


## DELTOS

Vol 33, No 51 (2023)



### Four-language dictionaries of post-byzantine medical-philosophical manuscripts

*Agamemnon Tselikas*

doi: [10.12681/dj.38112](https://doi.org/10.12681/dj.38112)

Copyright © 2024, Agamemnon Tselikas




This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

#### To cite this article:

Tselikas, A. (2024). Four-language dictionaries of post-byzantine medical-philosophical manuscripts. *DELTOS*, 33(51), 62–65. <https://doi.org/10.12681/dj.38112>

# Four-language dictionaries of post-byzantine medical-philosophical manuscripts

Agamemnon Tselikas<sup>1</sup>



Four - language Iatrosophion, 18th cent., Vatopedi Monastery, 381

**Key Words:** *iatrosophia, Greek enlightenment, sciences in the ottoman empire, Nikolaos Ieropais*

<sup>1</sup>“ARETHAS” Institute - Mediterranean Institute of Research on Palaeography, Bibliology & History of Texts.

Post-Byzantine medical-philosophical manuscripts (iatrosophia) were long ignored by medical, philological and palaeographical research, on the one hand due to their supposed lack of scientific value and on the other because the manuscripts themselves were in most cases private works, poorly fashioned and damaged by time and use. Indeed, they never belonged to organised libraries, and were kept in secrecy and used in more or less clandestine circumstances, but in recent years they have proved to be a vital source of information for the study of medicine in Greece during the period of Turkish rule.<sup>a</sup>

Recently, advances in palaeographical research and a renewed focus by scholars specialising in fields beyond history and philology, such as the history of medicine and pharmacology or even fields such as novel or forgotten methods of treatment and pharmacopoeia, have led to intensified interest in these manuscripts, in tandem with newly widespread views regarding therapeutic methods, dietary preferences, and preventative and precautionary measures against various diseases.

I first encountered just such a manuscript in the early days of my palaeographic research in the monasteries of Patras, 45 years ago.<sup>b</sup> It was a brief but well-written document, in which there were recorded cures for various ailments, all bookended by the word “δόκιμον” (recommended). Even though certain texts contained in the manuscript seemed rather odd, as did the names of certain herbs, diseases and therapies, I was most struck by the word “δόκιμον”. Years went by and as I delved deeper into palaeography, I would at times encounter similar manuscripts, but the feeling I had was always the same: curiosity followed by efforts to understand the environment in which works such as these were produced, circulated and consulted. The word “δόκιμον” or terms to the same effect, such as “εὔθετον”, “ἀρμόδιον”, “καλόν”, “καὶ ὑγιαίνει” [recommended or suitable] would occasionally recur.

Eventually I decided to organise my thoughts on the matter. First of all, more and more of these manuscripts and texts were being discovered throughout Greece, with more than a hundred documented thus far. Subsequently, an examination of how these manuscripts were produced, written and organised in terms of content

revealed the hands of writers who were fully aware of the work they were carrying out and who had varying degrees of familiarity with the written word, despite the fact that many of them exhibited poor handwriting as well as woeful spelling. On the other hand, the references to various prominent doctors, both of antiquity as well as contemporaries of the writers, demonstrated that these texts were rooted in an extensive scientific background. Indeed, the practitioners described in these texts, as important and respectable members of local societies, could hardly have practised medicine without being accepted by society at large, despite the accounts we have of alleged profiteers and charlatans both local and foreign.

Thus, after extensive palaeographical research and manuscript documentation, and with the help of my friend and colleague Giannis Karas' exceptional book “Οἱ ἐπιστῆμες στὴν Τουρκοκρατία – Χειρόγραφα καὶ Ἐντυπα, τόμος Γ΄. Οἱ ἐπιστῆμες τῆς ζωῆς” [Sciences in the Ottoman Empire - Manuscripts and Prints, Volume III. Life sciences]<sup>c</sup>, I began to publish a number of papers that paved the way for further research and the formulation of a scholarly sub-category with its own particular methodology. Concurrently, other scholars also began to publish similar texts and discuss issues related to the field. Their aims were to find out how individuals in Greece who possessed varying degrees of expertise and training practised medicine and prescribed therapy, the influence of and interactions with similar texts from the East and the West, the activities of certain individual medical practitioners, folk therapies as documented by folklorists and ethnologists, as well as lexicographic and dialectological analyses of words with Greek or foreign roots. This corpus of topics gradually began to be discussed in a more methodical manner, while modern scientific methods were used to assess the effectiveness of certain of these pharmaceutical preparations, with pharmaceutical companies and even small businesses selling products based on the results.

However, the approach, study and discussion of these texts requires an extensive specialisation in palaeography and philology in general. Consequently, scholarly editions of such texts are scarce due to the absence of adequate material for comparison of manuscript tradition and sequence. Additionally, identifying the correct edition in cases of corrupted, misrepresented, or encrypted words and recognising

a On this manuscript category, see Agamemnon Tselikas, *Τὰ ἑλληνικὰ γιατροσόφια. Μιὰ περιφρονημένη κατηγορία χειρογράφων*, «Ιατρικὰ βυζαντινὰ χειρόγραφα» [Greek iatrosophia. An overlooked category of manuscripts, "Medical Byzantine Manuscripts"], Athens 1995, pp. 57-69.

b This is the eight-folio Agion Panton Monastery of Patras manuscript 37, which dates to the 18th-19th-century.

c Published in the series of publications of the Section of Neohellenic Research of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, “Hestia” Publishers and Bookseller, Athens, 1st ed. 1994.

the various medical components and herbs with their scientific names are challenging. To edit similar texts, I often consulted manuscripts and older dictionaries written in Greek and other languages to identify the most suitable medical terminology for herbs and other items.<sup>d</sup> I thus decided to compile the collections of medical terms I encountered in post-Byzantine four-language manuscript dictionaries (in ancient Greek, Koine or Roman (modern Greek), Frankish (Italian or Latin) and Turkish), into a single corpus. The starting point was the well-known work of the prominent early modern Greek doctor Nikolaos Ieropais from Velisdoni in Agrafa, «Λεξικὸν τετράγλωσσον ...» [Four-language dictionary].<sup>e</sup> This work, which is not preserved in its original form, must have been quite popular and was widely circulated. Unfortunately, however, it has been subjected to numerous transcriptions and truncations, many of its words have been corrupted, and entire entries have been added or removed according to the needs and wishes of the owners of each individual manuscript copy. Thus, identifying the original text in its entirety is challenging. However, this has little impact on the present effort, as my current focus is not to produce a philological edition of a text but instead to compile a four-language lexicographical corpus encompassing all words and medical terms included in these manuscripts together with all their variants, i.e. their assorted corruptions. It is this latter aspect which I believe to be of particular importance for the study of these texts, because of the opportunity it will provide for readers to comprehend the incredible extent to which many Greek and foreign words have been corrupted. In fact, the corruptions are so extensive that inexperienced scholars will likely be completely unable to identify words and their meaning. In this effort, I utilised 14 post-Byzantine manuscripts and two printed editions which contained collections of medical terms (with the exceptions of numbers 12 and 13). The text of each source was copied separately per language in four columns, and all of the copies were subsequently united. As published in the present, they comprise a single corpus. More particularly, the source texts were the following:

1. Mt Athos, Monastery of Vatopedi 381. (fol. 1r-14v) Untitled dictionary in Greek, Frankish, Turkish and Koine. First entry: ἄκορον.  
[Sophronios Eustratiades and Arcadios of Vatopedi,

<sup>d</sup> An early effort was the edition of two similar collections in codex Pan. Taphos 339 of the Patriarchal Library of Jerusalem.

<sup>e</sup> On Nikolaos Ieropais, see *Νικολάου Ἱεροπαίδος ἐξ Ἀγραφῶν (:) Πραγματεία περὶ Φυσιολογίας καὶ Παθολογίας [Nikolaos Ieropais from Agrafa (?) Treatise on Physiology and Pathology]*.

deacon, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos*, Cambridge 1924, p. 72]

2. Library of the Hellenic Parliament 68. (fol. 127r-136v) Title: *Λεξικὸν τινῶν βοτανῶν συλλεχθὲν παρὰ τοῦ ἐν ἰατροῖς λογιωτάτου Νικολάου Ἱεροπαίδος τοῦ Ἀγραφιῶτου κατὰ διαλέκτους τέσσαρας ἑλληνικῆς, ἰταλικῆς, ἀραβικῆς τε καὶ κοινῆς [A dictionary of certain herbs collected by the learned physician Nikolaos Ieropais from Agrafa in four dialects of Greek, Italian, Arabic and Koine]*.
3. National Library of Greece 1897. (fol. 35v-38v) Untitled four-language dictionary of herbs in *classical Greek, Turkish, vernacular Greek, Latin*. First entry: ἄκορον.
4. Hellenic Literary and Historical Archive (ELIA, currently MIET) pal. 23 [undocumented].
5. Hellenic Literary and Historical Archive (ELIA, currently MIET) pal. 24 [undocumented].
6. Mt Athos, Monastery of Iviron 219. (fol. 13r-25r) Title: *Λεξικὸν ἰατρικὸν πρὸς ἀρχαρίου μεταγλωττισθὲν ἐκ τῆς ἑλληνίδος διαλέκτου εἰς τε τὴν φραγγικὴν καὶ τὴν τουρκικὴν καὶ κοινὴν παρὰ Νικολάου τινὸς ἰατροῦ Ἀγραφιῶτου [Medical dictionary for beginners, transliterated from the Greek dialect into French, Turkish, and Koine by Nikolaos, a physician from Agrafa]*.
7. Mt Athos, Monastery of Iviron 220. (fol. 5r-16r) Untitled dictionary with the first folia missing. First entry: ἀλκέα.
8. Pelion, Library of Milies 78 (fol. 146v-152v) Title: *Ὄνόματα τετράγλωσσα τῶν βοτάνων [Names of herbs in four languages]*. First entry: ἄκανθος λευκή.
9. Elassona, Monastery of Olympiotissa 35 (fol. 132r-141r) Title: *Λεξικὸν ἰατρικὸν πρὸς ἀρχαρίου μεταγλωττισθὲν ἐκ τῆς ἑλληνίδος διαλέκτου εἰς τε τὴν φραγγικὴν καὶ τὴν τουρκικὴν καὶ κοινὴν παρὰ Νικολάου τινὸς ἰατροῦ Ἀγραφιῶτου [Medical dictionary for beginners, transliterated from the Greek dialect into French, Turkish, and Koine by Nikolaos, a physician from Agrafa]*.
10. Elassona, Monastery of Olympiotissa 81 (fol. 33r-100r) Untitled dictionary. Begins with: *Ἀρχὶ σὶν θεὸ κ(α)τ(α) ἀλφάβητον. Στιχίον το ἀλφα. Ελενικα, φραγγικά, τούρκικα, κινά [Greek, French, Turkish, Koine]*.
11. Elassona, Monastery of Olympiotissa 93. (p. 271-287) Untitled four-language dictionary of pharmaceutical terms with the first folia missing. Begins with the letter E, first entry: ἐλύνη. Additional entries have been written into the margins

and the spaces between lines by a later, 18th-century scribe.

12. Manuscript from the Private Collection of the ophthalmologist Petros Protonotarios (Athens). Paper, dimensions: 165 X 115, pages: 246, 18<sup>th</sup> c. (pp. 186-187) *Ἐξήγησις εἰς τὰ ἑλληνικὰ ὀνόματα τῶν βοτάνων* [Explanation in Greek of the names of herbs]. [“Deltion of the Historical and Palaeographical Archive”, IV’ 1984-1987, Athens 1988, p. 223].
13. Zavorda, Grevena, Monastery of Metamorfoseos 50. (fol. 52r-55v) *Περὶ τοῦ ἐκλογισ βότανον κατὰ ἀλφάβητον. Ἀρχῆς τουρκικα, ἑλληνικά, κοινά.*
14. The printed edition: *Βοτανικὴ Πρακτικὴ προσηρμοσμένη εἰς τὴν ἰατρικὴν καὶ οἰκονομίαν* [Botanical practice adapted to medicine and economics] by Dionysius Pyrrhus of Thessaly, vol. I and II, Athens 1838.
15. The printed edition: *Ἑλληνικὴ Φαρμακοποιία... φιλοπονηθεῖσα παρὰ* [Greek Pharmacopoeia] by G[regorios] [Photeinos] of B[yzantium] ..., Smyrna 1835.
16. Manuscript from the Private Collection of the Professor of Medicine Georgios Antonakopoulos (Athens).

The documentation system implemented here was adapted to the needs of both specialised researchers and new scholars. More particularly:

1. All entries have been organised with consecutive numbering.
2. The title of each entry consists of the scientific name of each herb in both Greek and Latin, in bold lettering.
3. The title is followed by a record of every known name of the herb or medical/pharmaceutical term in each of the four languages, ancient Greek [E], Vernacular Greek [K], Frankish [F], and Turkish [T], together with variations in dialect.
4. As regards spelling, the Greek terms have been recorded in the polytonic system and have kept their initial forms as they appear in the manuscripts, with minor corrections. By contrast, where the spelling of the foreign terms is concerned, I preferred the monotonic system with simplified phonetics, as mandated by the staggering variety in spelling they exhibit, which made it impossible

to even conceptualise a standardised system for searching them. Thus, vowels and diphthongs are rendered only with the letters ε (αι), ι (η, υ, ει, οι) ο (ω), αβ (αυ) and εβ or εφ (ευ), while words that have double letters in Italian and Latin have only a single such letter in their Greek transcription.

5. Each documented term is accompanied by an exponent which denotes the number of the manuscript from which it was drawn.
6. Frankish and Turkish words are preceded by brackets which contain their corresponding spelling in Italian, Latin, Turkish (in the old Osmanic script in order to be in keeping with Arabic) and Arabic. An asterisk in brackets denotes a foreign word whose original form was impossible to locate in any of the various dictionaries.
7. In cases of ambiguities regarding verbal or spelling variants of a word or where the correct name of an herb is suggested, the relevant entry is documented in the apparatus together with the word and the manuscript number. The apparatus also documents any variations or confluences in the aforementioned language columns.

It must be noted once again that the present effort is not an attempt to produce a critical philological edition of the dictionaries, but rather constitutes a supplementary resource for the further study of post-Byzantine medical-philosophical manuscripts and texts. For this reason, the present work shall be available both in print and in a digital (PDF) edition. Users of the digital edition in particular will be able to easily find words and their entries through the “Find” feature. Users of the printed edition can find a useful appendix with indexes of all documented dictionary entries and variants.

Naturally, there are other manuscript dictionaries which have not been included in this edition, but it is my firm belief that the present collection is a step in the right direction. Users will thus have the ability to make corrections or additions to their copy. Indeed, I would be quite grateful to receive these corrections and additions in order to include them, naturally with due credit and thanks, in a future edition.

---

**Corresponding author:**

Agamemnon Tselikas  
e-mail: agatselikas@gmail.com