

Zeitschrift: Gesnerus : Swiss Journal of the history of medicine and sciences
Herausgeber: Swiss Society of the History of Medicine and Sciences
Band: 26 (1969)
Heft: 1-2

Artikel: Some notes on Jacobus Dalechampius and his translation of Theophrastus (Manuscript: BN. Lat. 11,857)
Autor: Schmitt, Charles B.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-520493>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 02.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Some Notes on Jacobus Dalechampius and His Translation of Theophrastus (Manuscript: BN. Lat. 11,857)¹

By Charles B. Schmitt

THEOPHRASTUS OF ERESOS (372/370–288/286 B.C.), pupil and follower of Aristotle, was one of those Greek authors practically unknown during the Middle Ages, but widely studied and discussed during the Renaissance. In the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries not only were his writings progressively recovered by the West, but were often translated into Latin, thus making them accessible to a much wider audience.² Among the Latin translations of Theophrastus which have hitherto attracted little attention among scholars is the one contained in manuscript Latin 11,857 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. This translation, which was made in the 1570s by JACOBUS DALECHAMPIUS,³ is actually one of the four manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale which are in some way connected with this writer.⁴ I do not

¹ The research necessary for this paper was carried out with the aid of U.S. Public Health Service Research Grant MH 11,808. The author would like to thank Professor NATALIE Z. DAVIS, M. ALAIN DUFOUR, Professor PAUL O. KRISTELLER, Dr. RUDOLF STEIGER, and Mr. CHARLES WEBSTER for numerous helpful suggestions and aids in connection with its preparation. He is also indebted to Mlle MARIE-THÉRÈSE D'ALVERNY for kindly checking several manuscript readings in the Bibliothèque Nationale and to Mr. PHILIP WEIMERSKIRCH for checking several references in the British Museum.

² The details of Latin translations of Theophrastus made before 1600 will be covered in my forthcoming article to appear in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, ed. P.O. KRISTELLER (Washington 1960f.). I am also completing a second article which will discuss more fully the recovery of Theophrastus' writings by the West and their *fortuna* during the Renaissance period.

³ See Appendix II for a description of the manuscript.

⁴ The other manuscripts are:

(1) Latin 11,858–11,859; paper, sixteenth century, in two volumes. Dalechampius' *Ornithologie*, which consists of hand colored drawings of birds with no descriptive material, save the names of the birds in Latin and French. It is possible that the descriptions which once accompanied the illustrations have been lost (see below, note 37). On these manuscripts which originally contained an early papyrus fragment, bound in with the Dalechampius manuscript, and their history see L. DELISLE, Notice sur un feuillet de papyrus récemment découvert à la Bibliothèque impériale de Paris..., in *Etudes paléographiques et historiques sur des papyrus du VI^e siècle* (Geneva 1866) 9–30, esp. 12–15; and CH. PERRAT, Des Pères du Jura à l'humaniste Grynaeus: le papyrus de Bâle IB, *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* XII (1950) 149–162, esp. 159. I am indebted to M. ALAIN DUFOUR for calling the latter to my attention.

(2) Latin 13,063; paper, sixteenth century, 514 fols. Correspondence of Jacobus Dalechampius, which consists of the copies of forty letters sent by him, as well as the originals of 299 letters which he received, in Latin, French, Greek, Italian, and Spanish. I am preparing an inventory of these letters, with some analysis of their contents and information concerning the correspondents, which I plan to publish shortly.

here intend to analyze exhaustively this manuscript translation of Theophrastus, but merely to point out several interesting features concerning it and to make it better known to the scholarly world in general. Before I do this, however, it seems desirable to say something about the translator himself, who was a figure of some importance in his own time, but who has been nearly forgotten in recent centuries. Since there is little precise or detailed secondary literature dealing with Dalechampius, I shall try to bring together what information I've been able to gather concerning him. *Jacobus Dalechampius*⁵ was born, it seems, at Caen in Normandy in 1513.⁶ He entered the University of Montpellier in 1545, took his first degree in medicine the next year and a doctorate in the same subject in 1547 under the eminent professor GUILLAUME RONDELET⁷.

⁵ Much of the basic research concerning both his life and his activities remains to be done. I have found no discussion of him to be correct in all particulars. The most detailed treatment is PHILIPPE-LOUIS JOLY, *Eloges de quelques auteurs françois* (Dijon 1742) 350–368. See also PIERRE DANIEL HUET, *Les origines de la ville de Caen* (Rouen 1702) 509–510; KURT SPRENGEL, *Geschichte der Botanik*, revised edition (Altenburg-Leipzig 1817/18) I, 332–334; MICHAUD, *Biographie universelle*, new edition (Paris 1843f.) X, 40–41; ERNST H. F. MEYER, *Geschichte der Botanik* (Königsberg 1857) IV, 395–399; HOEFER *Nouvelle biographie générale* (Paris 1853–1870) XII, 804–806; SAINT-LAGER, *Histoire des herbiers* (Paris 1885) 47–49; JULES ROGER, *Les médecins normands du XII^e au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1890–1895) II, 41–42; E. GURLT, *Geschichte der Chirurgie* (Berlin 1898) II, 786–790; ANTOINE MAGNIN, *Prodrome d'une histoire des botanistes lyonnais* (Lyon 1906) 14–15 [also in *Mémoires de la société botanique de Lyon* XXXI (1906) 14–15]; GEORGES GRENTÉ (ed.), *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le seizième siècle* (Paris 1951) 211; A. DAVY DE VIRVILLE, *Histoire de la botanique en France* (Paris 1954) 27–28; GEORGE SARTON, *Appreciation of Ancient and Medieval Science during the Renaissance (1450–1600)*, (Philadelphia 1955) 85–86; and *Dictionnaire de biographie française* IX (Paris 1961) 1518 (much less reliable than earlier works).

⁶ The secondary works disagree on his place of birth, some making it Bayeux, others Caen. In the printed works, however, Dalechampius is consistently referred to as *Cadomensis*. See below notes 12, 15, and 19. The confusion may have arisen because he was from the diocese of Bayeux. See below note 7.

⁷ The entry in Marcel Gouron, *Matricule de l'université de médecine de Montpellier (1503–1599)* (Geneva 1957) 102 reads as follows: «Jacobus Dalechampius, doc. [should be dioc., i.e. diocese] Bajocensis (Rondelet) 1^{er} décembre. Fol. 372, paiement des droits, B. 5 mai 1546, D. 1547. Botaniste célèbre. Mort à Lyon 1588.» It is not clear which part of this is directly copied from the university records and which part is due to the editor, but it is in essential agreement with JEAN ASTRUC, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la faculté de médecine de Montpellier* (Paris 1767) 353. Some sources state that his degree is from the University of Caen, e.g. JOLY, *op. cit.* 350 (where the date of the degree is given as 1560) and C. G. JOECHER, *Allgemeines Gelehrtenlexicon* (Leipzig 1750) II, 8.

He then apparently spent some time at Grenoble⁸ and Valence,⁹ before establishing himself at Lyon in 1552.¹⁰ It was at this latter city that he remained for the major part of his mature life and where he did his most important work in medi-

⁸ *Ed. cit.* below in note 15 has a letter from Dalechampius to Petrus ab Epinaco, archbishop of Lyon, which opens as follows: «Annis circiter ab hinc triginta, Allobrogum Cularonae, quam Gratianopolin vocant, medicinam cum publice profiterer, antistes in primis venerande, ac illius ego partem tractarem, in qua de salubribus et insalubribus alimentis disputatur.» fol. *2^r. JOECHER, *op. cit.* II, 8 says: «[er] lehrte zu Grenoble als Professor medicinae ...»

⁹ In the letter of Thomas de Iuges prefaced to the Seneca edition cited in note 20 below, fol. †3^v we read: «Hoc exemplo quoque utrumque Senecam olim agressus fuerat Dalechampius, philosophiae quondam professor Valentiae Allobrogum, eo pene tempore quo doctissimus Cujacius antecessor meritissimus iurisprudentiam Valentiae profitebatur.» It should also be noted that the *De peste* (full citation below in note 12) has a prefatory letter from Dalechampius to Iacobus a Turnone, Bishop of Valence. There is no mention of Dalechampius, however, in NADAL, *Histoire de l'université de Valence* (Valence-1861).

¹⁰ Again Theodore de Iuges tells us: «... sed enim mutata postea sede Dalechampius, Lugduni medicina clarus et occupatissimus ...», Seneca ed. (cited note 20), fol. 3^v. Lyon, Archives municipales, BB. 74, fol. 50, dated September 13, 1552 gives the precise information. On that day the consulate relieved Charles Desmarets of his position as *médecine de Hôtel-Dieu* and appointed one «Jacques Dalechant» in his place. At that time Dalechampius was also asked to give the traditional St. Thomas Day oration before the consulate at the December elections. I am indebted to Professor NATALIE Z. DAVIS, who communicated this information to me. See also, however, HENRY JOLY and JEAN LACASSAGNE, Médecins et imprimeurs lyonnais au XVI^e siècle, *Revue lyonnaise de médecine VII* (1958, Numéro spécial: *Lyon et la médecine*, 43 avant J. C.—1958) 87–116, at 103, which apparently makes use of the same archival source. It should be noted, however, that Dalechampius apparently had come to Lyon before he received the appointment as *médecin de Hôtel-Dieu*. In a letter from Ioannes Andreas a Croacia Constantinensis, dated 14 Kal. July, 1552, he is already addressed as «Jacopo Dalechampiono medico Lugdunensi.» Ms., BN Lat., 13,063, fol. 135^r. DOMINIQUE DE COLONIA, *Histoire littéraire de la ville de Lyon* (Lyon 1728–30) II, 799, and SAINT-LAGER, *op. cit.* 47 refer to him as a professor. It should be noted however, that as far as we have been able to determine he was not called “professor” in any of the works connected with his name in any way. In his translation of GALEN’s *De anatomicis administrationibus* (printed Lyon 1572) he is called «lecteur ordinaire de Chirurgie à Lyon.» I have not been able to consult this edition but take my information from J. BAUDRIER, *Bibliographie lyonnaise* (Lyon 1895–1921) III, 276. LAZARE MEY-SONNIER, *Histoire de l’université de Lyon et du collège de médecine faisant partie d’icelle...* (Lyon 1644) 19 briefly mentions Dalechampius and several of his works, but does not indicate whether he was a professor at the university.

cine, botany, and philology. Apparently, he died there in 1588, probably on March 1 of that year.¹¹

Although we know little of Dalechampius' private life, a good deal can be gathered concerning his intellectual interests and activities from his published writings and from the testimony of his contemporaries. He is perhaps best described by the epitaph "medical humanist," although he does not appear to have attained the fame of the most distinguished members of that group such as Niccolò Leonicensi, Conrad Gesner, and Thomas Linacre. His range of interests centers primarily on the life sciences and upon the ancient authors who wrote on those subjects, so it is not surprising to find him interested in Theophrastus.

The first publication for which Dalechampius had some responsibility was an edition of a work entitled *De peste* by the fourteenth century Montpellier physician, RAYMOND CHALMEL DE VIVIERS.¹² Already here in the "first fruits" of his work¹³ he shows a strong interest in good Latin and consequently emends Raymond's text to

¹¹ There is also some dispute over the date of his death, although 1588 seems clearly to be the year. Some earlier reference works have 1587, but this apparently rests on a mistake. The most probable evidence points towards March 1, 1588 as the date. For a discussion and evaluation of the conflicting information see PHILIPPE TAMIZEY DE LARROQUE, *Lettres françaises inédites de Joseph Scaliger* (Agen-Paris 1879) 261-262, and SAINT-LAGER, *op. cit.* 48, note 2, who prints the inscription from Dalechampius' tomb.

¹² *De peste libri tres. Opera Iacobi Dalechampii doctoris medici cadomensis in lucem aediti* (Lyon 1553). There seems to have been a printing a year earlier, but I have been unable to locate a copy. The fact that the author (Raymond Chalmel de Viviers) is not mentioned on the title page has led many later scholars to attribute the work to Dalechampius who was merely the editor. His role as editor is also clear from Dalechampius' prefatory letters to the edition. According to JOLY, *op. cit.* 352, the 1552 edition seems to mention Raymond on the title page. This, as nearly all later editions connected to Dalechampius, was published by the distinguished Lyonnais printer GUILLAUME ROUILLÉ (Rovillius). For a recent appraisal of Rouillé's importance in sixteenth century intellectual life see NATALIE ZEMON DAVIS, Publisher Guillaume Rouillé, Businessman and Humanist, in R. J. SCHOECK (ed.), *Editing Sixteenth Century Texts* (Toronto 1966) 72-112. Note especially the chart on p. 81, which clearly indicates Rouillé's importance as a printer of medical and scientific texts. On Raymond Chalmel and for a listing of the many variations of his name and further bibliography see GEORGE SARTON, *Introduction to the History of Science* (Baltimore 1927-48) III, 1694-1695.

¹³ «Hunc vero laborem meum ... perduravi, quasi primos fructus ... » *De peste*, 5.

meet his own stylistic taste.¹⁴ He also translated ATHENAEUS' *Deipnosophistae* into Latin,¹⁵ several works of GALEN and HIPPOCRATES into French,¹⁶ and was involved in one capacity or another in editions of PAULUS AEGINETA,¹⁷ DIOSCORIDES,¹⁸ and

¹⁴ In the preface Dalechampius says: «Scripsit autem, quod tantum licebat suo seculo, cum bonae literae iacerent, inepta, rudi, et barbara prorsus oratione, in qua tamen divinum ispius ingenium sic eluceat ... Qua in re non tantum oratio mutanda fuit, ut pro inculta illa et horrida aliquanto splendidior ac nitidior in vulgus prodiret, sed et reponenda vel potius divinanda multa quae in exemplari vetusto et carioso vix legebantur: ad nostrum dicendi usum accommodanda multa, quae pro Arabum consuetudine inaudita nobis ille usurpaverat: evolvendae quaestiones, quas ut in scholis didicerat arduas et obscuras, impediēbat verius, quam expediebat; quae a me perfecta sunt omnia non sine magna difficultate longoque taedio.» *De peste*, 4–5. Dalechampius completely revamped Raymond's text. Compare his edition to the section printed from Danzig, Marienstift, ms. 200 in ROBERT HOENIGER, *Der schwarze Tod in Deutschland* (Berlin 1882), 159–177. For additional manuscripts of this work see THORNDIKE-KIBRE, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin*, revised ed. (London 1963) 111, 318, 406.

¹⁵ *Athenaei Naucratis ... Deipnosophistarum libri quindecim ... in latinum sermonem versi a Iacobo Dalechampio Cadomensi ...* (Lyon 1583). See JOLY, *op. cit.* 360–362.

¹⁶ Cited in JOLY, *op. cit.* 352–353. The works translated (according to Joly) include: *De dissectione musculorum* (1564), *De usu partium* (1566), and *De anatomicis administrationibus* (1566). BAUDRIER, *op. cit.*, lists the following editions: *Administrations anatomiques* (1572, reprinted 1573; Baudrier, III, 276, 285); *Les deux livres de la dissection des muscles* (1564; Baudrier, IX, 299); and *De l'usage des parties du corps humain livres XVII* (1566; Baudrier, IX, 307). See also RICHARD J. DURLING, A Chronological Census of Renaissance Editions and Translations of Galen, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* XXIV (1961) 230–305, at 275, 276, which lists the same editions as Baudrier, making no mention of a 1566 edition of the *Administrations anatomiques*; and HOWARD STONE, The French Language in Renaissance Medicine, *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* xv (1953) 315–346, at 330–331, who lists all three translations. Dalechampius also translated (perhaps better, paraphrased) a part of Hippocrates' *De fracturis* into French as *Les discours d'Hippocrate sur les fractures des os et delouēures des jointures* in his *Chirurgie françoise* (Lyon 1570), fols. †6^r, 599. See STONE, *art. cit.* 339.

¹⁷ *Pauli Aeginetae medici opera. Ioanne Guinterio Andernaco medico peritissimo interprete. Eiusdem Guinterii et Jani Cornarii annotationes; item Iacobi Goupyli et Iacobi Dalechampii scholia in eadem opera* (Lyon 1589). See JOLY, *op. cit.* 351–352, who says that the work was printed in 1551, 1563, 1567, and 1589. BAUDRIER, *op. cit.* IX, 193, 315 lists only editions of 1551 and 1567, and only in the 1567 edition, which appears to be a revised version of the earlier one, did Dalechampius have a part. I use the 1589 edition, missed by Baudrier, but existing in the British Museum and cited by DAVIS, *op. cit.* 112. Dalechampius' contribution to this edition, is summarized in IOANNES MOLINAEUS' (Desmoulin) Preface as follows: «Postremus Iacobus Dalechampius huic operi manus admovit,

PLINY THE ELDER.¹⁹ Moreover, Dalechampius' notes and collations of various manuscripts were used after his death by Theodore de Iuges to aid in establishing a monumental edition of the works of the two SENECA.²⁰ Apparently Dalechampius was preparing his own edition of Seneca for the press when he died²¹ and only thirty years later did his researches become incorporated into de Iuges' edition.

medicus peritissimus, et in vetustorum scriptorum locis difficilioribus ponderandis synceri iudicii et in maculis quae eorum libris inhaeserint etiam abstrusissimis eluendis ingenii foelicissimi. Is cum aliorum librorum, tum sexti huius operis libri, qui de chirurgia est, locos plurimos tanta dexterritate ac foelicitate partim interpretatus est, partim exposuit, partim emendavit, ut omnes qui in hunc authorem operam suam contulerunt, superasse diligens et eruditus lector facile sit perspecturus.» fol. a 3^r.

¹⁸ *In Dioscoridis Anazarbei de medica materia libros quinque, Amati Lusitani ... enarrationes eruditissimae. Accesserunt huic opera praeter correctiones lemmatum etiam adnotationes R. Constantini, necnon simplicium picturae ex Leonharto Fuchsio, Iacobo Dalechampio atque aliis* (Lyon 1558). Apparently Dalechampius' only contribution to this edition was to provide some of the illustrations of plants which were appended to the work. It is claimed by W.P.D. WIGHTMAN, *Science and the Renaissance* (Edinburgh 1962) II, 8, without citing any evidence, that Dalechampius wrote a commentary on Dioscorides. I have been able to find no indication of this, nor is any mention made of such a commentary in JERRY STANNARD, *Dioscorides and Renaissance Materia Medica*, in *Analecta Medico-Historica* (Proceedings of Symposium of the International Academy of the History of Medicine, Basel: September 7, 1964) (New York 1966) 1-21.

¹⁹ *C. Plinii Secundi historiae mundi libri XXXVII ... omnia eiusdem multorum antehac doctorum hominum novissime vero laboriosis observationibus conquisita et solerti iudicio pensitata Iacobi Dalechampii medici Cadomensis* (Lyon 1587). This edition apparently occupied Dalechampius for many years and must be considered one of his major works. It was reprinted several times, but was also severely criticized by a number of later scholars, particularly on account of the boldness of some of Dalechampius' philological conjectures. See especially JOLY, *op. cit.* 354-360, but also *Prima Scaligeriana, editio altera priore emendatior* (Utrecht 1671) 63-64. According to Jacques-Antoine de Thou, Dalechampius worked for thirty years on his edition of Pliny. See *Mémoires de Jacques-Antoine de Thou depuis 1553 jusqu'en 1601* in C.-B. PETITOT (ed.), *Collection complète des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France XXXVII* (Paris 1823) 341. According to JOLY, *op. cit.* 354, Dalechampius was also responsible for an edition of the writings of Caelius Aurelianus, printed in London in 1579. I have been unable to verify the existence of such an edition.

²⁰ *L. Annaei Senecae philosophi et M. Annaei Senecae rhetoris opera quae extant omnia ... item I. Dalechampii et Th. de Iuges variae lectiones et notae ...* (Geneva 1628). For Dalechampius' part in the edition see DE IUGES' Preface (I, fols. † 3^r - † 4^r) and the list of manuscripts utilized by Dalechampius (I, † 6^v). See also JOLY, *op. cit.* 366.

²¹ See Appendix I, p. 52.

Dalechampius' interests in surgery and botany are illustrated by his two more-or-less original works, the *Chirurgie françoise* and the *Historia generalis plantarum*. Both of these compilations, although largely dependent upon earlier treatments of the subjects, have a certain amount of original material drawn from the author's own experiences and observations. The *Chirurgie françoise*²² is, in fact, essentially a translation of Book VI of Paul of Aegina's *De re medica* with such an extensive commentary and notes as to transform it into an essentially different work.

The *Historia generalis plantarum*²³ can probably be called Dalechampius' major work. It is an enormous compilation, perhaps the first full scale attempt in modern times to bring together a comprehensive descriptive work on botany, and contains the most complete list of plants available up to that time.²⁴ Moreover, it seems to include the first serious research on the flora of the region of Lyon.²⁵ Although the first edition of this work does not carry Dalechampius' name on the title page, there

²² Lyon 1570. See JOLY, *op. cit.* 353. The work contains additions not in the original, including illustrations of surgical instruments taken from AMBROISE PARÉ and JACQUES ROY (see Dalechampius' Preface, fol. † 7^r). JEAN GIRAULT reprinted the work with further additions at Paris in 1610. For an analysis and evaluation of the work as a whole see GURLT, *op. cit.* III, 786–790.

²³ The full title is: *Historia generalis plantarum in libros XVIII per certas classes artificiose digesta. Haec plusquam mille imaginibus plantarum locupletior superioribus omnes propemodum quae ab antiquis scriptoribus Graecis, Latinis, Arabibus nominantur: necnon eas quae in Orientis atque Occidentis partibus ante saeculum nostrum incognitis repertae fuerant, tibi exhibet. Habes etiam earundem plantarum peculiaria diversis nationibus nomina: habes amplas descriptiones e quibus singularum genus formam, ubi crescant et quo tempore vigeant, nativum temperamentum vires denique in medicina proprias cognosces. Adiecti sunt indices, non solum Graeci et Latini, sed aliarum quoque linguarum, locupletissimi* (Lyon 1586–87). The text has over 2,000 large, folio-sized pages, an impressive series of indices, and many illustrations. On the work see JOLY, *op. cit.* 362–366; SPRENGEL, *op. cit.* I, 332–334; MEYER, *op. cit.* IV, 395–399, and MAGNIN, *op. cit.* 14–15.

²⁴ Such is the judgement of MEYER: «Es war zu seiner Zeit die vollständigste Sammlung aller Pflanzen» (*op. cit.* IV, 398).

²⁵ MAGNIN, *op. cit.* 14. For a list of the plants newly described in the work predominantly of the Lyon region see besides MAGNIN, also SPRENGEL, *op. cit.* I, 332–334; SAINT-LAGER, *op. cit.* 49; and CHARLES PICKERING, *Chronological History of Plants* (Boston 1879) 912. There are also references to local flora in Dalechampius' correspondence (e.g. Ms. BN. Lat. 13,063, fol. 52^v, to Franciscus Miconius, dated May 24, 1576) and in marginal annotations to his Theophrastus translation (e.g. Ms. BN. Lat. 11,857, fols. 8^v, 69^r, 151^r). The first of these reads, in part, as follows: «Prope Lugdunum in nemorosis et argissosis [sic; argillosis?] effoditur nigro tuberi simile quidpiam ... Cf. THEOPHRASTUS, *De historia plantarum* I, 6, 5.»

seems to be no doubt that he was responsible for it, although he had a good deal of help in bringing it to completion,²⁶ particularly from JOHANN BAUHIN and JEAN DESMOULINS.²⁷ The work seems to have had some success for the whole thing was translated into French by Desmoulins²⁸ and also served as the basis for a later work by IACOBUS ANTONIUS CLAVENNA²⁹ of Treviso. It was severely criticized twice, however, particularly for the poor quality of the numerous plant illustrations and because the same illustration was often used several times in the course of the work as a representation of different plants.³⁰

As we might expect Dalechampius was in correspondence and close contact with some of the foremost scholars and scientists of his time. He seems to have remained close friends with his eminent teacher, GUILLAUME RONDELET, throughout his life, writing several poems in praise of Rondelet's *De piscibus* in 1554–55.³¹ He was also

²⁶ Dalechampius' authorship seems clear from the printer's (Rouillé's) Preface to the work which begins: «Vigesimus annus est, benigne lector, et eo quidem amplius, cum ingressus musaeum Iacobi Dalechampii, insignis aetate nostra medici, grande volumen eum prae manibus habentem reperivi, quam plurimis stirpium figuris conspicuum», fol. *3^r. See also the statement of Charles de l'Escluse cited in LUDOVIC LEGRÉ, *La botanique en Provence au XVI^e siècle* (Marseille 1899–1901) I («Pierre Pena et Mathias de Lobel») 54, and MEYER, *op. cit.* IV, 396.

²⁷ MEYER, *op. cit.* IV, 396–397.

²⁸ For Desmoulins see MAGNIN, *op. cit.* 15. The French translation was properly attributed to Dalechampius on the title page, which reads: *Histoire generale des plantes contenant XVIII livres egalment departis en deux tomes: Sortie latine de bibliotheque de M. Jacques Dalechamps, puis faite françoise par M. Jean Des Moulins, medecins très-fameux de leur siècle...* (Lyon 1615). The French translation was also reprinted at Lyon in 1653.

²⁹ *Clavis Clavennae aperiens naturae thesaurum eiusque gemmas depromens: vires scilicet plantarum in generali earundem historia ex Dalecampio potissimum sumpta a Gulielmo Rovillio Lugduni semel edita ...* (Treviso 1648). The plants contained in the *Historia generalis* are here arranged in alphabetical order and briefly described. See JOLY, *op. cit.* 366 (who confuses the author with Nicola Clavena of Belluno).

³⁰ IACOBUS PONS, *In historiam generalem plantarum Rovillii duobis tomis et appendice comprehensam breves annotationes et animadversiones compendiosas* (Lyon 1600) and CASPAR BAUHINUS, *Animadversiones in historiam generalem plantarum Lugduni editam ...* (Frankfurt 1601). The prefaces of these two works summarize the nature of the criticisms, while the texts give the specific corrections. See JOLY, *op. cit.* 364; MEYER, *op. cit.* IV, 397–398.

³¹ *Gulielmi Rondeletii ... Libri de piscibus marinis in quibus verae piscium effigies expressae sunt ...* (Lyon 1554–55) I, fol. α7^r; II, fol. α6^r. See also Gesner's letter to Ioannes Crato of August 16, 1561 in *Epistolarum medicinalium Conradi Gesneri ... libri III* (Zurich 1577), fol. 1^r, where Dalechampius is mentioned as being a friend of Rondelet.

on friendly terms with the Swiss polymath, Conrad Gesner, exchanging letters with him and sending to him numerous botanical specimens.³² He also corresponded with JOSEPH JUSTUS SCALIGER,³³ remained in close contact with ROBERT CONSTANTIN³⁴ for a number of years, and corresponded with JEAN FERNEL,³⁵ professor of medicine at the University of Paris.

The Bibliothèque Nationale manuscripts, from all indication, have not yet hitherto been utilized. Dalechampius' collection of letters was already signalled by PHILIPPE LABBÉ³⁶ in 1653 and the *Ornithologie* was mentioned in the early eighteenth century by DOMINIQUE DE COLONIA.³⁷ All four manuscripts had arrived at their present

³² See particularly Gesner's letter to Dalechampius dated January 8, 1562, printed in *Museum Helveticum ad juvandas literas in publicos usus apertum* (Zurich 1746) part I, 133–150. For further evidence of their connection see the note on p. 134–135 of the above; GESNER, *Epistolae medicinales*, fols. 1^r, 8^r; and BN. Lat. 13,063, fols. 27–36, 257–262, 264. See also JOHANNES HANHART, *Conrad Gesner* (Winterthur 1824) 170–171, and HANS FISCHER, *Conrad Geßner (26. März 1516 bis 13. Dezember 1565) Leben und Werk* (Zürich 1966) 65–66. Dalechampius sent to Gesner many botanical specimens as is evident from Gesner's annotations throughout Ms. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, 2386 [photocopy in Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, Mss. Z. VIII. 394–395]. According to the count made by R. STEIGER, *Erschließung des Conrad-Geßner-Materials der Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Gesnerus* xxv (1968) 29–63, at p. 43, therein are mentioned more specimens sent him by Dalechampius than by anyone else. The relations between Dalechampius and Gesner will be investigated more fully in a subsequent paper in which it is hoped to publish the letters between them preserved in Ms. Paris, BN. Lat. 13,063 cited above.

³³ See especially the eight letters of Scaliger, written between 1561 and 1587, in JACOB BERNAYS (ed.), *Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Berlin 1855) 308–314 and the references to Dalechampius in TAMIZEY DE LARROQUE, *op. cit.* 143, 247, 261–262.

³⁴ See Constantin's letter to Dalechampius in the Dioscorides edition cited above in note 18, fols. aa6^r–aa8^r and also the letters in BN. Lat. 13,063, fols. 71, 263, 265–296. CONSTANTIN (Constantinus) dedicated his *Lexicon sive Dictionarium Graecolatinum* (Geneva 1562) to Dalechampius. See the prefatory letter on fols. B_{iii}^v–B_{iv}^v, which is not included in later printings of the work. See also JOLY, *op. cit.* 351.

³⁵ BN. Lat. 13,063, fols. 13–14.

³⁶ It was then in the library of René Moreau, Professor of Medicine at Paris: «Iacobi Dalechampii medici eruditissimi epistolae ad varios et variorum ad illum», *Phillippi Labbei ... Nova bibliotheca MSS. librorum ...* (Paris 1653) 218. According to J.-F. NICERON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres...* (Paris 1729–45) xxxiv, 297, Moreau's library was broken up and sold after his death in 1656 by his son, Jean Baptiste.

³⁷ *op. cit.* II, 799, who says: «Il laissa un traité manuscrit, *De avibus et piscibus*, qui étoit encore le siècle passé dans le cabinet de M. le Conseiller de Chabanes, son gendre, où le P. Bullioud l'a vu.»

location in the Bibliothèque Nationale by 1868 when they are mentioned in the survey of LEOPOLD DELISLE,³⁸ but little notice seems to have been taken of them. In addition to the translations of Theophrastus, with which we are here primarily concerned, the letters are of great interest not only for what they can tell us of Dalechampius himself, but also for the information they give concerning the general intellectual and scientific *ambiance* in Europe during the sixteenth century.

It is, however, in his translation of Theophrastus that we are here particularly interested. Since Dalechampius' major publication was a general work on botany, we must suppose that he had a very strong interest in Theophrastus' writings throughout the years during which he was preparing the *Historia generalis plantarum* for the press. We have ample evidence for this from several sources.³⁹ He did not translate merely Theophrastus' botanical works, however, but rendered into Latin all of that author's works which were known to him, including number of fragments apparently not previously translated.

The manuscript which contains the Theophrastus translation was Dalechampius' own working copy, as the many cancellations, emendations, and interlinear and

Whether the present BN. Lat. 11,858–11,859 is the first part of this one I cannot say for sure. It would seem probable, however, that Dalechampius would have left a written commentary and description to accompany the illustrations now preserved in the BN. manuscripts. See also the references cited above in note 4.

³⁸ *Inventaire des manuscrits de Saint-Germain-des-Prés conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale sous les numéros 11,504–14, 231 du fonds latin* (Paris 1868) 24, 87 [printed also in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* XXVI (1865) 208 and XXVIII (1867) 551]. This was cited also by N.-N. OURSEL, *Nouvelle biographie normande* (Paris 1886–1912) I, 226; ROGER, *op. cit.* 42, and *Dictionnaire de biographie française* IX, 1518, but most other recent writers on Dalechampius fail to recognize the existence of these manuscripts and none give any evidence of having seen them. The degeneration of copied references is nicely illustrated here. DELISLE (1868) describes BN. Lat. 11,857 as «Jac. Daléchamps, version latine des ouvrages de Théophraste sur les plantes, etc. XVI». OURSEL (1886) and ROGER (1895) write «Traduc. de Théophraste sur les plantes», and LE TOURNEUR in the *Dictionnaire de biographie française* (1961) merely gives us the shelf mark and tells us nothing of the contents. The fact is that the manuscript contains a translation of all of the known writings of Theophrastus plus other translations. The other sources which I have consulted on Dalechampius published after 1868 seem to be unaware of the existence of these manuscripts.

³⁹ See the letters of Scaliger to Dalechampius in BERNAYS, *op. cit.* 309–312 and the various letters in BN. Lat. 13,063, esp. fols. 27–34, 39–40, 52–57, 174–175, 282–283, where both general and specific problems of Theophrastus scholarship are discussed.

marginal comments show. The manuscript, in many places, indicates that after translating a given Greek word in one way, the translator thought better of it and altered it. The codex itself seems to have passed into the hands of one of Jacobus' younger relatives,⁴⁰ perhaps his nephew, JEAN DALÉCHAMPS, one of whose works was also in the collection of RENÉ MOREAU.⁴¹ Apparently, Jacques' translation of Theophrastus did not go to the Moreau collection. What happened to it after it left the relative's hands, we have not been able to determine, but it later went to the Coislin library, then to the library of Saint-Germain-des-Prés,⁴² and ultimately to the Bibliothèque Nationale.

The introduction to the manuscript, written in a different hand than the remainder, is by Jacques' relative (perhaps his nephew Jean) and gives every indication of having been originally written as a preface to a proposed posthumous edition of the Theophrastus translations, which for some reason or another never actually saw the light of day. This introduction, which is interesting in its own right and gives us further insight into the personality and activities of Jacobus Dalechampius, is printed in its entirety below in Appendix I.

The Theophrastus translation was done, at least in part, during the years 1574–1575, as a note in the manuscript tells us.⁴³ The manuscript itself shows evidence of having been written in two different stages: (1) The *De historia plantarum* and *De causis plantarum* and (2) all the other works.⁴⁴ I have been able to find no precise internal information which would help to date the second part of the manuscript exactly.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ See Appendix I, p. 52.

⁴¹ JOLY, *op. cit.* 367; LABBÉ, *op. cit.* 218. Labbé mentions «Jani Dalechampii de summo bono» as being in the collection of Moreau along with Jacques Dalechampius' letters, as mentioned above in note 36.

⁴² A printed label pasted on fol. 1^r of the manuscript reads as follows: «Ex Bibliotheca MSS. Coisliniana, olim Segueriana, quam Illust. Henricus du Cambout, Dux de Coislin, Par Franciae, Episcopus Metensis &c. Monasterio S. Germani a Pratis legavit. An. M.DCC.XXXII.»

⁴³ «Inchoata haec versio die primo Novembris anno 1574 absoluta die 5 Septembris anno 1575», fol. 209^r. This note comes immediately after the translation of the two botanical works.

⁴⁴ The number of pages left blank after the two botanical works and before the other works would point in this direction. There is also (fol. 210^r) a table of contents which precedes the second part of the manuscript.

⁴⁵ The one bit of information which might help is a marginal annotation to the *De lapidibus* which says: «Remegius Belleau poeta Gallus lepidissimis versibus Sapphirum sibi conspectum describit»,

Several interesting features emerge from a study of the Dalechampius manuscript when it is placed in the context of Theophrastus studies in the sixteenth century. These may be summarized as follows: (1) Dalechampius is the first to give a complete translation of all of Theophrastus' known works; (2) from all indications he was the first to give some of the fragmentary works a Latin rendering; (3) he must have worked from several different Greek collections of Theophrastus' writings, for at his time there was not yet available a single printed edition which contained all of the works which he translated; and (4) he does not hesitate to disagree with earlier translators and editors concerning particular textual problems. Let us now discuss each of these points in greater detail.

Strange as it seems, although the writings of Theophrastus were all known and available in printed form—save for a few modern discoveries—by 1557,⁴⁶ it was not until 1613 that anything approaching a complete Latin translation of the writings appeared in print.⁴⁷ In fact, the bulk of the writings were available in Greek after the

fol. 213^r. This refers to BELLEAU's *Le saphir* first printed in REMY BELLEAU, *Les amours et nouveaux eschanges des pierres precieuses: vertus et proprietes d'icelles...* (Paris 1576) fols. 34^v–36^v. In an undated letter to Nicolaus Nancelius of Tours (Ms. BN. Lat. 13,063, fol. 70^r) Dalechampius says: «... Theophrastus cuius opera quae extant omnia latina feci ... » See also fol. 359 of the same manuscript, where Johannes Lalamantius mentions the translation in a letter to Dalechampius (also undated).

⁴⁶ See below note 53 and 56.

⁴⁷ *Theophrasti Eresii Graece et Latine opera omnia*, ed. DANIEL HEINSIUS (Leiden 1613). A few years earlier there appeared the following edition, which is as complete as the 1613 edition, except that it omits the easily available, *De historia plantarum* and *De causis plantarum*: *Theophrasti Eresii peripateticorum post Aristotelem principis pleraque antehac Latine nunquam, nunc Graece et Latine simul edita interpretibus Daniele Furlano Cretensi, Adriano Turnebo ... Ex bibliotheca Ioannis Vincentii Pinelli* (Hanau 1605). Even the 1613 edition, however, lacks the three following important works: *De sensu*, *Metaphysica*, and PRISCIANUS LYDUS' *Metaphrasis*. The 1605 edition, which contains translations of several of the works by DANIEL FURLANUS, apparently drew these from the library of GIAN VINCENZO PINELLI. I do not know of a manuscript containing Furlanus' translations, although there does still exist a manuscript (Milano, Ambrosiana, Q. 113 sup., fols. 55^r–65^v) which contains his commentaries on the *De lassitudine* and the *De lapidibus*, which were printed with the translations in the 1605 edition. This may be the only surviving fragment of a manuscript which originally contained all of Furlanus' translations and commentaries. See ADOLFO RIVOLTA, *Catalogo dei codici pinelliani dell'Ambrosiana* (Milan 1933) 47. It is not unlikely that other Theophrastus materials from Furlanus were lost in the early seventeenth century when a third of the Pinelli collection was lost in an unfortunate incident at sea. See RIVOLTA, *op. cit.* LXX–LXXI.

printing of the Aldine *editio princeps* of Aristotle and Theophrastus in 1495–1498.⁴⁸ And, indeed, even the 1613 Greek-Latin edition does not represent a new comprehensive Latin rendering by a single translator, but is merely a patchwork of earlier translations by no less than four different translators.⁴⁹ Not until Wimmer's edition of 1866 do we get anything in print which approaches a complete translation made by a single individual. Dalechampius' translation, although never printed, antedates Wimmer's by nearly three centuries.⁵⁰

Several of Theophrastus' works, extant only in fragmentary form, which Dalechampius rendered into Latin, did not appear in a printed Latin translation until 1605.⁵¹ Several others apparently were in the process of being published in translation for the first time while he was working on his own translation.⁵² Finally, one significant fragment which he translated seems to have escaped publication in

⁴⁸ Printed by ALDO MANUZIO at Venice (GW-2334). Missing from this edition are *Characteres*, *De sensu*, *Prisciani Lydi metaphrasis* and nos 2–7 cited in note 51.

⁴⁹ As far as the translations are concerned it is merely the 1605 edition with the two botanical works added in THEODORE GAZA's translation.

⁵⁰ For a list of the precise material translated by Dalechampius see Appendix II.

⁵¹ Here, as in the following notes, I give the common Latin title of the work (which sometimes differs slightly from the title which Dalechampius gives it) and in parentheses the number which WIMMER assigns to it in his edition of the fragments, followed by the folio numbers where it may be found in BN. Lat. 11,857. (1) *De lassitudine* (frag. VII; fols. 247^v–249^v); (2) *De animi defectione* (frag. X; fols. 264^r–264^v); (3) *De nervorum resolutione* (frag. XI; 264^r); (4) *De animalibus quae colorem mutant* (frag. CLXXII; fol. 263^v); (5) *De animalibus quae dicuntur invidere* (frag. CLXXV; fol. 266^r); (6) *De animalibus quae repente apparent* (frag. CLXXIV; fols. 264^v–265^v); (7) *De melle* (frag. CXC; fol. 266^v). The *De lassitudine* appeared in Latin translation in the 1605 edition under the name of DANIEL FURLANUS; the other six fragments were published in translation in the same edition with no name of the translator given. The fact that these had not appeared in Latin in print before is indicated on the title page of the 1605 edition. See above n. 47.

⁵² Here I add also the first printed translation. [1] *De vertigine* (frag. VIII; fols. 246^r–247^r; *Theophrasti ... De sudoribus libellus unus, de vertigine libellus alter. E Graeca lingua in Latinam conversi et annotationibus illustrati per Bonaventuram Grangerium Parisiensem doctorem medicum. Nunquam antea Latini editi ...* [Paris 1576]); [2] *De sudore* (frag. IX; fols. 250^r–253^v; see No. [1] above); [3] *De lapidibus* (frag. II; fols. 211^r–217^v; *Theophrasti de lapidibus liber ab Adriano Turnebo Latinitate donatus* [Paris 1578]); [4] *De ventis* (frag. V; fols. 230^r–238^v; by FEDERICUS BONAVENTURA in his *Anemologiae pars prior id est de affectionibus, signis, causisque ventorum ex Aristotele, Theophrasto, ac Ptolmaeo tractatus ...* [Urbino 1593]). Of the last of these there is also a translation by ADRIEN TURNÈBE, first printed in his *Opera* (Strasbourg 1600) II, 41–48, but certainly completed

translation until the nineteenth century.⁵³ Moreover, Dalechampius seems to be the only one before the nineteenth century to attempt new translations of works which were known from the fifteenth century onward in versions made by three great Quattrocento humanist-translators: THEODORE GAZA's translation of the botanical works, BESSARION's translation of the *Metaphysics* fragment, and MARSILIO FICINO's translation of PRISCIANUS LYDUS' paraphrases of *De sensu* and *De phantasia et intellectu*.

In order to translate all of the works of Theophrastus which he did, Dalechampius had first to assemble the appropriate Greek texts from which he could work. Since the range of material which he includes in his translation is more extensive than any other collection of Theophrastus material before the nineteenth century,⁵⁴ it was necessary for him to bring the material together from several sources. The minimum number of editions which he used was the Basel edition of 1541⁵⁵ and the Stephanus

before his death in 1565. There is an unpublished translation of the *De vertigine* from the fifteenth century by GREGORIUS TIPHERNAS, contained in Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, plut. LXXIX, 15, fols. 174–177 (see A.M. BANDINIUS, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Medicae Laurentianae* (Florence 1774–78) III, 175–176) and Vatican, urb. lat. 208, fols. 125^v–126^v (see C. STORNAIOLO, *Codices urbinates latini* (Rome 1902–21) I, 201–202).

⁵³ *De sensu* (frag. I; fols. 266^v–280^r). For some puzzling reason this work, although printed in Greek in 1552 and again in 1557, did not get into the standard editions of 1605 and 1613 nor in any other edition of Theophrastus' works until the nineteenth century. The Greek text is in: *Theophrasti historiam de plantis et de causis plantarum et quosdam alios ipsius libros continens tomus VI* [i.e. of this edition which contains also the works of Aristotle], ed. J.B. CAMOTIUS (Venice 1552), 483–511 and *Aristotelis et Theophrasti scripta quaedam quae vel nunquam antea vel minus emendata quam nunc edita fuerunt*, ed. H. STEPHANUS (Paris 1557) 17–46. See L. PHILIPPSON. *ΥΑΗ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΝΗ* ... (Berlin 1831) 81. There is another sixteenth century Latin translation of the work by JULIUS SANCUTIUS, done between 1574 and 1587 and preserved in Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magliabechiana, XII, 10. See J.B. McDIARMID, The Manuscripts of Theophrastus' *De sensibus*, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* XLIV (1962) 5, 18, 22.

⁵⁴ The works which Dalechampius translates but are missing from the 1613 edition include: *De sensu*, *Metaphysica*, and *Prisciani Lydi metaphrasis*. The first two of these works have attracted a good deal of attention in the twentieth century. See especially GEORGE MALCOLM STRATTON, *Theophrastus and Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle* (London 1917) and THEOPHRASTUS, *Metaphysics*, with Translation, Commentary, and Introduction by W.D. ROSS and F.H. FOBES (Oxford 1929).

⁵⁵ *Theophrasti ... opera quae quidem a tot saeculis adhuc restant omnia* ... (Basel 1541). A peculiarity of this edition is that there are two different variants, one having a Preface by H. GEMUSAEUS and

collection of 1557.⁵⁶ It would seem that at that stage of Theophrastus studies the logical thing was to bring all the works together into a single edition, but apparently no one but Dalechampius attempted it until 1613 and even that edition brought out by the great Heinsius was not as complete as Dalechampius' compilation.

In making his entirely new translation, Dalechampius is certainly aware of some of the earlier translating activity, although he contends that he did not know of FICINO's translation of PRISCIANUS LYDUS' *Metaphrasis*⁵⁷ until he was carrying out his own plan. He refers to ADRIEN TURNÈBE's translation of the *De odoribus*⁵⁸ and, indeed, bound with the manuscript is a copy of the first edition⁵⁹ of this work with very extensive annotations which seem to be in Dalechampius' hand. In the notes accompanying his translation of the botanical works he refers frequently to the earlier translations of THEODORE GAZA.⁶⁰ Although Gaza's translation had been accepted as standard for a century when Dalechampius was making his own translation, he does not hesitate to criticize it and to point out places where he disagrees not only with Gaza's rendering of the Greek into Latin but also with his reading of the Greek text.⁶¹

the other, one by J. CAMERARIUS. See FABRICIUS-HARLES, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Hamburg 1790-1809) III, 415.

⁵⁶ Cited above in note 53. We know for certain that Dalechampius used this edition, not only because some fragments were not otherwise available in printed form (numbers 2-7 in note 52 above), but also because he refers to emendations by STEPHANUS in several marginal notes, e.g. BN. Lat. 11,857, fols. 298^r, 298^v.

⁵⁷ As he says in a marginal note on fol. 305^r: «Haec Prisciani commentaria vertit Ficinus, quod nescivi antequam interpretandi labor iam fere ad extremum processisset.» This seems rather difficult to believe, for FICINO's translation had been printed in 1497, 1516, and 1561.

⁵⁸ On fol. 330^v he states: «Elegantius et ornatius hunc librum Turnebus vertit, ego rudius, sed optima fide et oratione magis perspicua.»

⁵⁹ *Theophrasti libellus de odoribus ab Adriano Turnebo Latinitate donatus et scholiis atque annotationibus illustratus* (Paris 1556).

⁶⁰ Fols. 4^r, 11^v, 12^v, 18^v, 19^v, etc.

⁶¹ For example, at fol. 30^r where he questions GAZA's interpretation of the Greek text, and 11^v, 12^v, 88^v. The concern with Theophrastus is also evident in many of Dalechampius letters as stated above (note 39). A particularly interesting example is in BN. Lat. 13,063, fol. 53^r in a letter to Franciscus Miconius, dated May 24, 1576, where he says: «Theophrasti perdicium esse, cap. 11, I. hist. aliquando sum arbitratus, in cuius historia Gaza omisit, consulto ne, an ignoranter aut intentiose, iudicant alii, an quod in suo codice non legerit: plures et *παχέλας* vel ut quidam legunt *δαπέλας*, densas hirsutas ne radices habere, quam folia.»

The one additional work, sometimes attributed to Theophrastus during the Renaissance, which Dalechampius does not include in his translation, is the *De coloribus*. This work, however, only very infrequently went under the name of Theophrastus, nearly always being attributed to ARISTOTLE.⁶² Another interesting feature is that embedded in the translations of Theophrastus are several translations of works by other authors. These include *On Things Heard*, *On Plants*, and *On the Situation and Names of Winds*, all of which went under the name of Aristotle during the Renaissance. In addition there is also a translation of a fragment from the writings of ARCHYTAS the Pythagorean.

In conclusion we must say that Dalechampius' translations add an additional factor which must be taken into account by any future attempt to comprehensively evaluate the importance of the influence of Theophrastus during the Renaissance period. While there seems to be no evidence that the translations themselves exerted a direct influence on later Theophrastus studies, they must certainly be considered for any proper analysis of Dalechampius' important and influential *Historia generalis plantarum*. These translations show, as well, that another major Theophrastus scholar was active during the period. Furthermore, there is a need to re-evaluate Dalechampius' scientific contribution, not only in light of the printed sources, but also through a consideration of the manuscript materials as well. His correspondence, in particular, is worthy of a much more detailed study than we have been able to give here. Finally, even this limited consideration of Dalechampius again calls attention to the importance of Lyon as a center of medical and scientific activity during the sixteenth century,⁶³ a point which has hardly been touched on by historians of science and medicine.

⁶² The only one who seems to have seriously considered the possibility that it may have been by Theophrastus was SIMONE PORZIO in his edition: *De coloribus a Simone Portio Neapolitano Latinate donatus* (Florence 1548). The title of the edition printed at Paris in 1549 reads: *Aristotelis vel Theophrasti de coloribus libellus ...* The work went under Aristotle's name throughout the Middle Ages (see G. LACOMBE *et al.*, *Aristoteles Latinus*, pars prior (Rome 1939), 90 and *passim*) and in the Renaissance translations of CELIO CALCAGNINI and EMANUELE MARGUNIO. Modern scholarship tends to indicate that the work was by Theophrastus or by a contemporary of Theophrastus, very much under his influence. See H. B. GOTTSCHALK, *The De coloribus and its Author*, *Hermes* XCII (1964) 59–85.

⁶³ Clear evidence for this comes from the many editions of scientific and medical works printed there. See DAVIS, *op. cit.*, esp. 81. DURLING's researches (*op. cit.*) indicate that for Galen editions, at least, Lyon was one of the two or three major centers.

Appendix I

Preface from Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds latin, ms.11,857

fol. 1^r

Adit te, magne vir, Theophrastus luculentissimus elegantissimusque scriptor ab Iacobo Dalechampio patruo meo latinus olim factus; opus, ut scis, non exigui laboris propter lacunas et menda, quibus scatet, ac potissimum, praeter libros de historia et de caussis plantarum, varia illa opuscula quae sequuntur in quibus restituendis, imo resarciendis quantum ille desudaverit tu ipse optime poteris judicare. Editionem ejus paulo ante mortem literis mihi commendaverat, siquid forte sibi humanitus accidisset interea dum extremam manum adderet Senecae philosopho magna cura in integrum ab eo restituto et multis adnotationibus illustrato. Et quidem dum huic operi invigilat, vita cedit; et, ne parum esset, Lugdunensibus, apud quos medicinam faciebat sublatum fuisse, invisata fata posteris lucubrationes et conjecturas ejus abstulere, adeo ut ex multis adnotationibus, quas quondam apud eum videram, variae quaedam tantum in controversias et suasorias Senecae patris lectiones et emendationes in manus meas devenire. Fecerat haud ita dudum jacturam fere similem in Mureti morte Seneca. Mureti cursum mors praecidit. Dalechampus delatus jam in portum eversus est. Emersit autem una cum Amalthea, cujus me heredem moriens instituerat, Theophrastus manu ejus male tamen quibusdam locis exaratus, quem nunc ego defuncto parens, utilitatisque publicae consulens, naufragio ereptum, una cum tabula tibi offero. Non fuit interpretes ejus obscurus inter medicos. Vixit carus Musis et illarum amoribus, Cujacio, Scaligero, Gesnero, Camerario, plurimisque alijs viris doctis, qui non sine praefatione laudis nomen ejus in medium adducunt. Vivit adhuc ipse in Plinio et in ceteris alijs publicatis scriptis, quae immortalitatem auctori suo pollicentur. Ego vero, qui similitudine tantum nominis illum refero, quia in tanto opere publicando viribus meis minus ausim confidere, elegi te nullius linguae, nullius scientiae nescium, atque eruditorum Maecenatem, qui auctoritate et benignitate tua Theophrastum Latinum ames, commendes, defendas. Neque propterea laudis gratiaeve quidquam aucupor aut consector apud posteros. Sat erit mihi, magne vir, si me diligas, si Theophrasti interpretes tibi gratus, legentibusque allaturus sit aliquid utilitatis. VALE.

Appendix II

Description and Contents of Manuscript Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds latin 11,857

Description: paper, 340 fols., bound with an annotated copy of A. Turnèbe's edition of Theophrastus' *De odoribus* (Paris 1556), 16th century (fol. 209^r: Inchoata haec versio die primo Novembris anno 1574 absoluta die 5 septembris anno 1575).

Contents: Fol. 1: Preface (see Appendix I); Fol. 2^r: miscellaneous notes in Greek and Latin; fols. 3^r–100^r: Theophrasti *De historia plantarum*; fols. 100^v–209^r: Theophrasti *de caussis plantarum*; there follow some blank unnumbered pages; fol. 210^r: A listing of the 26 works and fragments which make up the remainder of the manuscript; fol. 210^v: miscellaneous Greek notes; fols. 211^r–217^v: Theophrasti *de lapidibus*; fols. 218^r–219^v: Theophrasti *de piscibus* (i. e. *De piscibus in sicco degentibus*); fols. 220^r–229^v: Theophrasti *de igne*; fols. 230^r–238^v: Theophrasti *de ventis*; fols. 239^r–245^r: Theophrasti *de signis pluviarum et ventorum*; fols. 245^r–245^v: *Ventorum situs et nomenclatura ex commentariis Aristotelis de praesagiis*; fols. 246^r–247^r: Theophrasti *de vertigine*; fols. 247^v–249^v: Theophrasti *de lassitudine*; fols. 250^r–253^v: Theophrasti *de sudore*; fols. 254^r–263^r: Theophrasti *expressa morum animi quae signa et indicia*: *Χαρακτῆρες*; fol. 263^v: Theophrasti *de animalibus quae colorem mutant*; fol. 264^r: *Ex libro Theophrasti de nervorum resolutione*; fols. 264^r–264^v: *Ex libro Theophrasti de animi deliquio* [i. e. *De animi defectione*]; fols. 264^v–265^v: *Ex libro Theophrasti de animalibus quae apparent repente multa*; fol. 266^r: *Ex libro Theophrasti de animalibus quae aiunt invidere*; fol. 266^v: *Ex libro Theophrasti de apibus* [i. e. *De melle*]; fols. 266^v–280^r: Theophrasti *de sensu*; fols. 280^v–284^v: *Ex libro Aristotelis de iis quae audiuntur*; fols. 285^r–285^v: *Ex Archytae Pythagorei scriptis, initio libri de mathematica*; fols. 286^r–291^v: Theophrasti *de suprema philosophiae parte*: *τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ*; fol. 292^r: note on *Metaphysica* fragment; fols. 292^v–304^v: Prisciani philosophi Lydi eorum quae de sensu Theophrastus scripsit, enarratio sive metaphrasis; fols. 305^r–314^r: Prisciani philosophi Lydi scriptorum Theophrasti *de visis et imaginatione interpretatio*; fols. 314^v–330^r: *De plantis libri duo*, Aristotelis nomine ac titulo inscripti, ut Scaliger suspicatur latine primum editi deinde ab Arabe quodam in suam linguam versi et tandem a Planude monacho in Graecam orationem translati; fols. 330^v–340^r: Theophrasti *de odoribus*.