... principum sumere *om.* BL; *post* occurrere solet *exhibet* H, *in hunc locum transp.* | *posuimus corr.* Rose *posuimus* H | quod *corr.* Rose qui H | aut per stricturam] per *suppl.* Rose | illae *corr.* Rose ille H | curandae *corr.* Rose curande H | quae *corr.* Rose que H | occurrunt *corr.* occurrent H | retentio *corr.* Rose retensio H | clusurae *corr.* clusuras H | uulvae *corr.* Rose uulue H | ystericen pniga *corr.* Rose miseri centinita H | Graeci *corr.* Rose greci H | De retentioe ... purgantur *in hunc locum transp.*, *post* occurrere solet *exhibent* BL, *post* principium sumere *exhibet* H VIII *ante* De retentioe *add.* CXXVI B CXXV L | quotiens] cociens B | differet BL | retentionem L retensio H | ab ea ... purgatur *om.* H | purgantur L | qui H | ex totum L | occurret BH | in hac modicum] admodum B admodicum L | hac *corr.* Rose ac H IX quid] quidem LH | differret B differet L | purgantur H | ab illa que H | retentio B retensione L | qui ac res H | ualitudinera B uelitudinem H | *post* autem *om.* et BH |

Translation:

V. The second book starts.

[...] however, they have in particular like for example the suffocation of the womb and the blood flux; and also, these have to be attributed to the general conditions mentioned above. [...]

VI. Which are the conditions of women that might occur due to constriction? The retention of the menstruation, inflammation of the uterus, tension and inflation, swelling, hardening and suffocation of the uterus.

VII. Which are those due to flux? The blood flux indeed, and gonorrhoea.

Since we have established that all their conditions occur whether due to constriction or to flux and that the former, that occur due to constriction – i.e. menstruation's retention, or discharge with pain, inflammation of the uterus and tension, inflation, and swelling, callouses of the orifice and obstruction, uterus' suffocation that the Greeks call *ysterice pnix* – must be treated first, we wanted to start from these.

**About the retention of the menstruation
or when [women] menstruate with difficulty and pain**

VIII. What is the difference between the retention of the menstruation and she who menstruate with difficulty? That in the retention comes no blood whatsoever while for her only a small quantity.

IX. What is the difference between her who does not menstruate at all and her who has the retention of the menstruation? That the latter indicates a disease, while not to menstruate at all can happen also according to nature.

Rose (1882, 47,1–48,7):

INCIPIIT LIBER SECUNDUS

... aut per fluxum [uentris]. Specialiter tamen habent, sicuti est uuluae praefocatio et sanguinis fluxus, licet haec generalibus illis praedictis adscribi debent.

(142.) Quae sunt ergo ualitudines mulierum quae per stricturam fieri solent?

Retentio menstruarum, feruor matricis, tensio et inflatio, tumor, durtia et uuluae praefocatio.

(143.) Quae sunt quae per fluxum?

Ipsius sanguinis fluxus et gonorrhoea.

(144.) Quid differt retentio menstruarum ad ea quae guttatim purgatur?

Quod in retentione in totum nihil occurrit et in hac modicum.

(145.) Quid differt ea quae in totum non purgatur ab illa quae retentionem menstruarum habet?

Quod haec res ualitudines ostendit, non purgari autem et secundum naturam occurrere solet.

[Quoniam ergo posuimus quod omnes earum ualitudines aut per stricturam fiunt aut per fluxum, et illae priores curandae sunt quae per stricturam occurrunt, hoc est menstruarum retentio uel cum dolore exitus, feruor matricis et tensio, inflatio et tumor, callositas orificii et clusura, et uuluae praefocatio quam ystericen pniga Graeci dicunt, placuit ab ipsis principium sumere.]

Commentary:

specialiter [...] debent – see the commentary above, at pp. 105–108.

Quae sunt ergo [...] gonorrhoea – these two questions are transmitted by all the three main manuscripts, and they seem to function as a summary of the *praeter naturam* conditions that will be examined in the subsequent chapters; these conditions are categorised according to *strictura* and *fluxus*, the two fundamental commonalities in the Methodist theory.¹⁴³ However, the questions do not refer to material found in the Greek *Γυναικεῖα*, nor do they align with the actual content of the Latin *Gynaecia*. The lists of *causae* are incomplete and do not reflect chapter arrangements in Mustio’s text, which does not follow the *strictura/fluxus* dichotomy suggested by these questions; instead, Mustio’s structure more closely resemble that of Soranus, where *praeter naturam* conditions follow the natural progression of a woman’s sexual life – from conception to parturition – via uterine disfunctions and complications of labour.

feruor matricis – *feruor* and *feruura* are the two Latin terms employed by Mustio to denote bodily inflammation. Medert, following Ilberg’s theory that well educated speakers of Latin used *feruor* to translate the Greek *πύρωσις* and *feruura* to translate *φλεγμονή*, systematically emended Mustio’s text to conform to this model, even when such corrections diverge from manuscript

¹⁴³ See section 1.1.2.

tradition, or lack a clear Greek counterpart.¹⁴⁴ The transmission of *feruor* and *feruura* is problematic due to their visual similarity, especially in oblique forms (*feruurae/feruure* vs *feruore*), necessitating caution when drawing conclusions about language or content of a text based on these terms. Therefore, I prefer to adopt case by case the reading found in the majority of the manuscript, rather than follow an aprioristic theory. Nonetheless, the form *feruor matricis* is noteworthy, as uterine inflammation is always called *feruura matricis* in the chapter about the uterine inflammation,¹⁴⁵ and terminological variation in disease names is rare, given the high level of crystallisation of this category – for example, in the *Gynaecia*, we have only *uuluae praefocatio* and *praefocatio matricis*, and never the opposite disposition, i.e. *matrix praefocatio* and *praefocatio uuluae*.

sanguinis fluxus – the reading of the manuscripts are *flexus* (B), *fertur* (L) and *fluxum* (H). The list of conditions attributed to *fluxus* is even more imprecise than the one associated with *strictura*. Not only it is incomplete, but *sanguinis fluxus* lacks a direct counterpart in Mustio's following chapters; instead, the *Gynaecia* refers to *sanguinatio matricis*, a uterine haemorrhage resulting from miscarriage or trauma.

Quoniam ergo [...] principium sumere – this section is preserved only in manuscript H, where it follows the first questions on *retentio menstruarum*. It appears to engage with the list of conditions attributed to *strictura* and *fluxus* and I therefore propose relocating it to this context. Both Rose and Medert place it before the chapter *De retentione menstruarum*, although they do not associate questions VIII and IX with it. Bolton omits the passage entirely, as it is unique to H. However, the passage presents several anomalies: it repeats a list of conditions caused by *strictura* which seems redundant and diverges from the earlier enumeration. As previously noted, disease names in Mustio

¹⁴⁴ MEDERT (1911, 35).

¹⁴⁵ SORAN. 54, 3–57, 8.

tend to be fixed, yet here we encounter the unusual *menstruarum retentio* and a reference to *callositas orificii* which is absent elsewhere in the text. Instead, we find more general expressions as *collectiones quae in partibus mulibribus emergunt* and *condylomata in matrice positis*.¹⁴⁶ The passage concludes with the author's intention to begin analysing the conditions due to *strictura*, and the first chapter, on *retentio menstruarum*, indeed addresses such a case. However, as discussed, the sequence of topics follows a different logic the *strictura/fluxus* division, which is not referenced again in the *Gynaecia*.

This passage seems suspicious. A gap is likely to have occurred in B&L manuscript tradition, and this analysis suggests that a similar lacuna may exist also in H. We observe a section transmitted only by B and L, mirroring a passage in Soranus; then two questions (VI and VII) present in all the three main witnesses; and finally, a passage found only in H, which I believe should precede the analysis of the disease in *De retentione menstruarum*. Questions VI and VII, and the final section in H seem to present the same content – presumably original of Mustio – in two distinct forms. Incorporating one of them into the text would necessitate excluding the other.

I would prefer the expunction of the two questions, primarily because certain linguistic features in the H passage – such as the use of *placuit*, also found in the introduction – align with Mustio's stylistic tendencies; however, the questions are transmitted by all the three manuscripts, whereas the final passage appears only in one. The presence of a gap in this passage undermines any definitive judgement regarding the inclusion or exclusion of material; nonetheless, a reasonable degree of certainty can be achieved, based on the thematic division outlined in the first question of the *Gynaecia*. Moreover, the question-and-answer format reappears later in Mustio's text, notably in the following section and in the crucial chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*, for which I refer to section 2.4 below. A conclusive position on section of the

¹⁴⁶ SORAN. 96, 1–99, 19; SORAN. 107, 16–108, 2.

Gynaecia remains elusive, but this analysis underscores that some form of textual disruption has occurred, the full damage of which still remains unclear.

De retentione [...] purgantur – this reading is shared by all the three manuscripts, (with *cociens* in B instead of *quotiens*). It follows the first two questions on this topic, i.e. VII and IX; H anticipates *De retentio menstruarum* also after *incipit liber secundus*. I propose relocating the title before, and not after questions VII and IX, as the topic of amenorrhea is first introduced there, and its development continues in the following passage – the one transmitted after the title; the two sections are clearly connected and should not be separated:

(gr.7.) Multae sunt causae quae non purgari mulieres faciunt. Nam primo sunt quaedam quae nullam ualitudinem habentes naturaliter non purgantur. Aliae aetate impediuntur [...]. Aliae exercitio uocis sanguinis purgationem consumunt [...].¹⁴⁷

‘(gr.7.) There are many conditions that do not let women menstruate. First of all, there are some who do not menstruate naturally, without having any disease. Others are prevented by age [...]. Others again consume the blood of the menstruation in the exercise of the voice [...].’

Once again, we encounter the question-and-answer structure in the second book of the *Gynaecia*, where this format is not used anymore. It is plausible that uncertainty caused by the textual gap extends also to these initial passages of the chapter, especially given the illogical placement of the title itself.

2.4 *De difficili et laborioso partu*¹⁴⁸

I. DE DIFFICILI ET LABORIOSO PARTU. Quot sunt enim causae quibus laboriosus et difficilis partus efficitur? Plurimi duas causas esse dixerunt,

¹⁴⁷ SORAN. 48, 10.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. ROSE (1882, 76,20–81,5).

unam apud eam quae parit, alteram apud ipsum infantem qui nasci habet. Alii uero etiam tertiam causam addunt quae extrinsecus uenire consuevit. Apud alios etiam quarta causa emergit quae ex omnibus praedictis causis miscetur.

I ante DE add. CXLI B CLXL | difficillimi B | laboriosu H | partum L | quod B om. L | sint B | enim om. H | cause LH | ante causae add. modi uel H | post causae add. plurimae L | difficili L | post plurimi add. enim B | duas ... dixerunt om. BL | una BL | pquae B | parti LH | altera BL | ipsum] eum H | infantem om. H | que H | ali H | etiam] iam B iam iam L | tertiam B | addant B | que H | adsuevit H | alias B | post etiam add. uero H | que H

Translation:

I. ABOUT THE DIFFICULT AND DANGEROUS DELIVERY. How many are the reasons why a difficult and dangerous delivery can happen? Many say that there are two, one due to the woman who delivers, the other due to the baby to be born. Others however add another reason, that might come from external causes. Among others again a fourth reason occurs, that is a combination of all those mentioned.

Rose (1882, 76, 2–77, 3):

XVII De difficili et laborioso partu.

1. (53.) Quot sunt enim causae quibus laboriosus uel difficilis partus efficitur? Plurimi duas causas esse dixerunt, unam apud eam quae parit, alteram apud ipsum infantem qui nasci habet. Alii uero iam tertiam causam addunt quae extrinsecus uenire consuevit. Apud alios etiam quarta causa emergit, quae ex omnibus praedictis causis miscetur.

Commentary:

The chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* is illustrated with drawings in two of the three principal manuscripts of Mustio's tradition, the codices B and H. This chapter is also the most widely transmitted section of the entire *Gynaecia*,

having been extracted from its original context and copied into various other miscellanies and treatises. Notably, textual variation among the three main manuscripts is particularly pronounced in this section, often manifesting as the addition of content, typically with two manuscripts agreeing against a third. However, there is no discernible systematic pattern in these pairings. In most cases, the supplementary material aligns with the content of Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα* and it has therefore been retained in the edited text.

ipsum infantem – it is the reading found in the manuscript B, whereas L reads *eum infantem* and H just *eum*. The construction *is/ea/id* + noun occurs only once in Mustio, while *ipse/ipsa/ipsum* + noun is much more common.¹⁴⁹ In such contexts, *ipse* occupies a semantic space between its original emphatic sense ('the very thing') and its grammaticalised function approaching that of the definite article.

II. Quomodo dicunt per eam quae parit difficultatem partus emergere? Primum quidem aut si iracunda sit aut multum timida uel uerecunda aut primariola; corpore etiam uniuerso uel partibus impediatur: uniuerso, ut sit multum gracilis uel ualde pinguis uel muscolosa uel imbecille corpus habens; partibus autem ne forte eadem matrix in feruore sit uel aliquibus condylomatibus impediatur uel orificium eius angustum sit uel contortum uel ex parte conclusum uel in uicinitate aliae hemorroidae et collectiones sint uel in uessica lapis et in longaone stercorum retentio; his enim omnibus causis exitus infanti denegatur.

II ante Quomodo add. CXLII B CXLI L | ea BL | que H | difficultate BL | Primo H | quidem om. H | aut si] si aut H | iracundia B | multum] mulier B | uel partibus impediatur uniuerso om. BL | ut sit] aut BL | uel ualde] aut satis

¹⁴⁹ The only occurrence of *is* + noun is further on in the *De difficili et laborioso partu* chapter, see section 2.4; SORAN, 80, 12.

L | pingues *BL* | muscolosum *H* | inbicille *B* inbecillis *L* | corpus habens] habens corpus *H om. L* | partibus autem *om. L* | nec *L* | condylomatibus *corr. Rose* condolomatibus *B* condolomata *L* condilomatibus *H* | inpediatur *B* impeditur *H* | angustum *corr. Rose* congustum *BLH* | sit *om. H* | *post* angustum *add. et* conductum habeat *H* | sit uel] sit aut *L* | conturtum *H* | uel ex parte] aut ex parte *L* | uicinitatem *B* | aliae *corr. alias BL om. H* | hemorroidae *corr. emorroidas B* emorroydas *L* hemorrhoides *H* | sint *corr. esse BLH* | uel] et *BL* | uessica *corr. uisica B* uessicula *L* uesical *H* | lapis *corr. Rose* lapidem *BLH* | longaonem *H* | retentio *corr. Rose* retencionem *B* retentionem *L* retentionem *H* | has *L*

Translation:

II. In which way they say that the difficulty in the delivery occurs due to the woman who delivers? First is she is irascible or very shy and bashful, or primipara; then she might be prevented in her body or in her genital parts; in her body is she is very thin or too fat or muscular or if she has a numb body; in her genital parts is the uterus itself is inflamed or it is blocked by any condyloma or if the orifice is narrow or twisted or partially obtruded or there are other haemorrhoids or abscesses near-by, or a stone in the bladder or faeces' retention in the bowels; by all these things the exit of the baby can be impeded.

Rose (1882, 77, 4–77, 15):

2. (54) Quomodo dicunt per eam quae parit difficultatem partus emergere? Primum quidem si aut iracunda sit aut multum timida uel uerecunda aut primariola, corpore etiam uniuerso uel partibus inpediatur, uniuerso ut sit multum gracilis uel ualde pinguis uel muscosa uel inbicille corpus habens, partibus autem ne forte eadem matrix in feruore sit uel aliquibus condylomatibus inpediatur uel orificium eius angustum sit uel contortum uel ex parte conclusum, uel in uicinitate haemorrhoides et collectiones sint uel in uesica lapis et in longaone stercorum retentio. His enim omnibus causis exitus infanti denegatur.

Commentary:

uel partibus impediatur: uniuerso ut sit – H inserts this portion of text between *corpore etiam uniuerso* and *multum gracilis*. I follow Rose in including this addition, as it aligns with Mustio's *usus* to present a parallel between a problem *uniuerso corpore* and *partibus* — the latter typically referring euphemistically to the genital organs and/or the reproductive apparatus — prior to a more detailed analysis of both situations. See for example the pattern in these passages from the sections *De retentione menstruarum* and *De sterilitate*:

(gr.7) [...] Aliae uero sunt quae ualitudine aliqua aut uniuersi corporis aut partium non purgantur; uniuerso corpore ut sint tenues et syntecticae uel multum pingues et crassae, partibus uero inpediantur ut orificium matricis aliquando reclusum aut callosum habeant aut praecedente uulnere cicatrice duratum.¹⁵⁰

‘(gr.7) [...] There are others than that do not menstruate for an affliction, in the entire body or in their reproductive system; in the entire body if they are weak and consumptive, or very fat and plump, in their reproductive system if the matrix's orifice is closed or callous or hardened by the scar of a previous wound.’

(51.) [...] Haec ergo sterilitas efficitur cum aut masculus aut femina aliquam ualitudinem corporis habeant aliquando uniuersi, aliquando partium illarum conceptui necessariarum. Per uirum ergo conceptus inpeditur, cum omne corpus habeant in causa, praecedenti scilicet aliqua ualitudine chronia, ut inde semen ipsius tenue sit et aequatum [...]. Partibus autem uir inpediri solet, quotiens hypospadias est uel paratretus hoc est in latere balani cauernam habens per quem semen emittat.¹⁵¹

‘(51.) [...] This sterility occurs when both the male or the female have

¹⁵⁰ SORAN, 48, 19 – 49, 2.

¹⁵¹ SORAN, 75, 6 – 75, 16; 75, 18 – 75, 21.

any affliction, in the whole body or in those parts necessary for conception. Regarding the man, conception is prevented when they have their entire body affected by a disease, [...]. Then the man can be blocked in his parts, anytime there is hypospadias [...].’

angustum – it is the emendation of Rose, replacing the reading *congustum* of all three manuscripts; see the similar case of *angustia* in section 2.2.

hemorroidas – the readings of the manuscripts are *emorroidas* B, *emorroydas* L; *hemorroides* H. The ThLL records an enormous variety of writings for this term, stating that the most common ones are *(a)emorrois* and *hemorrois*, which correspond closely to the variants found in our manuscripts.¹⁵² As previously stated, my editorial approach to Greek loanwords is to favour the form closest to the original Greek, while also considering the complexities of adaptation and assimilation into Latin.¹⁵³ In this case, I maintain the initial <h> preserved by H and reconstruct the ending <-ae> to reflect the female nominative plural, which is required by the choice of the verb *sint* (see below), and is the form registered by the ThLL as common in Late authors like Theodorus Priscianus.

aliae hemorroidae et collectiones sint – the manuscript tradition has *alias emorroidas* (B)/*emorroydas* (L)/*hemorroides* (H) *et collectiones esse*. However, there is no reason for Mustio to change the type of subordinate in the middle of the period. I therefore adopt Rose’s conjecture, who edits the subjunctive *sint*, consistent with the preceding clause, and correcting the accusatives *lapidem* and *retentionem* to the nominatives *lapis* and *retentio*. For the same reason, the nominative *aliae hemorroidae* must also be restored.

¹⁵² RUBENBAUER. (1936). 1. *(h)(a)emorr(h)ois*, *-idis*. f., In *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online*, 6(3), 2492. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. https://tll-degruyter-com.ezproxy.its.uu.se/article/6_3_13_haemorrhais_1_v2007.

¹⁵³ See section 2.1.

III. Quomodo dicunt per infantem qui nasci habet difficillimum partum dari? Si naturaliter grande caput habeat uel omne corpus uel tres manus uel certe hydrops sit uel gibberosus uel languidus uel inflatus uel mortuus aut positione contra naturam.

III *ante* Quomodo *add.* CXLIII *B* CXLII *L* | pro infante *L* | partum *om.* *B* | dari] uenire *L* fieri *H* | Si] scilicet qui *B* aduenit autem per his qui *L* | habet *L* haber *H* | omnem *B* omnes *L* | uel certe] aut certe *BL* | ydrux *L* ydrops *H* | uel gibberosus ... uel mortuus *om.* *B* | gybberosus *L* | uel languidus uel] aut languidus aut *L* | postione *H* | *post* positione *add.* corporis sui *H* | naturae *B* natura *L* | *post* naturam *add.* inueniatur *H*

Translation:

III. In which way they say that the difficulty in the delivery occurs due to the baby to be born? If it is naturally big in the head or in the entire body or has three arms or if it suffers from dropsy or it is hunchbacked or numb or swollen or dead or in a position against nature.

Rose (1882, 77, 16–21):

3. (55.) Quomodo dicunt per infantem qui nasci habet difficillimum partum dari?

Scilicet qui naturaliter grande caput habeat uel omne corpus, uel tres manus, aut certe hydropicus sit uel gibberosus uel languidus aut inflatus uel mortuus aut positione contra naturam.

Commentary:

Si naturaliter – it is the reading of H. B has *scilicet qui*, chosen by Rose, Medert and also Bolton, and L has the longer *autem per his qui*. *Scilicet* is a common filler word in Mustio, appearing both at the beginning of sections or within the body of the text. However, it is not typically used in conjunction with a pronoun. By contrast, the hypothetical *si* is more appropriate for

introducing a list of characteristics, as seen in the previous passage. Nevertheless, I do not have sufficient grounds to strongly disagree with Rose's choice, and it is conceivable that the original text read *scilicet si naturaliter*, with *si* perhaps later confused for the tachygraphic sign for *qui* – a solution that will be even more consistent with Mustio's usage.

hydrops – it is the reading of B, while H has *ydrops* and L a form difficult to read resembling *ydroax*. Rose emendated the text to *hydropicus*, the more commonly attested term for a person affected by *hydrops* 'oedema, dropsy'; however, there are some late attestations of *hydrops* used to refer to the patient, as in Caelius Aurelianus among others. I therefore prefer to retain the manuscript reading.¹⁵⁴

IVa. Quot sunt enim et quae scemata quibus infantes nascuntur? Generalia quidem quattuor: in capite, uel in pedibus, uel in diuexum iacens, uel duplicatus; specialia autem scemata plurima inueniuntur. Ille enim qui in capite fertur; aliquando quidem caput in orificio matricis habet, reliquum autem corpus contortum; aliquando in capite quidem descendens aut in priore <parte> ab orificio aut retrorsum caput infigit, aut in diuexum se proicit. Et aliquando cum strictura haec scemata sunt, aliquando sine strictura. Aliquando etiam unam manum foris porrigit uel utrasque, reliqua pars intus iunctis pedibus inuenitur uel etiam ipsis patentibus. **IVb** Alio uero scemate quod in pedibus dicitur, aliquando descendens ita ut in directum in orificio matricis pedes habeat compositos et corpus habeat rectum manusque lateribus iunctas, aliquando in priore parte uel retrorsum ab orificio pedes infigit, aliquando unum pedem uel utrosque emittit manibus scilicet supra caput contortis, aliquando diuisis pedibus partibus matricis separatim infigit. **IVc.** Aliquando duplicatis pedibus in genua exire conatur; aliquando ita duplicatus ut sedenti similis naticas foris

¹⁵⁴ REHM. (1942). *hydrōps, -pis* m., In Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, 6(3), 3137–3138. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. https://tll-degruyter-com.ezproxy.its.uu.se/article/6_3_17_hydrops_v2007.

ostendat, uel contra ita duplicatus ut plantas capiti iunctas in orificio matricis inuenias. **IVd** Qui uero in diuexum iacet aliquando in latere aliquando supinus aliquando ad dentes inuenitur, <et> sic conduplicatus et in diuexum positum esse potest.

IVa. ante Quot add. CXLIII B CXLIII L | Quae B Quod L | enim et quae om. L | que H | scemate B scemates L | quibus om. BH | infantes nascuntur] infantum nascentium H | generaliter B | post quattuor add. genera hoc est B sunt id est L | post capite om. uel BL | in diuisum B in deuixum L | ia iacens H | uel duplicatus] aut duplicatus BL in duplicatum H | speciali H | quae L | feruntur L | post aliquando add. rectum H | capud H | in om. H | orificio corr. Rose orificium BLH | matrici L | relicum B | conturtum H | ante in capite add. aliquando H | descenden B | parte suppl. (cf. IVb.) | orificium BL | aut] autem BL | infigat BL | aut om. H | diuisum B deuexum L | pericit B | hac H | scemate BH | fiunt BH | aliquando sine strictura om. H | aliquando etiam] aut L | ante aliquando etiam add. hac B | una L | manus L | foras H | uel utrasque om. BL | reliqua pars BL | ante intus add. ita ut H | inuenitur ... in pedibus om. B | inuenitur corr. inueniatur LH | ipsi L **IVb.** scemate corr. scematae L scema H | quid H | dicitur om. BL | descendens ita ut] ita descendit ut H | post directum om. in BH | orificium BL | habeat] infigat B habent H | compositos ... habeat om. BL | habeat] habent H | rectus B rectos L | manumque L manibusque H | ante priore om. in L | priorem H | partem H | retrorsus H | ab] in L | orificium BL | pedes om. L | post infigit add. quod et ipsa B | aliquando unum pedem ... matricis infigit om. H | ante unum pedem add. etiam B | emittit corr. emittat L admittat B | scilicet] similiter L | ante diuisis pedibus add. etiam B | partibus om. L | separatim om. L | infigat L | post separatim infigat add. aliquando genus sostendat L **IVc.** per genua B | conetur B | aliquando ita ... contra om. L | duplicatur H | sedens

B | foros ostendit *H* | e contra *B* | duplicatur *H* | orificio *corr. Rose* orificium
BLH | matricis *om. L IVd.* qui] aliud *L* | uero *om. L* | diuisis *B* diuixum *L* |
iacens *L* iacent *H* | aliquando in latere ... positus esse potest *om. L* | ad dentes
corr. Rose ad dented *B* addentex *H* | *et suppl.* | *post sic add.* ergo *B* etiam *H* |
suplicatus *H* | *post* conduplicatus *om.* et *B* | diuexum *corr. Rose* diuisum *B*
diuesum *H* | potes *B*

Translation:

IVa. How many and what are the positions in which babies are born? The general ones are four: head-down, feet-down, horizontally lying, bent. However, many special positions are found. The baby who is carried head-down sometimes has the head at the matrix's orifice, but the rest of the body twisted behind; sometimes, descending head-down, it places the head ahead or behind the orifice, or it throws itself horizontally; and sometimes these positions come with constriction, sometimes without. And sometimes the baby stretches out a hand or both, while the rest of the body inside can be found with the legs closed or open. **IVb.** Then, in the other position that is called feet-down, the baby sometimes descends having the feet right at the matrix's orifice, and the body straight and the arms along the sides, sometimes fixing the feet ahead or behind the orifice, sometimes stretching out a foot or both, with the arms twisted over its head, sometimes fixing the feet open on the two sides of the matrix. **IVc.** Sometimes, with its legs bent, [the baby] tries to exit with its knees, sometimes it is bent so that it shows its buttocks as if sitting or, on the contrary, it is bent so that you will find its soles together with its head at the matrix orifice. **IVd.** The baby who lies horizontally is found sometimes on a side, sometimes on its back, sometimes face down, and it can be found bent and lying horizontally at the same time.

Rose (1882, 78, 1–79, 4):

4. Quot sunt enim et quae schemata quibus infantes nascuntur?

Generalia quidem quattuor hoc est in capite uel in pedibus uel in diuexum iacens aut duplicatus. Specialia autem schemata plurima inueniuntur.

Ille enim qui in capite fertur, aliquando quidem caput in orificio matricis habet, reliquum autem corpus contortum, aliquando in capite quidem descendens aut in priore ab orificio aut retrorsum caput infigit aut in diuexum se proicit. Et aliquando cum strictura haec schemata fiunt, aliquando sine strictura. Ac aliquando etiam unam manum foris porrigit uel utrasque, ita ut intus iunctis pedibus inueniatur uel etiam ipsis patentibus.

Alio uero schemate, quod in pedibus dicitur, aliquando descendit ita ut in directum in orificio matricis pedes habeat rectos manusque lateribus iunctas, aliquando in priore parte uel retrorsum ab orificio pedes infigat, quod et ipsum aliquando cum strictura, aliquando sine strictura fieri solet, aliquando unum pedem uel utrosque foris emittat, manibus scilicet supra caput contortis, aliquando etiam diuisis pedibus duabus partibus matricis separatim infigat.

Aliquando duplicatis pedibus per genua exire conatur, aliquando ita duplicatur ut sedenti similis naticas foris ostendat, uel econtra ita duplicatur ut plantas capiti iunctas in orificio matricis inuenias.

Qui uero in diuexum iacet, aliquando in latere aliquando supinus aliquando ad dentes inuenitur. Sic ergo conduplicatus et in diuexum positus esse potest.

Commentary:

quae scemata quibus – the text transmitted by the manuscripts have *quae scemate* B; *quae scemates* L; *que scemata* H, all lacking *quibus*. In H, the text continues with *infantum nascentium*, which appears to be an intelligent intervention of the educated copyist of H, trying to make sense of a difficult passage. For this reason, I agree with Rose in preserving *quae scemata* and in supplying *quibus* (to be connected with *nascuntur* of B and L), as its tachygraphic sign could have been easily omitted during transmission.

uel in pedibus – *uel* is the reading of H. The entire passage is structured as a series of lists and parallelisms, using conjunctions and adverbs that are not

always consistently transmitted across the manuscripts. For example, see the series of *aliquando* from line three: *aliquando [in capite]* is found in H, while *aliquando [etiam unam manum]* is found in B. There is no reason to assume that Mustio was inconsistent in the structure of the passage, and therefore I follow Rose in preserving these elements from the various manuscript readings as reported in the critical apparatus.

descendens ita ut – it is the reading of B and L, while H has *ita descendit ut*. Rose edited *aliquando descendit ita ut*, but I believe that the reading of B and L can be retained, since the use of the present participle in lists is not uncommon in Mustio, as can already be seen a few lines above in section **IVa**.

pedes infigat, aliquando unum pedem – Rose’s edition includes additional information after *infigat: quod et ipsum aliquando cum strictura aliquando sine strictura fieri solet*. This is a conjecture of the editor, likely modelled on the description of variation in the head-down position (*Et aliquando cum strictura haec schemata fiunt, aliquando sine strictura*).¹⁵⁵ Medert and Bolton follow this conjecture. However, I do not think it necessary to repeat this in the description of the feet-down positions merely to the sake of parallelism. Moreover, the action of *strictura* is not mentioned again in relation to the head-down positions, when they are analysed in greater detail later in the chapter, nor in relation to the feet-down position.

partibus matricis separatim – this text is part of a section shared only by B and L. More specifically, it is the reading of B, while L has only *matricis*. I believe that the more complete text of B helps better the comprehension of the passage; however, I don’t find Rose’s addition of *duabus* necessary (*diuisis pedibus duabis partibus matricis separatim infigat*).¹⁵⁶

in genua – it is the reading of H, while B has *per genua*, which is also the reading adopted by Rose. However, all other positions are described with *in* +

¹⁵⁵ SORAN, 78, 10–78, 11.

¹⁵⁶ SORAN, 78, 21–78, 22.

noun, as in *exire in capite, in pedibus*, whereas *per* is typically used in this chapter to indicate causation, like in *difficultatem emergere per id quod nasci habet*.

duplicatus – this form occurs twice in **IVc.**: in the first instance, it is the reading of B alone, while in the second it is shared by L as well; in both cases, H has *duplicatur*. I think that the participle is defensible, as it may refer back to the introductory list of positions at the beginning of section in **IVa**. Furthermore, the periphrastic construction “perfect participle + *esse*” for the present passive, rather than the synthetic *-or* form, is quite common in Mustio, as can be seen for example in the first questions of the first book about terminology.¹⁵⁷

ad dentes – it seems the most plausible explanation for the manuscript readings, which are *ad dented* in B and *addentex* in H (the passage *aliquando in latere [...] potest* is not transmitted by L). The phrase occurs four more times in Mustio, who appears to be the only author to use this expression to describe a bodily position that others refer to with the adjective *pronus*, ‘prone’, as in opposition to *supinus* ‘supine’.

sic conduplicatus et – the conjunction *et* is an addition by Rose, which I follow, as it clarifies the passage.

V. Ex quattuor scematibus praedictis quae sunt exoptabilia et secundum naturam? Quotiens in capite fertur, ita ut in orificio matricis <in> directum caput eius inueniatur manibus scilicet lateribus iunctis. Proximus bono scemati est nascentium infantum quotiens in pedibus descendit iunctis et in orificio matricis positus manibus scilicet lateribus porrectis; numquam eum obsetrix adducat sed, cum descendere coeperit, inmissa manu sua eius manus teneat et ipsas adducat, ne manus aperiat et ibi eae remaneant. Sed ex duobus

¹⁵⁷ SORAN, 6, 14–7, 3; see also section 2.2.

scematibus melius est qui in capite descendit. Cum enim labi coeperit nullus metus est.

V. *ante* ex quattuor *add.* si haec *L* | predictis *H* | ex ptabilia *B* et optauilia *L* | quae sunt *transp.* *L* *post* exoptauilia *sed* sunt quae | et *om.* *BL* | secundum naturam] in capite feruntur et secundum natura efficiuntur *L* | natura *H* | *post* secundum naturam *add.* ex quae aduersae contra natura secundum natura sunt *B* est *H* | *ante* quotiens *add* CXLV *B* CXLIII *L* | QUOCIENS *B* | fertur *corr.* *Rose* ferentur *B* feruntur *L* feruntur *H* | ut *om.* *B* | *post* ut *add.* cetera pars infantis in dextra latere mulieres inheserit inmissa obstetrix manu sua cum componat ut *L* | in *om.* *H* | orificio *corr.* *Rose* orificium *BLH* | in *suppl.* (*cf. quest. IVb*) | directus *L* | *post* directum *add.* capite feruntur. Ita in orificium matricis directum *B* | caput eius *om.* *L* | latebris *B* | *post* lateribus *add.* et femoribus *H* | iniunctis *L* | proximum *H* | *post* proximius *add.* uero *H* in *L* | bono scemati *om.* *B* | scemati *corr.* scemate *L* scemate *H* | nascentium infantium] nascencium Infancium *B* *om.* *H* | *ante* quotiens *add.* CXLVI *B* | *post* quotiens *add.* et *H* | *ante* descendit *transp.* iunctis *B* | descendens *L* | et] ex *B* | in *om.* *H* | orificium *BL* | positus] oppositis *H* | porrectas *B* | numquam ... remaneant *om.* *H* | eum *corr.* eas *B* eos *L* | adducet *L* | inmissam *B* | manu ... manus] unam et *B* | eae *corr.* eas *BL* *om.* *H* | remaneant] demittat *L* | sed] et *H* | qui] quid *H* | laui *B* | ceperit *H* | *ante* coeperit *add.* foras *H* | est] remanet *H* | *post* metus est *add.* Et si caput grande habetat et magnitudo ipsa capitis os uuluae cluserit exire non potuerit intrinsecus repellendus est et unctionibus perunctum orificium ipsum inmissa manum obstetrix eum teneat caput et sic adducat. Adiuuante conatibus sui que parti *L* ne manus ibi separate remaneat cum infantem adducere ceperi. *H*

Translation:

V. Among the four positions mentioned above, which are desirable and according to nature. When the baby is carried head-down so that the head is

found directly at the orifice of the matrix, with the arms along the sides. Closest to a good position of the babies to be born is when [the baby] descends feet-down, but closed, and it is placed at the orifice with the arms along the sides; the midwife shall never drag it but, when it starts to descend, inserted a hand, she shall keep its arms in place and pull them, so that it will not open the arms and they will stay there. But between the two positions, the one in which it descends head-down is better. For when it starts to come out, there is no fear.

Rose (1882, 79, 8–79, 19):

5. Ex quattuor schematibus praedicits quae sunt exoptabilia et secundum naturam, et quae aduersa et contra naturam?

Secundum naturam est quotiens in capite fertur, ita ut in orificio matricis directum caput eius inueniatur, manibus scilicet lateribus iunctis. Proximum uero bono schemati est [nascentium infantium] quotiens in pedibus descendit iunctis et in orificio matricis positus, manibus scilicet lateribus porrectis. Sed ex duobus schematibus melius est qui in capite descendit. Cum enim labi coeperit nullus metus est [ne manus ibi separatae remaneant cum infantem adducere coeperis.]

Commentary:

exoptabilia et secundum naturam – this is the reading found in manuscript H, albeit with some adjustments (*que sunt exoptabilia secundum natura est* H). This passage is also shared by B and L, accompanied by additional material that does not appear to be original. Manuscript B reads *quae sunt exoptabilia secundum naturam ex quae aduersae contra natura secundum natura sunt*, as an introduction about both the positions according to nature and those against nature. This version is adopted by Rose, followed by Medert and Bolton. While the positions *secundum naturam* are indeed the focus of the section, those *contra naturam* are not immediately analysed, as they are preceded by a more general list of causes of difficult labour, of which foetal positions are

just a part. Manuscript L reads *et optauilia sunt quae in capite feruntur et secundum natura efficiuntur*, but the insertion *in capite feruntur* seems more likely to be a gloss, or a repetition of the following lines, rather than part of the original text, especially given that the explanation of these positions according to nature comes immediately after.

fertur – conjecture of Rose, based on the singular subject *infans*. Bolton keeps *feruntur*.

in directum – B and H have *directum*, L has *directus*; I have chosen to insert the preposition *in* and consider *directum* as an adverb, consistent with Mustio's usage elsewhere – for example, in section **IVb**, where it appears alongside *in orificio* (*orificium* BL). The manuscript tradition of this passage is confused, with both B and L including additional material. B reads *CXLV QUOCIENS IN CAPITE feruntur. Ita in orificium matricis directum capite feruntur. Ita in orificium matricis directum caput eius*. The repetition of *capite feruntur. Ita in orificium matricis directum* seems to be a case of *saut du même au même*, where the copyist went back to the first *capite* instead of to *caput* after *directum*. L contains a longer passage: *CXLVIII Quotiens in capite feruntur ita ut cetera pars infantis in dextra latere muliere inheserit inmissa obsetrix manu sua cum componat ut in orificium matricis directus inueniatur*. This seems to describe a situation in which the foetus is bent or stuck toward the right side of the uterus, but it appears misplaced within the analysis of feet-down positions and is not referenced elsewhere in the manuscript tradition.

Proximus – it is the reading of B and L, while H has *proximum*. I defend the comparative form *proximus*, in line with what said in section 2.1 about the preference for the comparative form of adverbs in late Latin. This tendency toward more elaborate and structured forms may also apply here. In addition, *proximus* seems to function in a hybrid capacity, both as a neuter adjective with an attributive role to the entire sentence *quotiens [...] porrectis*, and as an adverb itself, possibly influenced by colloquial constructions involving

adverb + *esse*. Medert, in his 1911 thesis, declares to prefer the version *proximum uero bonum schema est quotiens*, without further explanation of his choice;¹⁵⁸ the 1997 Latin text just changes *schema* in *scema*.¹⁵⁹ In her edition, Bolton edits *proximum in bono scemate est nascencium infancium*, likewise without explanation.

eum – it is my conjecture. The manuscripts B and L have *eas* and *eos* respectively, while H omits the entire passage. Both readings are grammatically acceptable: *eas* could refer to the arms mentioned in the previous line, while *eos* could refer to the babies in general. However, the following clause *cum descendere coeperit* does not make sense if the arms are the subject, nor does a plural subject of babies with the following singular verbs. I therefore propose the masculine singular pronoun *eum*, which could easily have been lost or misread in transmission due to its brevity, especially in its tachygraphic form.

positus – it is the reading of B and L, while H has *oppositis*. Rose edits *positis*, referring it to the previously mentioned *pedibus*. While it is clear that in the feet-down position the infant is placing its feet in the uterine orifice, I do not consider it incorrect to say that the infant as a whole is *positus* – i.e., positioned – in the orifice.

VI. Quomodo dicunt de extrinsecus uenientibus causis difficultatem partus emergere? Frequentius enim aut frigore nimio aeris aut paulo plus calido aut certe cum ea quae parturientibus sunt necessaria non sunt.

VII. Quomodo dicunt per folliculum impediri partum? Cum tardius a fundo resoluitur matricis aut certe ita solidus est ut difficillime rumpatur aut econtra ita tenuis est ut ante tempus partus solutus sit et ante humorem illum effundat qui propter lapsum infantis a natura praeparatus est.

¹⁵⁸ MEDERT (1911, 63).

¹⁵⁹ HESS (1998, 234).

VIII. Quomodo dicunt per eum modum qui ex omnibus causis miscetur partum impediri? Eo quod languidus et lassus est infans et ideo non adiuuat parturientis conatus uel certe mortuus est aut breue caput habet et exinde orificium extendere non potest nec ab obsetrice facile comprehendi.

VI. *ante* Quomodo *add.* CXLVII L | dicis H | partis B | frequencius B | au H | frigore H | nimium B | eam B | que H | parturiendi H **VII.** *ante* quomodo *add.* CXLVIII B CXLVI L | dicunt *om.* H | impediri] dicis impedi H | a *om.* L | resoluetur L resoluitur H | *post* matricis *transp.* resoluitur H | aut] autem L *om.* H | ita solidus ... rumpatur *om.* B | solidus *corr.* Rose solidum LH | difficile L | econtra] certe L | tenuis *corr.* Rose tenuem B tenue LH | est *corr.* erit BL *om.* H | partum BL | solutus sit] solutum sit B solutum sit L soluitur H | illud H | qui propter ... praeparatus est *om.* L | a natura] sanatura B **VIII.** *ante* quomodo *add.* CXLVIII B CXLVII L | per *om.* B | partus H | impedire L | quod] si H | ideo] inde H | adiubat B | conatum H | exinde] in de B inde H | *post* orificium *add.* matricis H | possit H | nec] hec H | apprehendi H

Translation:

VI. In which way do they say that the difficulty in the delivery occurs for an external cause? Frequently due to air too cold or a little too warm, or of course if all the things that are necessary to the parturient are not present.

VII. In which way do they say that the delivery is prevented by the sack? When it detaches too late from the bottom of the uterus or if it is so thick that it is broken with great difficulty or on the contrary if it is so thin that the delivery starts before the due time and the liquid that it is prepared by nature for the exit of the infant flows early.

VIII. In which way do they say that the delivery is prevented because of a mix of all the reasons? When the infant is numb and weak and therefore does not help the pushes of the parturient or if it is dead or has a small head and

therefore it does not manage to dilate the orifice nor to be easily grasped by the midwife.

Rose (1882, 80, 1–80, 17):

6. (57.) Quomodo dicunt de extrinsecus uenientibus causis difficultatem partus emergere?

Frequentius enim aut frigore nimio aeris aut paulo plus calido, aut certe cum ea quae parturientibus sunt necessaria, non sunt.

7. (56.) Quomodo dicunt per folliculum inpediri partum?

Cum tardius a fundo matricis resoluitur aut certe ita solidus est ut difficillime rumpatur, aut econtra ita tenuis ut ante tempus partus solutus sit et ante humorem illum effundat qui propter lapsum infantis a natura praeparatus est.

8. Quomodo dicunt per eum modum qui ex omnibus causis miscetur partum impediri?...

(55.) Eo quod languidus et lassus est infans et ideo non adiuuat parturientis conatus, uel certe mortuus est, aut breue caput habet et exinde orificium matricis extendere non potest nec ab ostetrice facile comprehendi.

Commentary:

frigore – it is the reading of B and L, whereas H, followed by Rose, has *frigore*. The term appears ten times Mustio's text; in seven occurrences, all manuscripts agree on the later writing *frig(i)dor, -oris*. In two cases – including the one under discussion – H records *frigor, -oris*, and only once do all three witnesses agree on *frigor, -oris*. According to the ThLL, the writing *frigor, -oris* does not belong to Classical Latin, where one would expect *frigus, -oris*;¹⁶⁰ also according to the ThLL, *frig(i)dor, -oris* is attested in other

¹⁶⁰ RUBENBAUER. (1921). *frigor, -oris* m. In Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, 6(1), 1332. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. https://tll-degruyter-com.ezproxy.its.uu.se/article/6_1_6_frigor_v2007.

medical authors, like Caelius Aurelianus and Theodorus Priscianus.¹⁶¹ For these reasons, I have chosen to adopt this form in my edition.

IX. [Et haec sunt causae quas Mustio et ceteri auctores uoluerunt facere difficultatem partus. Soranus uero alias suggerit causas. Vult enim adfirmare aut de strictura impediri partum, aut constrictis et siccatis partibus ipsis, de fluxu abundantiae humoris uel fluxu sanguinis, consumptis uiribus parturientis uel illis rebus quibus orificium matricis concludi solet sicuti cicatricibus uel clauulis uel collectionibus uel hemorroidis et his pluribus simillimis, uel etiam morte infantis uel in diuexum contra naturam posito uel numerositate partium uel tres manus uel pedes habeat ut ipsi infantes quattuor uel quinque sint.]

IX. Et ... causae *om. B* | he *H* | cause *H* | ante Mustio *add. ego BL* | Muscion *LH* | auctores *om. H* | difficultate *L* | post uero *add. noster H* | uultu *L* | adfirmare *om. H* | de strictura] stricturam *H* | partu *H* | aut *om. H* | de] aut *H* | fluxum *B* | abundantiae *corr. Rose* habundantiae *BL* abunda *H* adundancia *H'* | humoris *om. H* | fluxum *BL* | ante parturientis *add. partibus BL* | parturientes *L* | concludi] clusi *B* | ante sicuti *add. et B* | clauulis *corr. Rose* cauculis *B* claulis *L* clausis *H* | hemorroidis *corr. emorroidas B* emorroidis *LH* | plurimus *B* | similis *H* | etiam] etim *L* | mortem *BH* | indiuisum *B* | natura *BL* | posito *corr. Rose* positum *BL* posita *H* | parcium *B* | ipse *B* ipsis *L* | post quinque *add. aut* dudodecim *B* concepte *H*.

Translation:

IX. And these are the reasons to which I, Mustio, and other authors, wanted to connect the difficulty of delivery. However, Soranus suggests other causes. He wanted to say that the delivery is prevented due to constriction or flux, or

¹⁶¹ RUBENBAUER. (1921). *frīg(i)dor, -ōris* m. In Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Online, 6(1), 1325. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. https://tll-degruyter-com.ezproxy.its.uu.se/article/6_1_6_frigidor_v2007.

due to constricted and dried genital parts, discharge of abundant liquids or of blood, the consumed strengths of the parturient or all those things by which the orifice of the matrix uses to be obstruct, like scars or small swellings or haemorrhoids or many other things of this sort, or due to the death of the baby or if it is placed horizontally against nature or due to the great number of foetuses, if they have three arms or legs or if the babies are four or five.

Rose (1882, 80, 18–81, 5):

Et haec sunt causae quas Muscion et ceteri auctores uoluerunt facere difficultatis partus. Soranus uero noster alias suggerit causas. Vult enim adfirmare aut de strictura inpediri partum aut constrictis et siccatis partibus ipsis de fluxu abundantiae humoris uel fluxu sanguinis consumptis uiribus parturientis, uel illis rebus quibus orificium matricis concludi solet, sicut cicatricibus uel clauulis uel collectionibus uel haemorrhoidis et his pluribus similibus, uel etiam morte infantis uel in diuexum contra naturam posito, uel numerositate partium ut tres manus uel pedes habeat, uel ipsi infantes quattuor uel quinque sint.

Commentary:

This passage is very peculiar in terms of content: Mustio includes himself among other authors who support the aforementioned causes of difficult labour, positioning himself in opposition to Soranus who attributes all such cases to the Methodist theory of constriction and flux. This information, however, is false. In the sections *Περί δυστοκίας* and those that follow, Soranus presents the same tripartite division of causes found in Mustio, namely those attributed to the parturient, those to the infant and a third group relating to the birth passage.¹⁶² Importantly, the originator of this theory is not Soranus himself, but Demetrius the Herophilean, as it is explicitly stated in the text. The precise delineation of these three groups, together with the observation that the scientific community did not reject the theory, strongly suggests that it was approved by Soranus as well, even though this is not explicitly stated in the

¹⁶² SORAN. 4.1.2–4.4.162.

text.¹⁶³ Moreover, Soranus does not specifically mention of the Methodist theory among the causes of difficult labour.

For all these reasons, it might be appropriate to consider excising this passage, as it appears to be an external explanation that was eventually incorporated into the text early in its transmission. Consequently, I have not emended the text, nor analyse its language or content, since I do not regard it as original of Mustio. I will, however, make one observation, regarding the end on the passage *uel infantes quattuor uel quinque sint*: the text of B has a curious addition, reading *uel infantes quattuor uel quinque aut dudodecim sint* and, among the illustrations of foetal positions that decorate the manuscript, there is the actual depiction of twelve babies in the uterus, in f. 29r. As previously noted, manuscript B is a fine object with big and coloured drawings, likely intended to reflect the wealth of its producers. It is plausible that the copyist or the illustrator – or the two of them together – chose to include the extraordinary case of twelve infants as a wonder to surprise and captivate the reader, in one of the most interesting chapters of the *Gynaecia*.¹⁶⁴ Or maybe someone really witnessed such a delivery and wanted to record this incredible event for posterity.

2.4.1 *The drawings*

In the descriptions of manuscripts B and H,¹⁶⁵ we have noted the presence of explicative drawings, which I believe belonged to Mustio's original text, as one of author's tools used to fulfil his didactical aim. The majority of these illustrations appears in the chapter entitled *De difficili et laborioso partu*, a section that describes all the various positions a foetus may assume in the uterus, and the appropriate methods for delivery. While the drawings in both

¹⁶³ SORAN. 4.2.191–4.2.194: *τούτων οὖν ῥηθέντων τῶν αἰτιῶν, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀντερείσας αὐτῶ καὶ ἀντειπὼν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μαρτυρήσας καὶ στηρίξας αὐτόν ὡς ἀληθῶς λέγοντα.*

¹⁶⁴ See also PASSARELLA (2012, 346).

¹⁶⁵ See sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.3.

manuscripts represent broadly similar foetal positions, they are executed in different artistic styles. This variation might reflect different purposes of the manuscripts themselves. For instance, B is an expensive object, a miscellany of medical texts intended not only for study and research but also to display the prestige of its commissioners; the text is written in a large script, with wide margins and red headings; the illustrations here seem to serve both didactic and decorative purposes, as evidenced by their large size, use of colours and creative rendering of the described positions. By contrast, H was clearly produced for personal study: its pages are densely written, with many marginal annotations, and accordingly, its drawings are small, monochrome sketches executed in the same ink as the text; the positions represented in H are also more faithful to the content of the *Gynaecia*, showing that the didactic aim is the fundamental one.

The transmission and reception of the drawings further support the credibility of Mustio's didactical intent, which is not only evident from internal textual features but also explicitly declared in his introduction. As mentioned in section 1.2.1, the foetal illustrations received great attention through the ages, and a high number of manuscripts reports them, both in connection with Mustio's text and inserted in other gynaecological texts.

Not all scholars consider the presence of drawings in Mustio as an original innovation of the author, arguing instead that such illustrations were already present in the Greek *Γυναικεῖα*. Their view is primarily based on the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 2153, which contains several blank pages at the end and a note in the index (f. 218r) that says:

Ἐντάυθα ἐστὶν ἕνος ἐκάστου σχήματος τὰ ἐν μήτρᾳ τῆς διαπλάσεως τῶν ἐμβρύων καὶ τῶς ὀφείλει ἐκβαλλεῖν ἕκαστον ἢ μαῖα, μετὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ γράμματος, ἐάσαμεν δὲ διὰ τὸ ποικίλον.

‘Here is one of each position of the representation of fetuses in the uterus and how the midwife has to deliver them, with the explanation of the drawing, separate in colours.’

I do not consider this sufficient evidence for the existence of drawings in Soranus' text. Manuscripts indices could easily have been added or altered by later hands; in this specific case, the index may even have been modelled on Mustio's text itself, since this Greek manuscript dates to the 15th century AD, and it is therefore later than the principal witnesses of our manuscript tradition.

Some scholars further contend that, besides the foetal illustrations found in Mustio's tradition, the entire *Γυναικεῖα* of Soranus was originally illustrated with numerous images. Ann Hanson and Monica Green for example, in their comprehensive study of Soranus' life and work,¹⁶⁶ mention paragraph 75 of Mustio's *Gynaecia* as evidence for the presence of drawings in the Greek text. In this passage, the Latin author declares to have not reported the *schema* of the position of the fistula in the uterus, as it would be an ailment too complex for midwives to treat:

(XXIII)

Subsequatur schema

De fistulis in matrice positis,

(75.) quod schema transferre nolui, siquidem obstetricibus superuacue hoc insinuabimus, cum etiam peritissimos medicos ad inspiciendum et ad curandum haec fistulae turbare possint.¹⁶⁷

‘(XXIII)

The *schema* about the

fistulas into the matrix followed,

(75.) *schema* that I did not want to translate, since we would have uselessly taught it to the midwives, because examining and treating these fistulae can trouble even the most expert doctors.’

¹⁶⁶ HANSON, GREEN (1994, 1023–1024).

¹⁶⁷ SORAN. 105, 16–105, 22.

The two scholars understand the word *schema* in the text as ‘drawing’, arguing that

“the casualness of Mustio’s remark suggests that illustrations were so abundant in his Greek original of Soranus *Gynaikēia* that he could be selective about which pictures he wanted to incorporate into his abbreviated Latin *Genecia*.”¹⁶⁸

However, within the *Gynaecia*, the term *schema* is used to mean ‘position’, corresponding to the Greek term *σχῆμα* in the *Γυναικεῖα*. Although we cannot compare the Latin section on the fistula with Soranus’ text due to the loss of this chapter in the Greek text, we may consider the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (*Περὶ δυστοκιῶν* in the *Γυναικεῖα*), where *schema*/*σχῆμα* denotes the various foetal positions at delivery. Thus, the meaning ‘position’ is plausible for the occurrence of *schema* in the chapter on the fistula as well. Nevertheless, I would argue that in this context, *schema* should be considered as a synecdoche – a figure of speech in which a part stands for the whole – since it is evident from the text that Mustio is refusing to reproduce not only a supposed drawing of the fistula in the uterus, but indeed the entire section on the topic, owing to complexity of the treatment required, which would be challenging even for experienced physicians and therefore impossible for midwives. Anna Maria Urso, in her contribution to the 1998 conference “Les Textes Médicaux Latins comme Litterature”, suggests emending *schema* in *scemma* (Greek *σκέμμα*), a term also found in Soranus with the meaning of ‘topic/subject under consideration’.¹⁶⁹ In any case, I do not believe that paragraph 75 can be used as evidence for the presence of drawings in the *Γυναικεῖα*, and certainly not as proof of their abundance. It should be noted also that Mustio used the verb *transfere* in reference to the act of writing and

¹⁶⁸ HANSON, GREEN (1994, 1024).

¹⁶⁹ URSO (2000, 304).

translating,¹⁷⁰ whereas when he explicitly refers to illustrations, the author employs the verb *inpingere* instead.¹⁷¹

Even if the presence of illustrations in the *Γυναικεῖα* was to be definitively confirmed, this would not undermine the originality of Mustio's didactic approach as outlined in the introduction to the *Gynaecia*. One particularly compelling piece of evidence supporting Mustio's innovative use of drawings is found in question **XI**:

XI. Quae singulae partes eius? Ut cognoscantur et facillime intellegere possint eius angula, uolui eam inpingere et singulis partibus eius singulae litterae appositae sunt. Ubi ergo est apposita A, orificium dicitur; [quid est ante partum pulposum et molle post partum uero callosum et spatiosum est] ubi uero est B collum dicitur; ubi est C ceruix dicitur; omnis autem horum concursus caula dicitur; ubi uero post angustias in rotunditate dilatare incipiunt et est ibi D umeri dicuntur; ubi autem est E latera dicuntur; ubi uero rotunditas concluditur et est ibi F fundus appellatur; intus uero ubi est G basis grandis dicitur; omnisque inanitas illa quae est in medio uenter et sinus appellatur.¹⁷²

‘**XI.** What are its specific parts? To make them recognisable and so that all its corners could be easily studied, I wanted to draw it, and letters are placed on each part. Where there is an A, is called orifice, [which is fleshy and soft before the delivery, but after the delivery it is callous and wide]; where there is a B, is called neck; where there is a C, it is called cervix; the meeting point of all of them is called stem; where it starts to open in a rounded shape after the narrowness, and there is a D, is called shoulders; where there is E, they are called sides; where the rounded shape closes and there is and F, is called bottom; inside then, where there is a G, is called great basin; the entire passage that is in the middle is called belly or gulf.’

¹⁷⁰ SORAN. 3, 4.

¹⁷¹ SORAN. 8, 4.

¹⁷² My edition; see section 2.2.

In this passage, Mustio explicitly declares that we drew the uterus to facilitate the understanding of all its parts, linking the image and the text through corresponding letters. No such connection of text and image is mentioned in the corresponding section of Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*, nor elsewhere in the Greek text, suggesting this addition to be an original contribution by Mustio. Although the drawing referenced in question **XI** is only found in B, as discussed in section **1.2.1.3**, there are reasons to believe that it was also intended for inclusion in manuscript H. The detailed illustration of the uterus, with all its parts clearly labelled, shows that Mustio – whether he adapted them from his source or not – undeniably refined the use of explanatory drawings as a didactical tool, aiming to enhance reader comprehension and to produce an effective manual of gynaecology. For this reason, I do not consider it necessary to confirm or refute the presence of drawings in Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*, especially given the inconclusive nature of the evidence.

The didactical value of these drawings is further vehiculated through their stylistic features. In both B and H, the uterus is depicted in a highly simplified manner, with abundant space around the foetus; the membranes and the umbilical cord – well known to the midwives through the *Gynaecia* – are minimally underlined. The illustrator's main concern does seem to be not anatomical realism, but didactical clarity, as underlined by Raffaele Passarella,¹⁷³ in order to provide to the readers with an unobstructed visual model, enabling them to picture all necessary manoeuvres to successfully deliver the baby. One might argue that the anatomical realism was unattainable at the time, given ancient medicine's controversial approach to autopsy. However, later adaptations of Mustio's *Gynaecia*, translated into modern languages and accompanied by similar sets of pictures, suggest that the simplified style was a deliberate didactical choice. An example is the already mentioned *Der Rosegarten*¹⁷⁴ by Eucharius Rösslin. The German physician, in 1513, wrote a

¹⁷³ PASSARELLA (2012, 351).

¹⁷⁴ HESS (1998, 101).

gynaecological manual in his native language for reasons very similar to those of Mustio, i.e. to provide contemporary midwives a comprehensible text for their professional education. Despite the advancements in anatomical knowledge in the early 16th century AD – including the availability of illustrations and research by Leonardo da Vinci – the drawings of the *Rosegarten* are remarkably similar to those of Mustio. The illustrator Martin Caldenbach, retained the simplified and spacious depiction of the uterus found in the *Gynaecia*, recognising in their didactical clarity their most distinctive and influential trait. The comparison between the drawings in H and those of Caldenbach strongly suggest that the former – or a similar model – inspired the latter.

3. The Language of the *Gynaecia*

A comprehensive analysis of the language of the *Gynaecia* will only be possible after the new edition of the entire work of Mustio. Nevertheless, bearing in mind in mind that all examples mentioned in the following discussion are drawn from the analysis of the four passages edited in chapter 2, it is still possible to propose some preliminary conclusions and hypotheses based on the language found in the three main manuscripts, whose distinct characteristics have been outlined at paragraphs 1.2.1.1, 1.2.1.2 and 1.2.1.3. The overview illustrated by the manuscript tradition aligns with expectations for a late Latin technical text such as this, as for example observed by Gerd Haverling in relation to the translations of the Hippocratic Aphorisms:¹⁷⁵ in the *Gynaecia*'s manuscript tradition, we find two codices dated around the 9th/10th centuries AD exhibiting more vulgarised readings, and one codex dated around the 11th/12th centuries AD that adheres more closely to the classical norm, though it too retains some late features. Overall, a general survey of the language of the three main witnesses to the *Gynaecia* reveals that the degree of variation between the B&L and H branches is not particularly pronounced.

¹⁷⁵ HAVERLING (2019, 91–92).

3.1 Orthography

We have seen that all three principal manuscripts share features characteristic of a late stage of Latin. B and L display a greater number of Vulgar Latin elements compared to H, although such elements are also present in this manuscript, particularly in its orthography. Notably, manuscript H is the one that systematically monophthongises the diphthong <ae> into <e>, whereas B shows more internal variation, as seen for example in *tunice* pro *tunicae*, *neruosae* pro *neruose* and both *que* and *quae* for the interrogative pronoun. The situation of L presents yet another pattern: while it registers less uncertainty around the diphthong, it still contains cases like *preter* instead of *praeter*, and even *profocatio* instead of *praefocatio*. More broadly, we have noted a general confusion in vowel usage, especially, but not exclusively, between the pairs <e/i> and <o/u>. However, no systematic pattern emerges across the manuscripts.

Greek vocabulary and loanwords are notably present in the *Gynaecia* and, although some variation exists within each manuscript, we observe that B and L tend to simplify the transcription of Greek, especially in its aspirated consonants. In contrast, H demonstrated a more confident handling of Greek orthography. For instance, in the list of Soranus' works cited by Mustio in the introduction, B reads *obtalmico cirorgimeno filiatro boetrimatico*, L presents *optalmico gyrorgumeno filiatro et theotematico* and H has *ophthalmico cyrorgumeno philiatro et boethematicis*; this manuscript includes also some Greek words written in Greek letters, *AEACY* H for *delfis* (one of the Greek names for *matrix*) and *ΠΘεPYΓΩHAVA* for *pterigomata* (the Greek equivalent for *pinna*, i.e., the labia), and even one Latin word written in Greek letters, *AAHaYKA* for *landica*, the clitoris. This last example is particularly intriguing, as it may reflect the relatively advanced knowledge of Greek of H's copyist, surpassing that of the copyists of B and L, though still marked by the uncertainties typical of medieval Europe. Alternatively, it may represent a form of

linguistic euphemism, an attempt to obscure a term that referred to a highly intimate part of the female body and that has long considered obscene by the Romans. If so, this would suggest a high level of familiarity with Latin literary tradition and Roman culture on the part of H's copyist, and it will not of course reflect Mustio's technical use of the word, which is clearly scientific and anatomical.

We have also identified some inconsistencies involving final consonants, particularly the omission of final *-m*, usually found in B&L – only one case is registered in H, of *secundum natura* instead of *secundum naturam*. In general, these omissions seem to stem from palaeographic errors, such as the failure to transcribe the tachygraphic sign for a final *-m*, especially given the lack of internal consistency within each manuscript – as seen for example in the case of the variation in H. Nonetheless, the broader confusion across all three manuscripts regarding case usage, both with or without prepositions, raises some questions and examples such as the writings *ad tussicula* and *per fluxu* instead of *ad tussiculam* and *per fluxum* in L appear slightly more suspicious.

3.2 Morphology

Turning to morphological phenomena, we observe notable uncertainties about the use of case and gender in nouns. As previously mentioned, the confusion surrounding cases is evident in all three manuscripts, often accompanied by internal variation, like for example between the writings *retensio* and *retensione* in H, or *partum*, *partus* and *partu* in L, *praeter natura* and *praeter naturam* in B. In many instances, it is difficult to determine whether such variations originate from genuine case confusion or rather from orthographic inconsistencies. See for instance the following cases:

In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet uniuersam mulierum traditionem?
[...] secundum naturam occurrentes causas et praeter naturam (preter natura B).

VI Quae sunt ergo ualitudines mulierum quae per stricturam fieri solent?
Retentio (retensione *H*) menstruarum [...].

VII [...] hoc est menstruarum retentio (retensio *H*) uel cum dolore exitus,
[...].

DE DIFFICILI ET LABORIOSO PARTU (PARTUM *L*). Quot sunt enim
causae quibus laboriosus et difficilis partus (partus *L*) efficitur?

A particularly puzzling case arises in paragraph **IV** of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu* (see section 2.4), where the syntagms *ab orificio* and *in orificio* are used in the description of different foetal positions:

IV. [...] aliquando quidem caput **in orificio** matricis habet, [...]; aliquando in capite quidem descendens aut in priore <parte> **ab orificio** aut retrorsum caput infigit, [...]. Alio uero scemate quod in pedibus dicitur, aliquando descendens ita ut in directum **in orificio** matricis pedes habeat compositos [...], aliquando in priore parte uel retrorsum **ab orificio** pedes infigit, [...].¹⁷⁶

‘**IV.** [...] sometimes has the head at the matrix’s orifice, [...]; sometimes, descending head-down, it places the head ahead or behind the orifice, [...]. Then, in the other position that is called feet-down, the baby sometimes descends having the feet right at the matrix’s orifice [...], sometimes fixing the feet ahead or behind the orifice, [...].’

I have followed Rose in adopting of the ablative forms *in orificio/ab orificio*, although however, this case is attested only by H, and not consistently across all occurrences. The following table shows the various manuscript variants:

tab. 8

¹⁷⁶ My edition; see section 2.4.

B	L	H
<p>[...] aliquando quidem caput in orificium matricis habet [...] in capite quidem descendens aut in priore ab orificium autem retrorsum caput infigat [...] aliquando descendens ita ut in directum orificium matricis pedes habeat [...] aliquando in priore parte uel retrorsum ab orificium pedes infigat. [...]</p>	<p>[...] aliquand quidem caput in orificium matrici habet [...] in capite quidem descendens aut in priore. Ab orificium autem retrorsum caput infigat [...] aliud uero scematae quod in pedibus aliquando descendens ita ut in directum in orificium matricis pedes habeat [...] aliquando priore parte uel retrorsum in orificium infigat [...]</p>	<p>[...] aliquando recutum quidem capud orificium matricis habet [...] aliquando in capite quidem descendens aut in priore ab orificio aut retrorsum caput infigit. [...] aliud uero scema quid in pedibus dicitur aliquando ita descendit ut in directum orificio matricis pedes habent [...] Aliquando in priorem partem uel retrorsus ab orificio pedes infigat.</p>

The variation in case usage with the preposition *in* reflects the ambiguity in expressing spatial orientation: the baby can have the head, or the feet, positioned in the orifice, but also towards it, the latter typically requiring *in* + accusative. The use of *ab orificio* is also problematic, though less in terms of interpretation and more in terms of linguistic peculiarity: the notion of movement away from the orifice is connected to expressions such as *in priore parte* and *retrorsum*, suggesting that the baby may position itself slightly ahead of or behind the orifice, while still be described as located in (or towards) the orifice.

Gender confusion is also registered among the manuscripts. In some cases, this may be attributed to the more general vowel confusion, as in *hanc ipsum*

and *hanc ipsam* in B, or *mollem orificium* for *molle orificium* in L. In other instances, genuine uncertainty regarding grammatical gender of the term appears to be at play, particularly in the oscillation between masculine and neuter forms for *corpus* (*corpus rectus* pro *corpus rectum* in B, and also *omnes corpus* vs *omne corpus* and *corpus rectos* vs *corpus rectum* in H, where *corpus* seems also considered to belong to the IV declension), and for *orificium* (*qualis orificium* pro *quale orificium* in L). Both these gender uncertainties, however, are not systematic and vary within each manuscript.

Finally, the verbal system also displays considerable variation among the manuscripts. The most frequent alternations involve subjunctive and indicative moods, like for example *sint* pro *sunt*, *infigat* pro *infigit* in B, *gubernat* pro *gubernet*, *inuentiatur* pro *inuenitur* in L, or *occurrent* pro *occurrunt* and *inueniatur* pro *inuenitur* in H. Variations between third-person plural and the third-person singular forms are also common, such as *efficiant* pro *efficiat*, *appellant* pro *appellat* in B, *solet* pro *solent* and *purgantur* pro *purgatur* in L, *habent* pro *habeat* and *iacent* pro *iacet* in H. However, these variations, which lack internal systematicity, appear to be more closely related to orthographic uncertainty than to morphological phenomena of late Latin. Even the sole instance of variation between active and passive voice – *uideo* pro *uideor* in B&L – seems attributable more to the omission of final <r>, than to the confusion between the two voices as found in other Late Antique Latin texts.

3.3 Syntax

The manuscript tradition shows a degree of unanimity regarding certain syntactic features characteristic of late Latin. Although these features are relatively few and generally infrequent, some notable exceptions stand out. One such example is the use of *ipse* with an attributive function, as illustrated in the following group of questions:

VI. Ubi iacet ipsa uulua? Intra duas coxas intus, quod est sub se habens longaonem et uesicam desuper.

VII. Natura qualis est ipsa matrix? Magis neruosa; contexta est arteriis uenis pulpis et neruis.¹⁷⁷

‘**VI.** Where does the uterus lie? Inside between the two thighs; which is so to have the rectum below and the bladder above.’

VII. What is the nature of the matrix? Mostly sinewy; it is composed of arteries and veins, flesh and sinews.’

The presence of *ipsa* is not consistent across the manuscript tradition; in examples above, for instance, it is absent in manuscript H. This use of *ipse*, where its original demonstrative meaning fades into a more attributive or even article-like function, is well attested in other late Latin texts.¹⁷⁸

Another recurring phenomenon is the alternation between the classical synthetic passive form in *-or* and periphrastic construction with a perfect participle + *esse*, which in classical Latin indicates the perfect passive. This variation appears for example in question V:

V. Matrix quot nominibus uocatur? Principaliter enim tribus nominibus dicta est; [...]. Grece etiam ystera appellatur [...]; grece etiam delfis dicta est [...].¹⁷⁹

‘**V.** By how many names is the matrix called? Mainly by three names; [...]. In Greek is then called *ystera*, [...]; in Greek it is also called *delfis*, because it makes those who are born from the same one brothers.’

In the sections analysed, we also encounter the use of *habere* + infinitive to indicate futurity in the expression *infans nasci habet*, which appears several

¹⁷⁷ My edition; see section 2.2.

¹⁷⁸ On the changing function of *ipse* in Late Latin, cf. for example LÖFSTEDT (1911, 64–66); VÄÄNÄNEN (1981, §§ 268–276); PINKSTER (2015, 1162–1164).

¹⁷⁹ My edition; see section 3.2.

times in the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*.¹⁸⁰ In this construction, the necessity of the birth is so imminent that it naturally conveys a future sense.

Consulting Rose's edition, I identified three other occurrences of the construction *habeo* + infinitive, but in these cases the implication of futurity in the necessity is more debatable. The examples are as follows:

66. *Obstetrix quomodo et ubi sedere debet?*

*Silicet uiriliter cincta sit, et si in lecto partus **effici habet**, modice inferius obstetrix sedeat ita ut facillime manus mittere possit.*¹⁸¹

'66. How and where must the midwife sit?

Of course, she should be dressed in an agile way, and if the delivery needs to take place in bed, the midwife should sit a little bit lower, so to be able to insert hands easily.'

115. *Ad omnes enim ploratus eius lac ei dare debemus.*

*Non semper nec statim sed in aliquantum moram facere, siquidem ad cibum hoc ploratu exerceatur ut spiritum trahat, et ipse commeatus qui lac **accipere habet** spatiosior efficiatur.*¹⁸²

'115. We shall give it milk anytime it cries.

Not always and not immediately, but wait a little bit sometimes, so that, with this crying, it is trained to keep its breath and the duct itself, that has to take the milk, becomes wider.'

(94.) [...] *Itaque supinam iactans eam quae **inspici habet**, accipies fasciam longam [...].*¹⁸³

'(94.) [...] So, placed [the woman] that needs to be examined supine, take a long bandage [...].'

¹⁸⁰ See section 3.4.

¹⁸¹ SORAN 23, 4–23, 7.

¹⁸² SORAN, 40, 6–40, 11.

¹⁸³ SORAN, 118, 3–118, 4.

3.4 Mustio's Latin

Throughout the analysis of orthographic and morphological variation, I have consistently emphasised the absence of systematic patterns both across and within the individual manuscripts. This lack of systematicity is the reason why I ascribe these variations to the transmission process rather than to the original composition. The only exception is the aforementioned case of the late Latin form *obsetrix*, that I adopt in my edition. This form is consistently transmitted by all three main manuscripts in every occurrence, with only minor variation and never in the classical form *obstetrix*, systematically emended by Rose.¹⁸⁴ Besides from *obsetrix*, I maintain that the most normative orthographic forms shall be preferred, and that the lower variants should be considered as a product of later vulgarization, especially those found in the manuscripts of the 9th and 10th centuries AD, as previously discussed.

This editorial stance implies that we consider Mustio as belonging to the well-educated class of people that in late Antiquity were still writing in what they considered the correct form of Latin, both in terms of orthography and syntax. Admittedly, this is a speculative conclusion, as it is based solely on the content of the *Gynaecia*, since we do not have any other information about Mustio, nor other surviving works despite the list of texts he claims to have translated in the introduction. Nevertheless, precisely Mustio's claim to have translated numerous works of Soranus from Greek into Latin, and, a few lines earlier, his reference to working with skilled yet uneducated *obsetrices*, offer insights into his level of education. These remarks suggest that Mustio was a physician expert not only in the practical aspects of his profession – *frequentius nobis in muliebribus obsetrix fuisset necessaria* – but also in its theoretical dimensions – *Ego uero Mustio multa iam uideor quomodocumque transtulisse ueritate rationis potius quam instructa diligentius polita usus, sicut in*

¹⁸⁴ See section 1.2.2.1.

*Ophthalmico Cyrurgimeno Philiatro et Boethematico legimus.*¹⁸⁵ One might argue that the introductory passages in ancient texts should be treated with caution and not taken *ad litteram*. However, Mustio's didactical aim stated in the introduction – to produce a manual for midwives to enhance their knowledge and practical skills – has already been proved trustworthy, as it is substantiated by concrete features inside the Gynaecia. These include didactical tools such as the explicative drawings discussed in section 2.4.1, and the use of what the author calls *muliebria uerba*, a specific midwives' lexicon which will be examined in detail later in the following section 3.6. On this basis, we may reasonably extend our trust to the rest of the introduction too.

However, beyond its content, the introduction also provides valuable insights on the level of Mustio's Latin through its stylistic qualities. The passage, as presented in my edition, reads:

Cum frequentius nobis in muliebribus obsetrix fuisset necessaria nullamque inueniremus studiosam quae litteras Graecas adtigisse uideretur, <arbitratus fui> quod si adtignisset omnia in latinitate sibi translata gynaecia posset rationem lectionis scire. 2. Ego uero Mustio multa iam uideor quomodocumque transtulisse ueritate rationis potius quam instructa diligentius polita usus, sicut in Ophthalmico Cyrurgimeno Philiatro et Boethematico legimus. 3. Placuit mihi haec quoque gynaecia in Latinum uertere sermonem, licet etiam maximam partem ad integrum tenorem secutus Soranum transtuli, ut possim mulieris animum hac ratione exhilarare; placuit nobis et Cata gynaecion breuitatem fuisse secutus, ut omnia dicere uidear et non grande corpus perfecissem; quibusdam uero capitulis multum breuiter dictis quaedam ex Dia iatrico tractato addidi ut de omnibus collectus commentarius sufficiens esse possit. 4. His autem multo simplicius uolui loqui, ut uerius dicam, muliebribus uerbis usus sum ut etiam imperitae obsetrices licet ab altero sibi lectam rationem facile intellegere possint.

¹⁸⁵ My edition, see section 2.4.

Even a superficial reading reveals a precise and coherent structure. The opening sentence establishes the main reason behind the *Gynaecia*, and it is followed by four main periods – *placuit mihi [...]*, *placuit nobis [...]*, *quibusdam uero capitulis [...]* and *his autem [...]* – that go into more details regarding the process of production. Each of these sentences is elaborated by a final subordinate clause introduced by *ut*. The result is an elegantly written passage, with a solid construction that mirrors the logical and practical process behind; it is clearly intended not only for the primary audience of midwives, but also for fellow physicians and educated readers. The author of this introduction demonstrates an ability to write with both clarity and sophistication.

The rest of the *Gynaecia* does not show the same stylistic elegance of the introduction. However, this discrepancy does not necessarily indicate inauthenticity of the passage; on the contrary, Mustio himself acknowledges the stylistic shift with the phrase *multo simplicius uolui loqui*, at the conclusion of the introduction. Late antiquity knows the rhetorical topos of authors apologizing to their audience for linguistic shortcomings – often declaring poor Latin, while writing in perfectly elegant language and style. Gregory of Tours for example opens his *Decem libri historiarum*, also known as the *Historia Francorum*, asking the reader to forgive his grammatical errors, due to lack of proper education in this art.¹⁸⁶ However, Mustio's introduction is marked less by false modesty and more by the pride of his linguistic knowledge, especially as a translator. His declaration of *simplicius loqui* is more akin to the statement made by the emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus,¹⁸⁷ in the introduction to his text *De administrando imperio*, where he advises his son not to be surprised by the lower level of the Greek 'for I have not been studious to make a display of fine writing or of an Atticizing style, swollen with the sublime and

¹⁸⁶ OLDONI (1981,13); GREG. TUR. hist. 1,3: *Sed prius ueniam legentibus praecor, si aut in litteris aut in sillabis grammaticam artem excessero, de qua adplene non sum inbutus*; see also HAVERLING (2025, 17–22).

¹⁸⁷ I thank David Westberg at Uppsala University for his mention of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus in relation with the introduction of Mustio.

loftly, but rather have been eager by means of every-day and conversational narrative to teach you those things [...].¹⁸⁸ Mustio, *mutatis mutandis*, adopts a similar approach, and, given the technical nature of the text, he chooses a simpler (*simplicius*) style than his usual one, exemplified in the introduction itself.

3.5 Further issues: the use and function of *ita ut*

Before proceeding with a more detailed analysis of one of the most important aspects in Mustio's language – namely, the *muliebria uerba*, previously mentioned as one of the author's didactic tools – it is important to stress once more that all observations made thus far regarding the Latin of the *Gynaecia* remain provisional, and they must ultimately be confirmed – or denied – by a comprehensive study and critical edition of the entire text. While I believe that the general overview traced from the analysis of the passages discussed in chapter 3 is likely representative of the broader work, several phenomena and issues still require a more thorough understanding of the text, its manuscript tradition and their historical context of production.

In this light, I would like to introduce a particularly noteworthy linguistic feature that I have observed throughout the *Gynaecia*, but which still demands further analysis. This feature concerns a particular use of the correlation between the adverb *ita* and a subordinate clause introduced by *ut*, which appears to function as a procedural marker. In order to clarify this usage, I begin with an example of the standard *ita ut* correlation: here the subordinate clause introduced by *ut* has a clear correlative meaning, and the adverb *ita* clearly refers back to the element under focus in the main clause – namely, *descendens*:

¹⁸⁸ MORAVICSIK, JENKINS (1967, 48–49); *Ὁὐ γὰρ ἐπίδειξιν καλλιγραφίας ἢ φράσεως ἡττικισμένης καὶ τὸ διηρμένον διογκούσης καὶ ὕψηλὸν ποιῆσαι ἐσπούδασα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον διὰ κοινῆς καὶ καθωμιλημένης ἀπαγγελίας διδάξαι σοὶ ἐσπευσα [...]*. See also BANNIARD (1992, 50–52) on Venantius Fortunatus.

Alio uero scemate quod in pedibus dicitur; aliquando descendens **ita ut** in directum in orificio matricis pedes habeat compositos et corpus habeat rectum manusque lateribus iunctas, [...].¹⁸⁹

‘Then, in the other position that is called feet-down, the baby sometimes descends having the feet right at the matrix’s orifice, and the body straight and the arms along the sides [...].’

However, in many other instances throughout the *Gynaecia*, the relationship between *ita* and *ut* appears more complex. Consider the following examples:

82. Ubi infantem iacere oportet?

In loco scilicet mediocriter calido **ita ut** nihil ibi oleat nec ualde sit lucidum, [...].¹⁹⁰

‘82. Where shall the baby lie down?’

In a moderately warm place, of course, making sure that nothing smells there and there is not too much light, [...].’

(10.) [...] strato scilicet molli cooperienda est stramentis nouis et floccosis, **ita ut** biduo nihil accipiat.¹⁹¹

‘(10.) [...] she must be covered with new layers of wool,¹⁹² and she doesn’t have to take food for two days.’

(41.) [...] Enchatisma etiam ex pusca frigida facimus aut ex aqua in qua decocta sunt murta, lentiscus, celsa agrestis, corium mali granati

¹⁸⁹ My edition, see section 2.4.

¹⁹⁰ SORAN. 30, 10–30, 12.

¹⁹¹ SORAN. 50, 13–50, 16.

¹⁹² The term of Rose’s transcription is *flocosis*, but the adjective *flocosus* is not attested in Latin; we have *floccosus*, emendation of Medert 1911, which can be found only one more time, in the Herbarius of the Pseudo-Apuleius. I translated with ‘of wool’ because, however the form is, it seems clear to me that it comes from the substantive *floccus*, which describes the consistency of wool.

uel eius frondes et uimen, **ita ut** cum haec bullierint refrigescant
[...].¹⁹³

‘(41.) [...] We prepare also hip baths made of cold pusca or water in which were boiled myrtle, mastic tree, sycamore, pomegranate peel, and its leaves and twigs, ensuring that it has cooled down after boiling, [...].’

In these cases, there is no explicit correlative element in the main clause, and the logic relationship between *ita* and *ut* seems broader, often conveying a meaning akin to ‘ensuring that’. This usage frequently – although not exclusively – occurs in descriptions of medical procedures or preparations of remedies. In order to determine whether this feature is unique to Mustio or part of a broader linguistic trend, I examined a sample of medical authors, focusing especially on Late Antiquity. A comparable usage appears only in the *De observatione ciborum* of Anthimos.¹⁹⁴ In other authors, this feature is either absent or occupies a middle ground between the correlative and the procedural meanings – as in a few cases in Mustio himself. Here are some examples from Anthimos:

Praeterea de lumbis porcellinas expedit assas manducare quia aptae sunt et bene conficiuntur, **ita ut** sale in aqua soluto cum pinnis quando assantur tangantur.¹⁹⁵

‘Then about the loin, that of pork should be eaten roasted, since it is suitable for it and it is good, making sure to brush it while its roasting with salt diluted in water.’

¹⁹³ SORAN. 68, 18–69, 1.

¹⁹⁴ The other works that I examined are *De medicina* of Celsus (SPENCER 1935), the *Gynaecia* of Caelius Aurelianus (DRABKIN 1951) and the *Liber geneeciae ad Soteris obsetrix* (URSO 2018).

¹⁹⁵ ANTHIM. 10, 14–16.

Napi boni sunt. Elixī in sale et oleo manducentur siue cum carnibus uel larido cocti **ita ut** acetum pro sapore in coctura mittatur.¹⁹⁶

‘Turnips are good. They can be eaten boiled in salt and oil or cooked with meat or lard, making sure to add vinegar while cooking, for the taste.’

Apium uero coriandrum et anetum uel porriones in omniorum coctura miscentur **ita ut** porri modicum praedurentur.¹⁹⁷

‘Celery and coriander and dill or leeks can be mixed to any preparation, making sure that the leeks are slightly pre-cooked.’

The presence of this procedural function of *ita ut* in both Anthimos and Mustio may be connected to the practical nature of their texts – culinary in the former, medical in the latter. When comparing Mustio’s use of *ita ut*, with the corresponding passages in Soranus, we do not find a direct equivalence in the content; rather, Mustio appears to condense longer Greek passages in more concise Latin formulations, and the *ita ut* procedural construction may serve this summarising purpose. In cases where a precise sentence in the Greek text is extant, a simple copulative conjunction is used.

3.6 The *Muliebria Verba*

We now turn to a more detailed analysis of the *muliebria uerba*, an expression employed by Mustio at the conclusion of his introduction; this phrase constitutes a significant authorial statement regarding his own linguistic choices.

The first issue is to address the precise meaning of the adjective *muliebris* in this context. In order to do so, I present all occurrences of this term within the *Gynaecia*. It becomes evident that *muliebris* is not merely used with the

¹⁹⁶ ANTHIM. 17, 1–3.

¹⁹⁷ ANTHIM. 17, 12–14.

general meaning of ‘feminine’, but rather with the more specific connotation of ‘obstetrical, related to midwifery’:

I. In quot uel quas partes diuidere oportet uniuersam mulierum traditionem? In duas, unam quae de obsetrice tractat, alteram quae de omnibus obsetricibus occurrentibus constat; hanc ipsam iterum diuidimus <in duas>: secundum naturam occurrentes causas et praeter naturam.¹⁹⁸

‘**I.** In how many and which parts do we divide the gynaecological knowledge? In two, one that discusses about the midwife, another that consist of all that might occur to a midwife; and this one again we divide in two: conditions according to nature and conditions against nature.’

II. Obsetricalis ratio quid a muliebri differt? Quod pars ab uniuerso. Obsetricalis enim pars est muliebrum rationis.¹⁹⁹

‘**II.** How does the obstetrical doctrine differ from the gynaecological one? As a part from the whole. The obstetrical is in fact a part of the gynaecological doctrine.’

Another instance of *muliebris*, appears in the locution *sinus muliebris*, referring to the vagina. While in this case the adjective may be translated as ‘feminine’, it represents a medical euphemism – a tendency to use minimally connotative language when referring to sensitive body parts, in order to avoid any suggestion of obscenity. In the context of a gynaecological treatise, it is clear that a ‘gulf’ (*sinus*) described as ‘feminine’ does not refer to any generic cavity or niche in the woman’s body, but specifically to the vagina. Thus, its association with midwifery and gynaecology is unmistakable.

Against this background then, I propose that also *muliebria uerba* should not be interpreted simply as ‘female speech’ tout court, but rather as ‘gynaecological/ obstetrical words’ – a specific speech related to a group of individuals connected by the gender, profession and, probably, social class. This

¹⁹⁸ My edition, see section 2.2.

¹⁹⁹ My edition, see section 2.2.

aligns with what Mazzini defined as “lingua socialmente marcata” – socially marked speech:

“Per il concetto di lingua socialmente marcata, una volta precisato che con esso intendiamo comprendere sia quello di lingua speciale sia quello di lingua tecnica, si può adottare la definizione comunemente accettata per la lingua speciale, [...] «Variazione della lingua comune, prodotta e utilizzata all’interno di gruppi sociali i cui componenti sono uniti tra loro da uno o più vincoli, i quali, a loro volta, possono essere di carattere ideologico, professionale, culturale, di classe, di età, di sesso o altro»²⁰⁰

‘For the concept of socially marked speech, once specified that with it we want to encompass both the concept of special speech and of technical speech, we can adopt the commonly accepted definition for the special speech, [...] «Variation of common language, produced and used within social groups whose members are united by one or more bonds which, in turn, may be of an ideological, professional, cultural, class, age, gender or other nature».’

As previously noted in the analysis of the illustrations, Mustio’s didactical intent, declared in the introduction, is substantiated by the structure and the content of the *Gynaecia*, where didactical tools are employed. I argue that the *muliebria uerba* constitute one of such tools. In the following sections, I will examine three distinct lexical groups that I have identified as components of the *muliebria uerba*: the Greek medical loanwords, the lexicon of remedies and the so-called nursery terms.

3.6.1 The Greek Medical Loanwords

The first lexical group I identify as *muliebria uerba* consists of Greek medical loanwords. Under this category, I include Greek terminology related to

²⁰⁰ MAZZINI (2010, 16);

medicine, primarily names of remedies and treatments. These terms are typically transliterated into Latin, and exhibit a hybrid grammatical nature between Latin and Greek. This is evident for example in these two occurrences of the word *epithima* (from the Greek verb *ἐπιτίθημι*, ‘to lay, place or put upon’) which refers to of a plaster applied externally to the affected body part:

43. [...] Postea autem uinum siccosque et constrictorios accipiant cibos, cum epithimatibus stalticis.²⁰¹

‘43. [...] Then they will also take dry and astringent food, with astringent compresses.’

(41.) [...] Aut de herbis haec epithimata fiant, hoc est portulaca, ginga, herba pulicari, zenzur, uua lupina et de plantagine et intubis.²⁰²

‘(41.) [...] Or these compresses shall be made out of herbs, like purslane plant, henbane, fleabane, knotgrass, wolfsbane and of plantain and chicory.’

These terms often retain Greek endings when used as subjects or objects (e.g., *epithimata* in the second example), but adopt Latin endings in oblique cases, (e.g., ablative *epithimatibus* in the first occurrence). Most importantly, these Greek terms are used inside the text without any explanation or acknowledgment of their origin.

The presence of Greek terminology in the *muliebria uerba* – that Mustio claims to use in order to be understood by women unfamiliar with Greek – may appear contradictory. This is for example the concern of James Adams who, in his 2005 article “Neglected Evidence for Female Speech in Latin”, argues that Mustio’s aim to write for midwives should be interpreted as poetical rather than literal, precisely because of the inclusion of Greek terms that would be inaccessible for an audience of “ordinary women”, as Adams

²⁰¹ SORAN. 16, 17–16, 18.

²⁰² SORAN. 69, 19–70, 1.

characterises Mustio's audience.²⁰³ However, Adams does not mention the abundant Greek medical loanwords for remedies and treatments as evidence. Instead, he refers to question 6 in Rose (our question V), in which Mustio discusses the Greek terminology for the uterus:

V. Matrix quot nominibus uocatur? Principaliter enim tribus nominibus dicta est; primum quidem ab eo quod mulieres partu suo matres efficiat. Graece etiam *ystera* appellatur hoc est nouissima siquidem ut nouissima omnibus intestinis iaceat aut quod annis XIII uacua sit apud uirgines <et> post mutationem aetatis effectus suos per partus mulieribus repraesentet; graece etiam *delfis* dicta est quod fratres efficiat omnes qui ex una nascuntur.²⁰⁴

‘V. By how many names is the matrix called?’

It is called mainly by three names, the first from the fact that it makes women mothers through delivery. In Greek it is called *ystera*, which means *nouissima*, because it lies last under all the intestines or because it is inactive among virgins until the fourteenth year and then, after the changes of age, it shows its activity to women through delivery. In Greek it is called also *delfis* because it makes brothers all those who are born from the same one.’

This question is unusual within the *Gynaecia*, as Mustio rarely includes etymological explanations derived from Soranus, preferring instead to focus on practical knowledge useful to midwives. Moreover, none of the Greek terms mentioned here is really used inside the *Gynaecia*, a part from *matrix*. The inclusion of such a question, where the Greek terminology is explicitly explained and even translated, suggests that Mustio did not assume familiarity with these Greek terms among his readers. This stands in contrast with Mustio's typical unmarked use of Greek medical vocabulary elsewhere in the

²⁰³ ADAMS (2005, 584).

²⁰⁴ My edition, see section 2.2.

Gynaecia, and therefore cannot be considered representative of his general linguistic practice.

In the commentary to the critical edition of this question (section 2.2), reference is made to David Langslow's classification of Greek terminology in Latin medical texts. Langslow categorises them under the following labels:²⁰⁵

- “B Borrowed: used without mention of Greek origin;
- MG₁ Mentioned as Greek but elsewhere used without comment;
- MG₂ Mentioned as Greek on every occurrence (usually once only);
- ML Mentioned as Greek and given a Latin equivalent, with:
 - ML₁ the Greek term preferred;
 - ML₂ neither independent of the other;
 - ML₃ each independent from the other;
 - ML₄ the Latin term preferred.”

Applying this framework to Mustio's terminology, *matrix* can be labelled as MG₁; *ystera* goes under the group ML, specifically ML₂, since it appears with the Latin equivalent *nouissima*, a semantic calque not used anywhere else in the *Gynaecia*; finally, *delfis* fits under the label MG₂, as it appears only once in Mustio's text. The Greek terms for remedies and therapies however, fall under the label of B: they are used by the author without explanation, indicating that Mustio assumed that his readers were familiar with them.

Adams's characterisation of Mustio's audience as “ordinary women” may therefore be misleading. Rather than addressing a general readership of “ordinary women”, Mustio appears to target a specific group, connected by gender, job, and possibly social status. Mustio's contemporary midwives may have been well-acquainted with Greek medical terminology, through their professional training and interactions with physicians, while still lacking a comprehensive knowledge of the language system of Greek itself.

²⁰⁵ LANGSLOW (2000, 99).

3.6.2 The Lexicon of Remedies

The second lexical group I classify as *muliebria uerba* is the lexicon of remedies, which encompasses all terms referring to plants, animal products, minerals, and foodstuffs used for medicaments, remedies, and special diets. A comprehensive table of these terms is provided at the end of this section; here is an excerpt from it:

tab. 9

<i>Acetum</i>	Vinegar
<i>Adeps anserinus</i>	Goose fat
<i>Adeps gallinacius</i>	Hen fat
<i>Adeps taurinus</i>	Bull fat
<i>Afronitrum/us</i> <i>Αφρόνιτρον</i>	Aphronitre
<i>Alica</i>	Spelt
<i>Athaeae boba</i>	Mallow althea
<i>Alumen rotundum</i>	Round alum
<i>Alumen scissum</i>	Slit alum
<i>Amygdala</i>	Almond/Almond tree
<i>Anthera</i>	Lip balm/remedy made of flowers
<i>Apium</i>	Celery/parsley/wild celery
<i>Artemisia</i>	Mug wort

The identification of certain plants and minerals remains problematic due to ambiguities in terminology and regional variation. Of particular interest is the multilingual nature of the lexicon, which includes both Latin and Greek, as evident already from table 9. Additionally, Greek appears in compound expressions formed with the preposition *διά* and the name of a natural element, usually in Greek and in the genitive case. These expressions are catalogued in the following table:

tab. 10

<i>Diacadmias</i>	of zinc oxide
<i>Diachartu</i>	of papyrus
<i>Diadafnidon</i>	of bay/bay leaves
<i>Diaiteon</i>	of willow
<i>Dialadanu</i>	of laudanum
<i>Diamolybdu</i>	of lead
<i>Diamoron</i>	of mulberry/of blackberry
<i>Diasamsucu</i>	of marjoram
<i>Diaspermaton</i>	of seeds
<i>Diasycon (+ dia finicon?)</i>	of figs
<i>Diacodion</i>	of poppy
<i>Diaquion/dia chylon</i>	of juices

These expressions may appear either in conjunction with a remedy name or independently. For example:

(88.) [...] **epithima** etiam **dia finicon** uel **dia iteon** emplastrum inducimus.²⁰⁶

‘(88.) [...] we use even the compress diafinicon or the plaster diaiteon.’

136. [...] Siccatis uero aliquantum humoribus iam possumus uti et **diamoron** et **diacodion**, suco etiam plantaginis cum melle decocto.²⁰⁷

‘136. [...] When the liquids have dried a bit, we can use then a diamoron and a diadocon, and even plantain juice boiled with honey.’

In both cases, whether accompanied by a type of remedy or not, *dia*-expressions must be intended as the name of the remedies mentioned, rather than ingredient descriptors. For instance, in the first example, I translate it as ‘we

²⁰⁶ SORAN. 112, 18–112, 19.

²⁰⁷ SORAN. 44, 13–44, 15.

use the compress [called] diafinicon’, rather than ‘we use a compress made of figs’. This interpretation is supported by passages where *dia*-expressions appear in lists alongside other remedy names,²⁰⁸ and by Mustio’s use of the simple genitive or *ex* + genitive to specify ingredients elsewhere in the text.²⁰⁹

This section of the lexicon also includes the three African plant terms that have been cited as evidence for the African provenance of Mustio and his work. These words – *boba* ‘mallow’, *ginga* ‘henbane’ and *zenzur* ‘knotgrass’ – were first identified by Rose, and then confirmed by the studies of André and Adams.²¹⁰ *Boba* is also mentioned by Dioscorides, who notes that Africans call this way what Romans call *malua rustica*.²¹¹ *Ginga* appears in an interpolation in the *Herbarium* attributed to the Pseudo-Apuleius,²¹² where it is stated that the plant known as *herba symphonica*, called *hysoscyamum* by the Greeks, is called *ginga* by the Punics. The correspondence with the Greek term is further supported by Soranus, who writes *ὄσσηύαμος*²¹³ where Mustio uses *ginga*. Both mallow and henbane have varieties native to North Africa. The case of *zenzur* is more complex. It corresponds to *πολύγονον* in Soranus, and also appears in another interpolation in Pseudo-Apuleius.²¹⁴ However, the traditional identification of *zenzur*/*πολύγονον* with ‘knotgrass’ is problematic, as knotgrass typically grows in humid and rainy environments – conditions not characteristic of North Africa.

All three terms have synonyms in Greek, and even in Latin in the case of *malua* (for *boba*). Their unmarked use – without explanation – suggests that they were familiar to Mustio’s intended audience.

²⁰⁸ See for example SORAN. 66, 18–67, 2.

²⁰⁹ See for example SORAN. 17, 9–17, 10; 81, 19.

²¹⁰ ROSE (1882, IV); ANDRÉ (1954, 52–64); ADAMS (2007, 529–530).

²¹¹ ADAMS (2007, 529–530); the author of the Hebrew translation of the *Gynaecia Sefer Dinah* calls another type of *malua*, the *malua uisco*, with the Spanish term *malbabis* (see BARKAI, 1998, 52). I have not investigated further the etymology of the word, but it is important to register its similarity with *boba*.

²¹² PS. APUL. *Herb.* 4, 26; see also ADAMS (2007, 529).

²¹³ SORAN. 3.12.68.

²¹⁴ PS. APUL. *Herb.* 18, 27; see also ADAMS (2007, 530).

Here is the complete table of the lexicon of remedies:

tab. 11

<i>Acetum</i>	Vinegar
<i>Adeps anserinus</i>	Goose fat
<i>Adeps gallinacius</i>	Hen fat
<i>Adeps taurinus</i>	Bull fat
<i>Afronitrum</i>	Foam of nitrum
<i>Alica</i>	Spelt
<i>Althaeae boba</i>	Mallow althea
<i>Alumen rotundum</i>	Round alum
<i>Alumen scissum</i>	Fissile alum ²¹⁵
<i>Amygdala</i>	Almond fruit; almond tree
<i>Anthera</i>	Remedy made of different flowers
<i>Apium</i>	Celery; parsley
<i>Artemisia</i>	Mugwort; wormwood
<i>Boba</i>	Mallow
<i>Butyrum</i>	Butter
<i>Celsa agrestis</i> ²¹⁶	Mulberry
<i>Centaurea</i>	Centaurea
<i>Centifolius marinus</i>	a type of rose, but there aren't other attestation of the type <i>marinus</i>
<i>Cera</i>	Wax
<i>Cerebrum ceruinum</i>	Deer brain
<i>Cerussa</i>	White lead
<i>Chalcitis</i>	Potassium alum
<i>Coriandrus (-um)</i>	Coriander
<i>Crocus</i>	Crocus

²¹⁵ BAILEY (1929a, 107).

²¹⁶ The precise nature of *celsa agrestis* is unknown.

<i>Cucumer (cucumis)</i>	Cucumber
<i>Cyminum</i>	Cumin
<i>Cyperon (-os)</i>	Cyperus; galingale
<i>Cypressus</i>	Cypress tree
<i>Daucum creticum</i>	Wild carrot from Crete
<i>Diacadmias</i>	of zinc oxide
<i>Diachartu</i>	of papyrus
<i>Diadafnidon</i>	of bay
<i>Diafinicon</i>	of date-palm
<i>Diaiteon</i>	of willow
<i>Dialadanu</i>	of laudanum (a resin)
<i>Diamolybdu</i>	of lead
<i>Diamoron</i>	of marjoram
<i>Diaspermaton</i>	of seeds
<i>Diasycon</i>	of figs
<i>Diacodion</i>	of poppy
<i>Diaquilon/ diachylon</i>	of juices
<i>Dragant(um)</i>	Dragon lily
<i>Elleborum/elleborus</i>	Hellebore
<i>Eruum</i>	Vetch, a kind of lentil
<i>Faenum graecum</i>	Fenugreek
<i>Fel taurinum</i>	Bull bile
<i>Ficus</i>	Fig
<i>Galla</i>	Galla
<i>Ges aster</i>	Samos clay
<i>Ginga</i>	Henbane
<i>Gliquiritia</i>	Liquorice
<i>Herba pulicaris</i>	Fleabane
<i>Hordeum</i>	Barley

<i>Intubum (-us)</i>	Endive; chicory
<i>Iris</i>	Iris
<i>Iris Illyrica</i>	Illyrian Iris
<i>Lac</i>	Milk
<i>Lactuca</i>	Lettuce
<i>Lapis ignarius</i>	Pyrite stone
<i>Laurus</i>	Bay
<i>Lenticula</i>	Lentils
<i>Lentiscus</i>	Mastic tree
<i>Lycium indicum</i>	Buckthorn (maybe dyer's buckthorn)
<i>Malum cydonium</i>	Quince
<i>Malum granatum</i>	Pomegranate
<i>Malua</i>	Mallow
<i>Marrubium</i>	Horehound
<i>Medulla ceruina</i>	Deer marrow
<i>Mel</i>	Honey
<i>Melilotus</i>	Sweet yellow clover
<i>Menta</i>	Mint
<i>Mespila (-um)</i>	Medlar tree; loquat
<i>Murta</i>	Myrtle
<i>Nitrum</i>	Nitre
<i>Oleaster</i>	Wild olive tree
<i>Oleum cyprinum</i>	Cyprus oil
<i>Oleum irinum</i>	Iris oil
<i>Oleum liliacium</i>	Lily oil
<i>Oleum murtinum</i>	Myrtle oil
<i>Oleum roseum</i>	Rose oil
<i>Oleum sansucinum</i>	Marjoram oil
<i>Oleum uetus</i>	Old oil

<i>Oleum uiride</i>	Green oil
<i>Oliua</i>	Olive fruit; olive tree
<i>Oryza</i>	Rice
<i>Palmula</i>	Palm date
<i>Pane</i>	Bread
<i>Passum</i>	Raisins wine
<i>Pepo (pepon)</i>	Melon
<i>Polenta</i>	Barley mush
<i>Portulaca</i>	Purslane plant
<i>Prunella</i>	Prunella
<i>Ptisana</i>	Pearly barley; barley decoction
<i>Puleium</i>	Penny-royal
<i>Pusca</i>	Drink of water and vinegar
<i>Rosa</i>	Rose
<i>Ruta</i>	Rue
<i>Semina lini</i>	Flaxseeds
<i>Sorba</i>	Sorb tree/sorb
<i>Spuma argenti</i>	Litharge
<i>Stafylinum</i>	Carrot; carrot juice
<i>Terebintina</i>	Terebinth resin
<i>Triticum</i>	Wheat
<i>Tus</i>	Incense
<i>Vua lupina</i>	Wolfsbane
<i>Vinum</i>	Wine
<i>Ypoquistida</i>	Uncertain, maybe from <i>ὑποκιστίς</i> .
<i>Ysop(um)</i>	Hyssop
<i>Zenzur</i>	Knotgrass

3.6.3 The Nursery Terms

The third and final lexical group identified as *muliebria uerba* consists of what Adams called “nursery terms’, in the aforementioned article on Greek terminology.²¹⁷ Specifically, Adams listed *mamilla*, *dida* and *mamma* in this group, to which I would add *ubuppa* and *titina*. These terms exhibit reduplication of the primary syllable – a characteristic feature of children’s lallation. In Mustio’s *Gynaecia*, *mamilla* consistently refers to ‘nipple’, *dida* to ‘breast’ – with one occurrence as ‘wet-nurse’ – and *mamma* is used more or less equally as ‘breast’ (from now on, *mamma*₁) and ‘wet-nurse’ (*mamma*₂). Adams argues that a hierarchy exists among synonyms, governed by the degree of intimacy associated with the presence of the baby. Thus, when direct interaction with the child or breastfeeding are involved, *dida* is preferred to *mamma*₁ – a word that can be found also in literary contexts – and *mamma*₂ to *nutrix*, the formal term used to indicate this profession.

tab. 12

	‘Breast’	‘Wet-nurse’
Presence of the baby	<i>dida</i>	<i>mamma</i> ₂
Absence of the baby	<i>mamma</i> ₁	<i>nutrix</i>

These nursery terms are linked to the baby not only semantically, but also phonetically, reflecting the speech patterns of an infant; for this reason, *nutrix* is not considered part of the category of *muliebria uerba*. However, while the presence of the baby is a significant factor, it is not the sole determinant of term usage. For example, the word *dida* is used instead of *mamma*₁ in three passages where neither the baby nor breastfeeding are mentioned: in reference to the first menstruation of young women, to the treatment of pregnant women entering the eighth month and to the preparations for childbirth:

²¹⁷ ADAMS (2005, 582–596).

28. Quibus signis intellegimus purgationem primo uenturam?

Plane uero a quarto decimo anno incipit, et didas habent inflatas, pondus etiam supra pectinem cum quadam prurigine sentiunt. [...].²¹⁸

‘28. From which signs do we understand that the first menstruation is coming?’

Usually, it starts around the fourteenth year of age, and the breasts are inflated, and they also feel a weight on their pubes with some sort of itch. [...].’

44. Quomodo mense septimo agenda sunt grauidae mulieres?

In omnibus patienter et quiete, ne nimia gestatione pecus iam perfectum foris excutiatur, siquidem etiam et septimani nasci possunt. Neque ergo exercitius partes illas fricare neque pectoralibus fasciis didas constringere. [...].²¹⁹

‘44. How must pregnant women be treated during the seventh month?’

With attention and calm in everything, so that the baby, almost ready, does not come out for an abrupt motion, since babies can be born even during the seventh month. And do not massage too strongly those parts nor tighten the breasts with chests bands. [...].’

46. In nono mense quae facienda sunt?

Iosum uersum laxius obuoluere, superiores uero partes sub didas amplius stringere, ut proximante partu inferiora loca exponantur, ut illuc infans possit celerius exire. [...].²²⁰

‘46. During the ninth month, what must be done?’

Bandage more loosely downwards, but tighten more the parts under the breasts, so that the lower parts will be free as childbirth approaches, and the baby can come out more quickly. [...].’

²¹⁸ SORAN. 12, 19 – 12, 23.

²¹⁹ SORAN. 16, 20–17, 1.

²²⁰ SORAN. 17, 13–17, 16.

I therefore think that the choice among nursery terms' synonyms is influenced not only by the specific presence of the baby, but by a more general level of intimacy involved in the situation:

tab. 13

	'Breast'	'Wet-nurse'
+ intimacy	<i>dida</i>	<i>mamma₂</i>
- intimacy	<i>mamma₁</i>	<i>nutrix</i>

As mentioned before, two additional terms – *ubuppa* and *titina* – also need discussion within this category. They both appear in question 131, where Mustio describes how to administer liquids to a baby:

131. Quid ei bibere dabimus?

Aliquando aquam aliquando uinum aquatius per uasculum uitreum ad similitudinem papillae formatum et pertusum, quod rustici ubuppam appellant aut titinam.²²¹

'131. What do we give it to drink?

Sometimes water, sometimes watery wine through a glass jar shaped like a nipple and pierced, that countryman call *ubuppa* or *titina*.'

The term *titina* derives from the colloquial Latin *tit(t)a*, 'breast', with diminutive suffix *-inus/-ina/-inum* which became increasingly common in late Latin.²²² The etymology of *ubuppa* is more uncertain. Like *titina*, it features syllabic reduplication typical of other nursery terms, but its root is difficult to identify. Adams reports suggestions of various scholars, like *puppa* — another colloquial word for 'breast' — *uber* and *uuula*, and ultimately proposes a derivation from *obba/ubba*. Due to the lack of an exhaustive etymology, the word has been classified as an African term already by Adams.²²³ This seems to be sustained by Mustio's note that the word was used by *rustici* – country folk.

²²¹ SORAN. 43, 3–43, 6.

²²² ADAMS (2005, 594); see also HAVERLING (2011 b).

²²³ ADAMS (2007, 539–540).

However, this very piece of information complicates the classification of *ubuppa* and *titina* among the nursery terms. If we apply the criterion used for Greek medical loanwords – i.e., the absence of explanatory glosses – then these terms do not fully qualify, as Mustio provides an explanation that put a distance between them and his readers.

3.6.4 Conclusions

In the discussion of *muliebria uerba*, the focus has been limited only to lexical elements, as it is easier to find peculiar and specific elements here than in other linguistic domains such as, for example, syntax.

The three lexical groups identified as belonging to *muliebria uerba* – the Greek medical loanwords, the lexicon of remedies and the nursery terms – exhibit varying levels of specificity. The first two groups were likely shared by all those connected to medical practice, literature or education, while the third group appears to be more specifically associated with the professional language of midwives. Nonetheless, I argue that all three groups legitimately belong to the *muliebria uerba*, rather than being merely components of general medical Latin. Regarding the Greek loanwords, their inclusion is justified by the argument previously advanced in response against Adams' critique: although Mustio's contemporary midwives did not understand Greek as a language, they were familiar with specialised terms that were integral to their daily tasks. These terms, tied directly to their professional duties, formed part of their specific speech, and therefore qualify as *muliebria uerba*. A similar reason applies to the lexicon of remedies. The multilingualism in this group – comprising Latin, Greek and African terms – can be better understood when viewed through the lenses of professional specificity. Three of the terms recognised as African – *boba*, *ginga* and *zenzur* – belong to this group, and two others – *dida* and *ubuppa* – fall under the label of nursery term. Their presence among the *muliebria uerba* suggests a further degree of specialisation: while

this tripartite classification may reflect a broader linguistic register possibly used by midwives across the entire Graeco-Roman world, the terminology registered in the *Gynaecia* reflects the particular speech of Mustio's contemporary African midwives. It would be of considerable scholarly interest to investigate whether similar patterns of *muliebria uerba* can be identified in other gynaecological texts, especially in those composed with a female audience in mind.

4. Summary and Conclusions

The primary aim of this thesis has been to demonstrate and substantiate the necessity of a new critical edition of Mustio's *Gynaecia*. To this end, chapter 1 explores the background of both the author and of the text (1.1), beginning with the limited information available in the introduction to this technical treatise: the author's name, his relationship with Soranus, his profession as a physician – likely a gynaecologist – his activity as a translator from Greek into Latin, and his didactical interest for the education of contemporary midwives, the intended audience of the *Gynaecia*. Mustio's declared didactic purpose is realised through specific tools detectable in the text, most notably the inclusion of explanatory illustrations and the use of a specific speech of midwives. Other aspects of Mustio's life and work can only be inferred, such as the geographical and chronological context of the text, which was first proposed by Valentin Rose in his critical edition of 1882.

The chapter continues with a detailed description of the three main manuscripts of the *Gynaecia* (1.2.1), i.e. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 3701-15 (B), Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 73.1 (L) and Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Saml. 1653 4 (H). Particular attention has been given to the presence of drawings in B and H, and to the evidence supporting their originality in Mustio's *Gynaecia*. This overview is followed by the analysis of previous philological works (1.2.2), namely Rose's edition, the research of Hans Medert, divided between the publications of 1911 and that of 1997/1998, and finally the 2015 doctoral dissertation of Lesley Annette Bolton from 2015.

Chapter 2 presents samples of my critical edition, specifically of four passages which exemplify the broader philological and linguistic challenges found throughout the *Gynaecia*. These passages are Mustio's introduction (2.1), the initial questions on female anatomy from the first book (2.2), the transition between the first and the second book (2.3) and, finally, the beginning of the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*, where the various causes of difficult delivery are described (2.4). As outlined in the description of the purpose of this work (1.3), my editorial approach to the *Gynaecia* seeks a balance between a text overly normalised and simplified, as the one found in H and, then, in Rose, and a text excessively vulgarised, built on the readings found in B&L as it is edited by Bolton. While Rose's edition remains the seminal work on Mustio's text, and Medert's and Bolton's studies offer different and often complementary perspectives, on the approach to both the Latin text and Rose's edition, my own work emphasises the importance of direct manuscript consultation and careful evaluation of problematic and bizarre readings, which may be key to solve some of the most problematic passages in the *Gynaecia* – such as in the cases of *Dia iatrica* and of *Cata gynaecion* in the introduction.

Precisely this passage underwent the most important transformation in my edition (section 2.1). The revised version presents the author as a well-educated man addressing his fellow writers and physicians, to explain and justify the composition of his text, as is customary and even expected in the prologue of a technical treatise. A closer examination of the critical apparatus reveals that it is not necessary to reject some of the later readings of B&L, nor to overly normalise the final language, in order to reconstruct a passage that is elegant yet simple, both in its Latin and in its structure. Section 2.2, further exemplifies the importance of integrating the textual traditions of B, L and H. In some passages, H was fundamental for the reconstruction of the text; however, where it introduces additional material, or a reading diverging significantly from the other manuscripts, an attempt of collation and integration

needs to be sustained, and the readings of B and L can equally provide essential readings. The text edited proposes a reordering of material based on parallels with Soranus' *Γυναικεῖα*, which might seem hasty, but which is still a new perspective to be considered. The same editorial strategy is applied in section 2.3, where, however, the presence of a substantial gap affecting in different ways the entire manuscript tradition makes the reconstruction of the transition between the first and the second book uncertain. Nevertheless, the new edition suggests minor adjustments to the sequence of content that enhance overall clarity. Finally, section 2.4 addresses the chapter *De difficili et laborioso partu*, where portions of material often occur in pairs of manuscripts versus a third; in each case, I have retained material that adds clarity to the text or aligns with Soranus' Greek original. The final explanatory passage has been removed due to incongruities in the content and likely represents a later interpolation. This chapter also provides an opportunity to discuss in detail the presence and the role of explicative drawings (section 2.4.1), and to sustain the argument that these drawings were an original addition of Mustio rather than an element already present in Soranus; their presence supports the didactical aim expressed by the Latin author at the beginning of the *Gynaecia*.

Chapter 3 then addresses the language of Mustio's text. It begins with a detailed examination of orthographic, morphological and syntactical features found in the three main manuscripts, and then offers a broader overview of the Latin employed by Mustio. The new version of the introduction serves as a benchmark for evaluating and reconstructing the Latin throughout the rest of the text. Mustio himself defines the language used in the rest of the text as *simplicius*, a comparative form that gains clarity when considered in relation to the more elevated style of the introduction. It is therefore not surprising that the rest of the *Gynaecia* exhibits a less literary and elegant tone. Nevertheless, it is important to reiterate that the preliminary nature of the present research precludes definitive conclusions regarding Mustio's Latin; the linguistic insights derived from the analysis of the introduction needs to be tested against

a complete edition of the text. In this perspective, section 3.5 illustrates as an example a noteworthy linguistic phenomenon – a particular use of the *ita ... ut* construction, possibly linked with the technical nature of Mustio's text – that waits further investigation to be better understood.

Another key element in Mustio's description of his linguistic choices is what he calls *muliebria uerba*, discussed in detail in section 3.6. As demonstrated, the adjective *muliebris* in the *Gynaecia* does not merely denote 'female', but carries the more specific connotation of 'obstetrical'; In this context, *muliebria uerba* is used to indicate not just female words or female speech, but a specific speech of midwives. Within this framework, I have identified three principal lexicon groups that can be considered part of the *muliebria uerba*: the Greek medical loanwords, the lexicon of remedies and the nursery terms. These three groups exhibit different levels of specificity; it is therefore important to avoid conceptualising the *muliebria uerba* as a codified or uniform system used by all midwives, but rather it has to be understood as Mustio's documentation of the most popular and effective terms employed by his contemporaries. This analysis is not intended as a rigid classification, but a contribution to the dialogue on the presence of elements in the Latin language that are characterised, not only but also, by the female gender of the users.

The *Gynaecia* of Mustio are indeed a very complex text, from both a philological and a linguistic point of view. Earlier in this work, I emphasised that, with my research, I wanted to show the interdependence of these two dimensions, and their centrality for a better comprehension of the author, his work, the context and the reasons behind his production. The importance of this statement has been particularly evident in the work on the introduction to the *Gynaecia*, a passage that – especially through its revised form – is a fundamental starting point for a better understanding of the whole text, especially in terms of language. However, caution is required when working with such a technical and late text, to avoid tautologic approach towards both the

philological and the linguistic aspects, i.e. explaining the language through editorial choices and vice versa. Another challenging aspect of this research has been the attempt to reconstruct the author's background and the context of the text's production. As argued throughout this study, Mustio likely was a well-educated physician, proficient in both Latin and Greek, with a strong didactical interest for the education of contemporary midwives. The hypothesis that he and his work originated in the Roman province of Africa during the second half of the 6th century AD aligns with the internal evidence of the *Gynaecia*, the cultural environment of that province – where a great number of medical translation and adaptation from Greek into Latin were produced – and the attempt of politics to integrate female practitioners into society. While no external evidence allows for a definitive portrait of the author, I am aware that there is the risk of circularity in such reconstructions. Nonetheless, I believe that this thesis has demonstrated that an approach that moves back and forth between contextual knowledge, philological edition and linguistic analysis, can apport meaningful insights, even in the case of a late technical text of medicine like Mustio's *Gynaecia*.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- Bolton, Lesley A. 2015. *An Edition, Translation and Commentary of Mustio's Gynaecia*. Calgary.
- Burguière, Paul; Gourevitch, Danielle; Malinas, Yves. 1988. *Soranos D'Éphèse, Maladies des femmes. T I*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Burguière, Paul; Gourevitch, Danielle; Malinas, Yves. 1990. *Soranos D'Éphèse, Maladies des femmes. T II*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Burguière, Paul; Gourevitch, Danielle; Malinas, Yves. 1994. *Soranos D'Éphèse, Maladies des femmes. T III*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Burguière, Paul; Gourevitch, Danielle; Malinas, Yves. 2000. *Soranos D'Éphèse, Maladies des femmes. T IV*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Daremborg, Charles. 1859. *A. Cornelii Celsi De Medicina, libri octo*. Lipsiae: Teubner.
- Drabkin, Miriam F. & Israel E. 1951. *Caelius Aurelianus, Gynaecia, Fragments of a latin version of Soranus' Gynaecia from a thirteenth century manuscript*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hess, Helmut H. 1997. *Gynaecia Mustionis: der Hebammenkatechismus des Mustio*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
- _____. 1998. *Gynaecia Mustionis: the midwife's catechism of Mustio*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
- Ilberg, Johannes. 1910. *Die Überlieferung der Gynäkologie des Soranos von Ephesos*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Medert, Hans. 1911. *Quaestiones criticae et grammaticae ad Gynaecia Mustionis pertinentes*. Giessen: O.Kindt (Gissae lat.).

- Moravcsik, Gyula, Jenkins, R. J. H. 1967. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Administrando Imperio*. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library.
- Oldoni, Massimo. 1981. *Gregorio di Tours. La Storia dei Franchi. Vol. 1. Libri I V*. Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla. Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.
- Rose, Valentin. 1877. *Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum Epistula Ad Theudericum Regem Francorum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- _____. 1879. *Cassi Felicis de medicina ex graecis logicae sectae auctoribus liber translatus sub Artabure et Calepio consulibus (anno 447)*. Lipsia: Teubner.
- _____. 1882. *Sorani Gynaeciorum Vetus Translatio Latina, nunc primum edita cum additis graeci textus reliquiis a Dietzio repertis atque ad ipsum codicem parisiensem*. Lipsia: Teubner.
- Urso, Anna Maria. 2018. *Liber geneciae ad Soteris obsetrix. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione e commento*. Santiago de Compostela: Andavira.
- Wolf, Caspar. 1566. *Gynaeciorum, hoc est, de mulierum tum aliis, tum gravidarum, parentium et puerperarum affectibus et morbis, libri veterum ac recentiorum aliquot, partim nunc primum editi, partim multo quam antea castigatores. [...]*. Basileae: per Thomam Guarinum.

Secondary Literature

- Acquati, Anna. 1971. Il vocalismo latino-volgare nelle iscrizioni africane. *ACME: Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* (24). 155–184.
- Acquati, Anna. 1974. Il consonantismo latino-volgare nelle iscrizioni africane. *ACME: Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* (27). 21–56.

- Adams, James. 2005. Neglected evidence for female speech in Latin. *Classical Quarterly* (55). 582–596.
- _____. 2007. *Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- André, Jacques. 1954. Sur quelques noms de plantes. *Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* (28). 52–64.
- Antonopolou Theodora. 2016. The Ancient Passion of St Clement of Ancyra: Preliminary Remarks on the Planned First Edition. In: E. Göransson, G. Iversen, B. Crostini, B. M. Jensen, E. Kihlman, E. Odelman, D. Searby (eds.) *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin. A Casebook*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. 22–33.
- Bailey, Kenneth C. 1929. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects. Part I*. London: Edward Arnold & Co.
- _____. 1932. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects. Part II*. London: Edward Arnold & Co.
- Banniard, Michel. 1992. *Viva voce. Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en Occident latin*. Paris: Institut des Études Augustiniennes.
- Barkai, Ron. 1998. *A History of Jewish Gynaecological texts in the Middle Ages*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek; Volume II*. Leiden: Brill.
- Benseddik, Nacéra. 1989. La pratique médicale en Afrique au temps d'Augustin. In: *L'Africa Romana: atti del Convegno di studio, 16–18 dicembre 1988, Sassari (Italia)*. II. Sassari: Edizioni Gallizzi, 663–682.

- Billanovich, Giuseppe. 1975. Milano, Nonantola, Brescia In: *La cultura antica dell'occidente latino dal VII all'XI secolo; settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, XXII*. Spoleto: presso la sede del Centro. 321–352.
- Bischoff, Bernard. 1998. *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*. Teil I: Aachen–Lambach. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Bliquez, Lawrence J. 2014. *The Tools of Asclepius: Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Boscherini, Silvano. 1991, La metafora nei testi medici Latini. In: G. Sabbah (ed.) *Le latin médical: La constitution d'un langage scientifique*. Saint-Etienne : Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne. 187–193.
- _____ 1995. Come parlavano le donne a Roma. In: *Studi linguistici per i 50 anni del circolo linguistico fiorentino*. Firenze: Olschki. 55–60.
- Canfora, Luciano. 2002. *Il copista come autore*. Palermo: Sellerio editore.
- Capitani, Umberto. 1974. Il recupero di un passo di Celso in un codice del *De medicina* conservato a Toledo. *Maia* (26). 161–212.
- Cillers, Louise. 2019. *Roman North Africa: Environment, Society and Medical Contribution*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Clackson, James. Horrocks, Geoffry. 2007. *The Blackwell History of The Latin Language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Coleman, Robert. 1971. The Origin and Development of Latin *Habeo* + Infinitive. *The Classical Quarterly* (21). 215–232.
- _____ 1976. Further Observations on the *Habeo* + Infinitive as an Exponent of Futurity. *The Classical Quarterly* (26). 151–159.
- Del Faïda, Abdelaziz. 2006. Émigration du savoir: médecins en Afrique Romaine (apport de l'épigraphie), in: Aomar Akerraz, Paola Ruggeri, Ahmed Siraj, Cinzia Vismara (eds.) *L'Africa Romana, Mobilità delle persone e dei popoli, dinamiche migratorie, emigrazioni ed immigrazioni nelle province occidentali dell'Impero romano*. II. Sassari. 729–740.

- Edelstein, Ludwig. 1967. *Ancient Medicine*. Oswei Temkin, C. Lilian Temkin (eds.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Ferraces Rodríguez, Arsenio. 2023. *Yatromagia tardoantigua I. El capítulo De homine de Sexto Plácito Papiriense*. La Coruña: Andavira..
- Ferrari, Mirella. 1988. La biblioteca del monastero di S. Ambrogio: episodi per una storia. In: *Il monastero di S. Ambrogio nel Medioevo. Convegno di studi nel XII centenario: 784–1984*. Milano: Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. 82–164.
- Firpo, Luigi. 1972. *Medicina medievale. Testi dell'Alto Medioevo, Miniature del codice di Kassel, Regole salutari salernitane, Incisioni del "Fascicolo de medicina", Anatomia di Mondino de' Liuzzi*. Torino: UTET.
- Flemming, Rebecca. 2000. *Medicine and The Making of Roman Women. Gender, Nature, and Authority from Celsus to Galen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Galdi, Giovanbattista. 2023. Searching for Order in the *Rule*: The Contribution of Philology and Linguistics to the Study of Saint Benedict's Latin. In: Giannakis K. Georgios, Filos Panagiotis, Crespo Emilio, de la Villa Jesús (eds.), *Classical Philology and Linguistics. Old Themes and New Perspectives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 619–645.
- Gratwick, A.S. 1972. *Habeo and Aveo: The Romance Future*. *The Classical Quarterly* (22). 388–398.
- Gazzaniga, Valentina. 1997. Phanostrate, Metrodora, Lais and the others. Women in the medical profession. *Medicina nei secoli*. 277–290.
- Gesner, Conrad. 1555. *Chirurgia. De chirurgia scriptores optimi quique veteres et recentiores, plerique in Germania antehac non editi, nunc primum in unum coniuncti volumen*, Zurich: Andream Gessnerum et Iacobum Gessnerum.

- Gourevitch, Danielle. 1998. The Paths of Knowledge: Medicine in the Roman World. In: Mirko D. Grmek (ed.), *Western Medical Thoughts from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 104–138.
- _____. 1999. Les Cataperotiana Gynécologiques attribués à Soranos d'Éphèse (Parisinus graecus 2153). In: Philippe Mudry (ed.), *Le traité des maladies aiguës et des maladies chroniques de Caelius Aurelianus. Nouvelles approches, actes du colloque de Lausanne*. Nantes: Université de Nantes. 206–211.
- Green, Monica. 2000. Medieval Gynaecological Texts: a Handlist. In: *Women's Healthcare in the Medieval West*. Bury St Edmunds. St Edmundsbury Press. Appendix 1–37.
- _____. 2009. The Sources of Eucharius Rösslin's 'Rosegarden for Pregnant Women and Midwives' (1513). *Medical History* (53). 167–192.
- _____. 2017. "Cliff Notes" on the Circulation of the Gynecological Texts of Soranus and Muscio in the Middle Ages. Academia.edu.
- Hanson, Ann. E., Green Monica H. 1994. Soranus of Ephesus: methodicorum princeps. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt; Teil II: Principat*. 37.2. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter. 968–1075.
- Haverling, Gerd. 2007. Sulle categorie di tempo, aspetto e azionalità nella traduzione 'ravennate' degli *Aforismi* d'Ippocrate, in: Arsenio Ferraces Rodríguez (ed.) *Tradición griega y textos médicos latinos en el período presalernitano. Actas del VIII Coloquio Internacional Textos Médicos Latinos Antiguos (A Coruña, 2–4 septiembre 2004)*. A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña. 159–176.
- _____. 2008. On Variation in Syntax and Morphology in Late Latin texts, in: Roger Wright (ed.) *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif VIII: Actes du VIII^e Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Oxford, 6–9 septembre 2006*. Hildesheim: Olms–Weidmann. 351–360.

- _____ 2010. On textual criticism and linguistic development in the Late Latin translation of the Hippocratic Aphorisms, in: David R. Langslow & Brigitte Maire (eds.) *Body, Disease and Treatment in a changing World. Latin texts and contexts in ancient and medieval medicine. Proceedings of the IXth International Conference «Ancient Latin Medical Texts», Hulme Hall, Université of Manchester, 5th-8th September 2007*. Lausanne: Éditions BHMS. 105–118.
- _____ 2011 a. Le flottement entre les cas en latin tardif, in: Michèle Fruyt, Michel Mazoyer & Dennis Pardee (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, Volume 64, Grammatical Case in the Languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the International Colloquium «Variations, concurrence et évolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques, Paris, 2–4 April 2007»*, Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 275–296.
- _____ 2011 b. La suffixation « diminutive » du latin préclassique et classique au latin tardif, in: Michèle Fruyt & Olga Spevak (eds.), *La quantification en latin. Actes du colloque sur la quantification en latin tenu à l'université Paris IV–Sorbonne les 5–7 juin 2006*. Paris: Collection Kubaba, L'Harmattan. 225–257.
- _____ 2014 a. Il latino letterario della tarda antichità, in: Piera Molinelli, Pierluigi Cuzzolin et Chiara Fedriani (eds.), *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif X, Actes du X^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Bergamo 5–9 septembre 2012*. Bergamo: Bergamo University Press. 845–872.
- _____ 2014 b. On terminological variation in the Late Latin translation of the *Hippocratic Aphorisms*, in: Brigitte Maire (ed.) *'Greek' and 'Roman' in Latin Medical Texts. Studies in Cultural Change and Exchange in Ancient Medicine*, (acts of the colloquium *A la croisée des médecines grecque et romaine. Contributions à l'histoire d'une greffe scientifique et culturelle. 10e Colloque international sur les textes médicaux latins, Lausanne 3–6 novembre 2010*). Leiden & Boston: Brill. 368–382.

- _____. 2016. On the use of *habeo* and the perfect participle in earlier and in later Latin, in: James N. Adams & Nigel Vincent (eds; with the assistance of Valerie Knight) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 180–201.
- _____. 2018. Sur les changements dans le lexique verbal en latin tardif, in: Anne Carlier & Céline Guillot (eds.), *Latin tardif, français ancien: Continuités et ruptures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 235–266.
- _____. 2019. Some more remarks on the language of the late Latin translation of the Hippocratic Aphorisms, in: Gerd V. M. Haverling (ed.), *The Acts of the 11th International Colloquium on Ancient Latin Medical Texts, Uppsala, September 10th–13th, 2013*. Uppsala: Studia Latina Upsaliensia 36: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. 89–107.
- _____. 2025. Literatursprache und Sprachentwicklung in der römischen Spätantike. In: Bardo M. Gaulty & Alexander H. Arweiler (eds.), *Sprache, Stil und Text in der lateinischen Spätantike. Beiträge zur lateinischen Literatursprache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Brill), 17–52.
- _____. Forthcoming. On Gregory of Tours, Late Latin, and Medieval manuscripts. In the Acts of the 15th Colloquium Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif, Munich in September 2024.
- Helmreich, Georg. 1889. *Marcelli De medicamentis liber*. Lipsia: Teubner.
- Hofmann J.B; Szantyr Anton. 1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Howald, E. Sigerist, H. E. 1927. *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum IV. Antonii Musae De herba uettonica liber. Pseudoapulei Herbarius. Anonymi De taxone liber, Sexti Placiti Liber medicinae ex animalibus*. Leipzig and Berlin: BBAW.
- Ieraci Bio, Anna Maria. 1995. L' 'ΕΡΩΤΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ nella letteratura medica. In: C. Moreschini (ed.), *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in età tardoantica: atti del terzo Convegno dell'Associazione di studi tardoantichi*. Napoli. 187–207.

- Ingerslev, Emmerik. 1909. Rösslin's "Rosegarten": Its Relation to the Past (the Muscio Manuscripts and Soranos), particularly with regard to Podalic Version. *The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the British Empire* (XV). 1–25.
- Keil, Heinrich (ed.). 1880. *Grammatici Latini, Volume 7, Scriptores de orthographia*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kind, Friedrich Ernst. 1927. Soranus. In: *Pauly-Wissowas realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (zweite Reihe, dritten Band)*. Stuttgart. Metzler Verlag. 1113–1130.
- Kihlman, Erika. 2016. The "Representative Text": Editing Sequence Commentaries. In: E. Göransson, G. Iversen, B. Crostini, B. M. Jensen, E. Kihlman, E. Odelman, D. Searby (eds.) *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin. A Casebook*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.
- Langslow, David R. 2000. *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2023. An Interplay of Approaches in the editing of a Late Latin Medical Translation. In: Giannakis K. Georgios, Filos Panagiotis, Crespo Emilio, de la Villa Jesús (eds.), *Classical Philology and Linguistics. Old Themes and New Perspectives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 547–556.
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*. Uppsala & Leipzig: Almqvist & Wiksell und Rudolf Haupt.
- Maire, Brigitte. 1995. Les vulgarismes comme critère de l'authenticité d'une tradition: l'exemple d'une réutilisation tardive de Celse chez Mustio. In: Louis Cabellat (ed.), *Latin Vulgaire – Latin Tardive 4, Actes du 4e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif*. Caen. 655–666.

- Marchetti, Francesca. 2017. *Figura ita est: origine e uso delle illustrazioni dei manuali di ostetricia dalla tarda antichità al Medioevo*. In A. Foscati, C. Gislon Dopfel, A. Parmeggiani (eds.), *Nascere. Il parto dall'antichità all'età moderna*. Bologna: Il Mulino. 15–31.
- Mazzini, Innocenzo. 1991. La presenza dell'elemento cristiano nel vocabolario medico latino dei secoli IV e V. In: G.J. Bartelink, A. Hilhorst, C.H. Kneepkens (eds.), *Eulogia, Mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire*. The Hague: Nijhoff International. 183–192.
- _____. 1997. *La medicina dei Greci e dei Romani. Vol 1 & 2*. Roma: Jouvence.
- _____. 2010. *Storia della lingua latina e del suo contesto, II. Lingue socialmente marcate*. Roma: Salerno editrice.
- Montero Cartelle, Enrique. 1991. *El latín erótico. Aspectos léxicos y literarios*. Sevilla: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- O'Donnell, James J. 1979. *Cassiodorus*. Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Ollero Granados, Dionisio. 1973. Dos nuevos capítulos de A. Cornelio Celso. *Emerita*, (41). 99–108.
- Passarella, Raffaele. 2012. Aspetti di medicina ginecologica nel tardoantico; Muscione e il parto. In: Vanna Maraglino (ed.), *Scienza antica in età moderna: teoria e immagini*. Bari: Carucci. 339–356.
- Perotti, Pier Angelo. 2000. La locuzione “quod si”, e altre simili. *Latomus* (59.1). 8–14.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume I. The Simple Clause*. Oxford: The Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2021. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume II. The Complex Sentence and Discourse*. Oxford: The Oxford University Press.
- Prenner, Antonella. 2012. *Muscione “traduttore” di Sorano di Efeso*. Napoli: Liguori editore.

- Radicchi, Rino. 1968. *Introduzione e considerazioni sulla Gynaecia di Muscione (VI s. d. C.) e studio dei suoi codici*. Pisa: Giardini.
- _____. 1970. *La Gynaecia di Muscione: manuale per le ostetriche e le mamme del 6 sec. d. C.; traduzione italiana e note con testo latino tratto dai codici e ampio glossario*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Rinaldi, Valentina. 2013. *Marcellus Empiricus, De medicamentis liber*. Vercelli: digilibLT.
- Rowland, Beryl. 1981. *Medieval Woman's Guide to Health. The First English Gynaecological Handbook*. London: Croom Helm Limited.
- Scarborough, John. 1969. *Roman Medicine*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Scimone, Alessandra. 2023. *Unum quoddam corpus nova facie formatum: Caspar Wolf e la composizione dell'Harmonia Gynaeciorum*. Galenos (17). 141–168.
- Segoloni, Maria Paola. 1992. La dedica della traduzione latina dei Gynaecia di Sorano. In: C. Santini, N. Scivoletto (eds.), *Prefazioni, prologhi, poemi di opere tecnico scientifiche latine, II*. Roma: Herder Editrice e Libreria. 617–626.
- Spencer, William George. 1935. *Celsus, De medicina, in three volumes*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Svennung, Josef. 1935. *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Volkssprache*. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Urso, Anna Maria. 2000. Procedimenti di riscrittura nei “Gynaecia” di Muscione. In: A. & J. Pigeaud (eds.), *Les textes médicaux latins comme littérature; actes du VIe colloque international sur les textes médicaux latins*. Nantes: Institut universitaire de France. 297–315
- _____. 2020. *Contributi alla tradizione latina di Sorano: i manoscritti dei Gynaecia di Mustione affini all'Hauniensis*. Galenos. (14). 91–105.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1971. *Introduzione al latino volgare*. Bologna: Patron editore.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1981. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.

