

ENIKŐ BÉKÉS

**SCIENTIA SEXUALIS AND DUCAL CULTURAL POLITICS:
THE LESSONS OF A TEXT PUBLICATION**

One of the main topics of Galeotto Marzio's *De doctrina promiscua*, dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici, is the introduction of the relationship between the body as *microcosmos* and the celestial bodies as *macrocosmos*. In his treatise written in 1489–90, the author reviews the way stars affect diseases and our look, and presents other astronomical information needed for curing. He also talks about the various types of poison, herbs, Galen's humoral theory, the reasons for melancholy and about talismanic magic too.¹ The knowledge concerning human body is a defining element of Galeotto's other works as well, which can be traced back not only to his medical qualification but also to his radical Aristotelian philosophy of soul; he advertises the thought of an inseparable unit formed by the body and the soul, and his doubts raised in relation to the immortality of the soul in basically all of his works. His physiognomic knowledge also fits into this context, but the body is the point of reference for the *medicus*–Medici metaphor used several times in the examined work too.² The ideal image, rooted in medieval tradition, of the good monarch who cures the body of society as a doctor (*medicus*) is also implied in Galeotto's work by the pun referring to the name of the dedicated (Medici).

In Chapter XVIII (titled *De mulieribus in viros conversis et maris an foeminae in coitu sit maior voluptas*) and XIX (titled *De coitu, et eius vocabulo suppresso ab antiquis*) the author leads us to the field of *scientia sexualis* that concerns questions of anatomy and sexuality. As we will see in the following, sexuality was a frequent topic of medieval medical treatises. We can often encounter a review of the positive and negative effects of sexual intercourse in Greek medical texts, so among others in Galen's works.³ Encouragement to temperance, preference of virginity can be found in these works as

¹ For the review of the work see also: Cesare VASOLI, *L'immagine dell'uomo e del mondo nel De doctrina promiscua di Galeotto Marzio*, in: *L'eredità classica in Italia e Ungheria fra tardo Medioevo e primo Rinascimento*, ed. Sante GRACIOTTI, Amedeo DI FRANCESCO, Roma, 2001, 185–205; Gabriella MIGGLIANO, *Galeotto Marzio da Narni: Profilo biobibliografico* (IV), *Il Bibliotecario*, 36–37(1993), 83–191.

² In connection with physiognomy see: Enikő BÉKÉS, *Physiognomy in the Works of Galeotto Marzio*, in: *Acta conventus neo-Latini Bonensis: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, gen. ed. Rhoda SCHNUR, Tempe AZ, ACMRS, 2006, 153–162; about the physician–monarch metaphor: Enikő BÉKÉS, *La metafora "medicus–Medici" nel De doctrina promiscua di Galeotto Marzio*, *Camoenae Hungaricae*, 3(2006), 29–38.

³ Michel FOUCAULT, *Histoire de la sexualité, III, Le Souci de soi*, Paris, Gallimard, 1984, 19–154. On antique sexology, among others on Foucault's criticism see also: Helen KING, *Sowing the Field: Greek and Roman Sexology*, in: *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*, eds. Roy PORTER, Mikuláš TEICH, Cambridge, 1994, 29–46.

well; this tendency has significantly increased with the appearance of Christianity.⁴ The church recognised the necessity of married couples' love directed to engendering descendants while in the beginning it strictly regulated its time, place, method and extent, and it always judged virginity as being more preferable to God.⁵ However the topic of sexuality became a part of medical discourse since the 11th century; the prototype of these works has been for long Constantine the African's work titled *De coitu*.⁶ Finally in the late Middle Ages, Avicenna's *Canon* became the primary source of *scientia sexualis* for Western medicine, which authorised doctors to discuss all those topics that Galeotto also touches upon in the two examined chapters.⁷ Avicenna gives a detailed description of the female and male genitals, their diseases, and the advantages and disadvantages of sexual intercourse through several chapters, and he also writes about conception, sterility etc.⁸

Examining the concepts of the body in different historical periods and embedding them into social historical narrative besides the medical historical one, has become a determining approach of interpretation in recent decades.⁹ Although this paper does not have such an analysis among its aims, we still have to mention this wider, science historical aspect of the medical and sexual historical topics discussed also by Galeotto. As an example we can mention Thomas Laqueur's theory who in his book analysed the extent

⁴ Peter BROWN, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York, 1988.

⁵ See more on this: James A. BRUNDAGE, *Law, Sex and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*, Chicago-London, 1987.

⁶ The main topics of the work are: The physiology of sexual intercourse; Types of the *semen*; On genitals; Conception; The advantages and disadvantages of sexual intercourse; Recipes of aphrodisiacs, dishes that increase sexual desire. Its publication: *Constantini Liber de coitu – El tratado de Andrologia Constantino el Africano*, ed. E. MONTERO, Santiago de Compostela, 1983. See its translation below: *Constantinus Africanus' De coitu: A Translation by Paul Delany*, Chaucer Review, 4(1969), 55–65.

⁷ See other works written on the topic in the Middle Ages and the review of Avicenna's effect: Danielle JACQUART, Claude THOMASSET, *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, trans. M. ADAMSON, Cambridge, 1988, 116–138.

⁸ AVICENNA, *ibid.*, lib. III, fen. XX–XXI. On Avicenna's contemporary reputation see among others: Nancy G. SIRAI, *Avicenna in Renaissance Italy: The Canon and Medical Teaching in Italian Universities after 1500*, Princeton, 1987.

⁹ We can find a good science historical summary here: LAFFERTON Emese, *Az ember és a társadalom testéről a modern tudományok tükrében: Szakirodalmi áttekintés* (On the body of man and society in the mirror of modern sciences: A bibliographical review), Replika (Test/kép), 28(1997), 39–57. The following works made a fertilizing effect on the mainly anthropological examinations directed to the relationship of the body and society (within the present frameworks we can only list a few basic works): Mikhail BAKHTIN, *Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура средневековья и Ренессанса*, Moscow, 1965 (*Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène ISWOLSKY, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1993); Norbert ELIAS, *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation: Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen, I, Wandlungen des Verhaltens in den weltlichen Oberschichten des Abendlandes; II, Wandlungen der Gesellschaft: Entwurf einer Theorie der Zivilisation*, Basel, 1939; Michel FOUCAULT, *Histoire de la sexualité, I, La Volonté de savoir*, Paris, 1976; *II, L'usage des plaisirs*, Paris, 1984; *III, Le Souci de soi*, Paris, 1984.

to which the existing view on social sex (gender) determines the knowledge constructed about biological sex (*sexus*).¹⁰

Caput XVIII: sexus mutatio and the medical views on sexuality

The topic of the first chapter dealing with sexuality is transformation between genders and the physiology of sexual pleasures. Galeotto claims that transformation between genders is possible in reality as well, and—answering the question raised in the title of the chapter—that women have greater pleasure during sexual intercourse. As he says this latter statement is proved by Tiresias' story who could experience it exactly due to his transformation from man to woman.¹¹ Then referring to Avicenna, “Nicolaus the Peripatetic” and his own anatomic studies, Galeotto gives a detailed description of the form of male and female genitals, the relationship of which—according to the idea of the times—proves the possibility of metamorphosis between the genders. Even in the 15th century, the dominating model was still the so-called one-sex model originating from the antique times, according to which women have the same genitals as men, the only difference is that the former have them inside while the latter outside. Laqueur supposes that this anatomical model was sustained by the idea which in fact considered women being inferior men, thus making their lower position in social hierarchy felt.¹²

The biological, physiological and consequently the psychological inferiority of women was also expressed in several places by Aristotle whose views transmitted by scholasticism made their effects in Galeotto's time too. Women's weaker corporeal and spiritual characteristics were explained similarly, with physical handicaps even in the early modern period: accordingly women's weaknesses and their inclination to sin were assigned to the excession of the yellow bile that has cold and wet qualities.¹³ The theory of isomorphism was elaborated by Galen; according to his statement women are basically men in whose body the lack of sufficient heat resulted in their genitals remaining stuck within their bodies while men's parts are totally developed.¹⁴ This theory imagined the vagina as an inner penis, the labia as foreskin, the womb as scrotum and the ovaries as testicles. This exact idea can be caught in Galeotto's lines too: “...mentula virilis foras et muliebris intro protenditur, deinde in sexu foemineo testiculi non pendent, sicuti in viro, in

¹⁰ Thomas LAQUEUR, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1990.

¹¹ OVID, *Metamorphoses*, III, 316–338.

¹² LAQUEUR, *ibid.*, 4. This interpretation of female genitals only started to be dismissed from the 1600s. The medieval views of gender questions are discussed in: Joan CADDEN, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture*, Cambridge, 1993. The Renaissance anatomical and medical views relating to the female body are reviewed in detail in: Ian MACLEAN, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman: A Study in the Fortunes of Scholasticism and Medical Science in European Intellectual Life*, Cambridge, 1980, 28–46.

¹³ To Aristotle see for example: *Hist. anim.* IX, I; *De gen. anim.* II, 3.

¹⁴ GALEN, *De usu partium; De semine*, 2,1.

omnibus vero aliis conveniunt: nam et glandem, et colem, et praeputium habent, ita ut haec in matrice penem intro versus constituent, ut si penis noster retrocederet, ita ut glandem ad interiora, et testiculos ad exteriora pelleret, matricem efficeret.”¹⁵ Thus Galeotto explains the mythical transformation stories with this theory, about which there is nothing extraordinary in his opinion, because nothing else is needed for this but the otherwise identically formed genitals being inside or outside. Then to prove this, he refers again to antique authors’ authority as a metamorphosis similar to that of Tiresias is also reported by Pliny the Elder, according to whom: “Ex feminis mutari in mares non est fabulosum.”¹⁶ The principal of isomorphism was carried on in medieval medical works which transmitted Galen’s model with Arabic intervention.¹⁷ This is reflected in Avicenna’s *Canon*; Galeotto surely refers to this work as well at the beginning of the chapter when he indicates his source.¹⁸

The presentation of genitals also well illustrates that the doctrines laid down in the texts have dominance over the experience gained in reality: no matter Galeotto refers to his own anatomical information (*nam quae oculis vidimus inter anatomicos*), he supposes that these are in concordance with the opinion of the two mentioned authors, Avicenna and Nicolaus the Peripatetic (*cum eorum sententiis concordant*). It seems that the interpretation of the view of human parts seen during autopsy has long been under the effect of old presumptions: even in the 16th century anatomic information and illustrations could not really break with the isomorphic representation of the genitals.¹⁹ Although in the 15th century the practice of autopsy became wide-spread in Padova, Galeotto’s university city, it was only limited to a couple of occasions a year and its primary aim was not to revise old resources but rather to demonstrate them.²⁰

¹⁵ *Ed. princ.*, 161.

¹⁶ *Nat. Hist.*, lib. VII, IV, 36. The question also interested the doctors of the 16–17th century: a list of alleged cases of transformation can be read in the work of Johann SCHENK von Grafenberg titled *Observationes medicae* (Frankfurt, 1609). Schenk knew *De doctrina* because he mentions that in another one of his works titled *Bibliotheca iatrica, sive Bibliotheca medica*, which was published in the same year, see also Gabriella MIGGIANO, *La fortuna di Galeotto Marzio in Europa tra Cinquecento e Seicento*, in: *L’eredità classica in Italia e in Ungheria dal rinascimento al neoclassicismo*, a cura di Péter SÁRKÓZY, Vanessa MARTORE, Budapest, 2004, 198–199.

¹⁷ See the detailed review of medieval anatomic, medical theories concerning biological sexes in: JACQUART–THOMASSET, *ibid.*

¹⁸ AVICENNA, *Canon*, lib. III, fen. XXI, I, 1: “...et quasi conversum instrumentum virorum.” The other author to whom he refers as Nicolaus the Peripatetic can probably be identified as the author of *Anatomia Magistri Nicolai Physici* (12th century). About this text see JACQUART–THOMASSET, *ibid.*, 26, 32–35. To Galeotto, Avicenna was in some cases even more prestigious than Galen, because he borrows from *Canon* the theory of the third duct in the penis that can not be found in the Greek author’s texts.

¹⁹ LAQUEUR, *ibid.*, 63–114. Although Galeotto also mentions that: “sunt quidam minus tamen idonei qui narrant in anatomia se vidisse in muliere matricem inversam et alio modo sitam quam maior pars ferat”, but a few lines later he explains that these must have been exceptional cases (162–163).

²⁰ On the anatomic knowledge of the period see: Nancy G. SIRAI, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1990, 84–97; on the anatomic studies in Padova: Loris PREMUDA, *Le conquiste metodologiche e tecnico-operative della*

After the review of genitals, Galeotto moves on to the physiological explanation of pleasure: “nunc videndum est in quo sexu sit maior voluptas coitus.”²¹ The analysis of the role, nature and amount of pleasure also formed part of the literature of sexuality; several medieval authors discussed the question.²² In the time of scholasticism, the authors approached this topic partly from a physiological viewpoint and partly as a problem related to reproduction, but the discussion of sexual appetite provided an opportunity to expound the foibles typical of women. However, there were several kinds of explanations to the greater pleasure traditionally assigned to women and also known from the Tiresias-story. One of the repeated questions in this discourse, to which authors were seeking an explanation, was the following: if the temperature of the female body is lower than that of the male body, then how is it possible that they have greater pleasure? Similarly to the previous ones, Galeotto’s answer can be found in earlier medical texts: the woman is glowed by the man’s sperm, and this is accompanied by the “pleasant itching feeling and rubbing” (*fricatio, pruritus*).²³ In addition, while the man suffers a loss during *ejaculatio*, the woman receives him into herself, which increases the intensity of her feelings. Galeotto brings up a third argument for female pleasure: unlike Aristotle, Galen and later Avicenna believed in the existence of the female *semen*, what is more, he pointed out its role not only in conception but in the way leading to pleasure as well.²⁴ This is followed by Galeotto’s description as well who also accepted the existence of the female *semen*: “Mulier igitur semen viri fusum colligendo et *suum quoque fundendo*...”²⁵ Both opinions had supporters among Renaissance physicians but this disagreement is a typical example showing that although Aristotle was the primary authority for most natural philosophers, in some questions related to physiology, just like Galeotto in this case, they still followed Galen. The discussion of these medical issues is frequent in medical works; in fact the name of Pietro d’Abano’s *Conciliator* refers to this. Pleasure and its medical relations will be the central topic of several Renaissance texts too. Similarly to the discussed chapter of *De doctrina*, these works often start with Tiresias’ story and discuss the question of the related metamorphosis between genders.²⁶

medicina nella scuola padovana del secolo XV, in: *Scienza e filosofia all’Università di Padova*, a cura di Antonio POPPI, Padova, 1983, 395–428.

²¹ *Ed. princ.*, 165.

²² Among others Avicenna, Pietro d’Abano, Taddeo Alderotti, Jacopo da Forlì, see more on this: CADDEN, *ibid.*, 150–154 (“The Measure of Pleasure”). Pietro d’Abano puts the question like this: “An vir muliere amplius delectet in coitu?”, *Conciliator*, Diff. 34.

²³ The significance of the latter ones was highlighted by AVICENNA, *Canon*, lib. III, fen. XX, I, 3.

²⁴ GALEN, *De usu partium*, 2, 643; *De semine*, II, 2. ARISTOTLE’S standpoint: *De gen. anim.*, 727a. According to this latter opinion, the woman has an inferior role even in conception because she does not have *semen*.

²⁵ *Ed. princ.*, 166. We have to mention here that female orgasm was important to the literature dealing with sexuality also because the view, which considered female orgasm an indispensable precondition for conception, has been held to for a long time. This was surely in connection with Galen’s theory about the existence of female *semen*.

²⁶ Such as: Dominicus TERELLIUS, *De generatione et partu hominis*, Lugduni, 1578, 9–11: its chapter titled *An voluptas in coitu sit maiori in viro quam in muliere et quomodo mulieres semen habeant*; Franciscus

At the end of the chapter, the author briefly mentions the positions that are medically harmful.²⁷ We can learn that it was a *coitus perverso ordine peractus* if *mulier ascendit virum* because this could cause hernia or ulcer to the man. Medieval medical works handled this topic with more modesty, however the medical explanation of positions appears for example in Avicenna's work, and also in Michele Savonarola's work who was closer to Galeotto in time and whose *Practica maior* reminds of the same thing as *De doctrina*.²⁸

Caput XIX: De coitu; coitus masculi

Galeotto is aware of the piquancy of his choice of topic therefore he starts the chapter with apologizing. As a short introduction, he commences his message with etimologization that he often uses elsewhere too: the Romans' strict morals first considered sexual desire reprehensible thus for a long time they did not even have a proper word to express it. However as later morals were changing, a variety of words developed to express sexual acts. Then referring again to Avicenna, who discusses the medical relations of *coitus* through several chapters of *Canon medicinae*, he shifts to the extent of sexual intercourse recommended by doctors and to the discussion of its beneficial or detrimental effects made on the body and soul.²⁹ Moderate intercourse eases the anger, dispels melancholy and diseases, and furthermore it decreases the pain of the kidneys, so Ovid was right in saying: *...pax omnis in uno concubitu*.³⁰ However, exaggerated sex has numerous disadvantages as it weakens the organism, impairs eyesight, causes backache etc.

Maybe it is not only an accident that the most serious difference between the manuscript and the printed tradition of the text can be caught in this certain chapter, which I

PLAZZONUS, *De partibus generationi inservientibus libri duo*, Patavii, 1621, 126–136: the chapter titled *Quaestio non minus utilis quam iucunda: An vir vel femina magis in coitu delectentur*, see more on these: Valerio MARCHETTI, "Every Woman is a Man": *Alcune discussioni cinquecentesche sulle metamorfosi del corpo*, Il Piccolo Hans, 79–80(1993), 56–93.

²⁷ *Ed. princ.*, 167–168.

²⁸ *Practica maior*, VI, 20, 28. After all, the explanation here is also in connection with the belief in the existence of the female *semen*, see also: JACQUART–THOMASSET, *ibid.*, 134–138. Medieval sermons about marriage and handbooks of confessions also discuss the moral and religious judgement of certain positions, see GECSER Ottó, *A házasság gyakorisága és ajánlott korlátai a középkori prédikációkban* (The frequency of marital life and its proposed limitations in medieval sermons), in: *Nők és férfiak..., avagy a nemek története* (Women and men... or the story of genders), ed. LÁCZAY Magdolna, Nyiregyháza, 2003, 373–380; SZÖRÉNYI László, *Szexualitás és erotika a 18. századi gyónatási kézikönyvekben* (Sexuality and erotics in the 18th-century handbooks of confession), in: *Amor, álom és mámor: A szerelem a régi magyar irodalomban és a szerelem ezredéves hazai kultúrtörténete* (Amor, dream, and ecstasy: Love in old Hungarian literature and the thousand-year-old Hungarian cultural history of love), ed. SZENTMÁRTONI SZABÓ Géza, Budapest, 2002, 501–514.

²⁹ AVICENNA, *ibid.*, lib. III, fen. XX–XXI; *ed. princ.*, 171–172.

³⁰ *Ars amatoria*, lib. II, 413.

have discovered during the textological works done on the critical edition.³¹ The next 43-line-part to be examined, which is about the medical judgement and the cultural history of sexual intercourse between men, can be found in both manuscripts while the Florentine *editio princeps* and the later prints omit it.³² The part in question indeed contains fairly bold statements: again referring to an opinion found in Avicenna's work, Galeotto states that although sexuality "is aimed at sacred race preservation" (...*sanctum utileque humani generis conservationi esse noscatur...*), this is more exhausting for the human organism than intercourse between men.³³ Avicenna discusses it among the effects made on health by different intercourses, right after the detrimental positions mentioned also by Galeotto. Galeotto speaks cautiously; he emphasizes several times that such an act is a serious sin still as if he suggested that it was not medically disadvised. The curiosity of this part of the text is that it goes beyond medical discourse and it discusses the various nations' different judgements on homosexuality. He tells us that Jews forbade boys' love while Greeks allowed it, what is more he refers to Plato, who recommended to soldiers the less "enervating" intercourse between men because of the otherwise encouraging effect of sexual intercourse (*puerorum complexum militibus dandum censuit, coitus enim audaciam praestat*) and it cannot be imputed to him (*qua propter Platoni, ut philosopho, non imputabimus...*).³⁴ Then he contrasts this to the Romans' stricter morals who did not allow soldiers to have intercourse either with women or with men in the camps, to which we are reminded by the similarity of the words *castra* and *castrated* too.

This was so far the short extract of the content of the part omitted from the print, which the Florentine publisher considered too scandalous surely because of its topic.³⁵ In

³¹ Two 15th-century-manuscripts of the text are known: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 52.18; Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. Lat. 1838.

³² *Liber de doctrina promiscua*, Florentiae, L. Torrentinus, 1548. Only one modern edition of the work has been issued so far, however it only contains selected extracts from the text: *Varia doctrina*, a cura di Mario FREZZA, Napoli, Pironti, 1949. The analysed part is not included in this selected edition of Frezza, and he also totally omitted the two chapters dealing with sexuality. The text left out from the prints is included at the end of my study.

³³ AVICENNA, *ibid.*, lib. III, fen. XX, I, 11: "Coitus quidem cum infantibus est foedus apud multitudinem gentium et prohibitus in lege, et est ex parte nocibilior et ex parte minus nocivus, et ex parte quidem, quia natura indiget in ipso motu plurimo, ut educat sperma est nocibilior, sed ex parte alia, quoniam sperma non expellitur cum eo expulsionem plurima, sicut fit in mulieribus, minoris nocimenti." This thought can be found in later Arabic treatises dealing with *scientia sexualis*, see for example as-Samau' al ibn Yahyâ's work from the 12th century: JACQUART-THOMASSET, *ibid.*, 124. Avicenna separately discusses those men who are passive participants of the unisexual intercourse (so called *aluminati*), he thinks that although enjoying it has corporal reasons, these men are mentally ill: *ibid.*, III, XX, pp. 40–43.

³⁴ The original text goes like this: "And if there were only some way of contriving that a state or an army should be made up of lovers and their loves, they would be the very best governors of their own city, abstaining from all dishonour, and emulating one another in honour; and when fighting at each other's side, although a mere handful, they would overcome the world." 178e–179a, trans. Benjamin JOWETT.

³⁵ I do not think that in this case it would be an accidental text omission because the examined part is too long for that. The *ed. princ.* only leaves out a couple of words in each cases from the original text; some of these are typical mistakes of copying, others are text corrections that seem to be intentional but these differences never extend a few words.

the following, I will endeavour to reveal its possible reasons. One of the reasons could be that the author refers to a place of Plato's *Symposium*, which had key importance to Florentine Neo-Platonism, in such a "dehonestating" context. It is known that Plato's 15th-century translators and commentators had difficulties with translating and interpreting those parts of the dialogues that refer to homoeroticism. The early translators of the dialogues, for example Bruni or Decembrio, often "mistranslated" or simply left out these places.³⁶ Trapezuntius also blamed Plato with pederasty who was then defended by Ficino and cardinal Bessarion, reckoning love between men among the category of "platonic love". By this, however, they tried to emphasize the spiritual side of such relationships. Ficino could not and did not want to deny Plato's references to homosexual emotions, what is more, in his interpretation those strictly noble and clear emotions between men that nevertheless exclude sexuality are closer to heavenly love than an "earthly attraction" between a man and a woman that includes corporeality.³⁷

What I believe to be the other and maybe the primary reason for the publisher's censorship also has Florentine relations: the researches of the most recent decades dealing with homosexuality in the early modern ages pointed out what a significant role these "sinful relationships", persecuted by the church and included in the category of sodomy, actually played in men's sexual and everyday life exactly in Renaissance Florence. The city in those times was notorious throughout Europe of the "sodomite-like relationships" so much that *Florenzer* was the synonym for *sodomite* in contemporary German.³⁸ The city of sin was chastised by contemporary preachers as well: in 1424 and 1425 in Florence Bernardino da Siena explicitly dedicated several speeches of the fasting period to the topic of sodomy, in which comparing Florence to Sodom and Gomorrah he encouraged the leaders of the city, among others the Medicis, to punish these sins even more strictly. The preacher's descriptions suggest that the relationships established between men seriously influenced the development of the merchants' patronage network, this is why he supposes parents were also lenient in this question.³⁹ In his book titled *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*, Michael Rocke, the monographer of the topic gives a review, based on archival researches, on the decrees announced against unisexual relationships—in 1432 the Signoria established a separate

³⁶ See: Jill KRAYE, *The Philosophy of the Italian Renaissance*, in: *Routledge History of Philosophy, IV, The Renaissance and Seventeenth-century Rationalism*, ed. G. H. R. PARKINSON, London–New York, 1993, 26 ff.; James HANKINS, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, I–II, Leiden, 1990, passim.

³⁷ Jill KRAYE, *The Transformation of Platonic Love in the Italian Renaissance*, in: *Platonism and the English Imagination*, eds. Anna BALDWIN, Sarah HUTTON, Cambridge, 1994, 76–85. See more on this: Giovanni DALL'ORTO, "Socratic Love" as a Disguise for Same-sex Love in the Italian Renaissance, in: *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, eds. Kent GERARD, Gert HEKMA, New York, 1989, 33–66.

³⁸ In that time homosexual relationships were considered sodomy too. On the development and meaning of the concept of sodomy see: Mark D. JORDAN, *The Invention of Sodomy in Christian Theology*, Chicago, 1997.

³⁹ *Le prediche volgari*, ed. C. CANNAROZZI, Pistoia, 1934, II, 30–36, 37–56, 57–71; *Le prediche volgari*, ed. C. CANNAROZZI, Florence, 1940, II, 270–290. See the analysis of the sermons in: Michael ROCKE, *Sodomites in Fifteenth-century Tuscany: The Views of Bernardino of Siena*, in: GERARD–HEKMA, *ibid.*, 7–31.

body, the so-called *Ufficiali di Notte*, to find and punish sodomite relationships—and those well-known people who supposedly maintained homosexual relationships, as for example Angelo Poliziano who was actually the educator of the children of Lorenzo, the addressee of *De doctrina*. Furthermore, he reviews how these relationships developed and what an important role they really had in Florentine men's social network, in the fabric of the republic based on bonds of relatives, friends, and patrons.⁴⁰ Rocke presents the sexual culture in which men established such relationships relatively young, usually before marrying; and it is important to remark here that as medical literature primarily reprehended the “passive enjoyers” of unisexual intercourses, the Florentine merchants were accordingly “active” participants of relationships with younger boys (but not children!).

As opposed to the earlier views depicting Lorenzo's age as the period of sexual licentiousness, the development of which, after all, can be traced back to the anti-Medici Savonarola politics, Rocke states on the basis of archival data that homosexuals were treated very strictly during Lorenzo's time too. However it is also true that this tendency significantly decreased in the 1480s until Lorenzo's death, which is interesting to us because Galeotto's dedication falls right into this period.⁴¹ Anyway, from the publisher's point of view the topic must have been embarrassing even at the time of publishing the *editio princeps*, that is in 1548, as according to the evidence of the resources the leaders of Florence were occupied with the sanctioning of the frequent male relationships even in the middle of the 16th century. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that duke Cosimo I de' Medici aggravated the punishment of “sodomites” to public burning at the stake right in 1542, but this law shows a stricter attitude against the phenomenon in other aspects as well, and as a consequence even the “suspicious” ones close to the Medicis were imprisoned.⁴²

But let us now take a closer look at the person who published the text, Lorenzo Torrentino, more precisely at his relation to the Medicis. Following his book vending activities in Bologna, Laurens van den Bleek, as the typographer with Holland roots was called originally, was invited to Florence by Cosimo I de' Medici himself so Torrentino became the duke's typographer and publisher in 1547.⁴³ As such he had to meet various

⁴⁰ Michael ROCKE, *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*, Oxford, 1996. On further research of the topic relating to the age see: *The Sciences of Homosexuality in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Kenneth BORRIS, George ROUSSEAU, London, 2008; *Same-sex Desire in the English Renaissance: A Sourcebook of Texts, 1470–1650*, ed. Kenneth BORRIS, New York, 2004 (it deals not only with English texts).

⁴¹ See: ROCKE, *ibid.*, 197–201.

⁴² ROCKE, *ibid.*, 232–235. In one of the most famous trials of the time Benvenuto Cellini was accused of homosexuality: Margaret Ann GALLUCCI, *Cellini's Trial for Sodomy: Power and Patronage at the Court of Cosimo I*, in: *The Cultural Politics of Duke Cosimo I de' Medici*, ed. Konrad EISENBICHLER, Aldershot, 2001, 37–46.

⁴³ Gustavo BERTOLI, *Contributo alla biografia di Lorenzo Torrentino stampatore ducale a Firenze*, in: *Studi in onore di Arnaldo d'Addario*, a cura di L. BORGIA et al., Lecce, 1995, II, 657–664; Frans SLITS, *Laurentius Torrentinus: Drukker van Cosimo, hertog van Florence*, Gemert, 1995.

requirements but these were all in the service of the Medici duke's culture politics.⁴⁴ Among others he had to satisfy the requirements of the reopened university of Pisa, but among the publications we can also find many of the works of the Florentine academy members and—in the spirit of a main objective of the institution—the works of the illustrious representatives of Florentine literature, sometimes in *volgare* translation. Besides, the publication of the manuscripts found in the Medici library was also his task, thus the publication of *De doctrina* was part of this conscious programme, which happened in the first really active year, 1548. During his stay in Florence, Torrentino published about 275 books; among others in 1550 Vasari's famous biography collection titled *Lives of the Most Excellent Italian Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, and *Poimandres* assigned to Hermes Trismegistus, and Alberti's *De architectura* both in *volgare* translation. Nevertheless, among the volumes including the works of antique classical writers and humanists, we can also find numerous medical works and a commentary written to Sacrobosco's *Sphaera*.⁴⁵

In spite of the grants and various privileges he was given in return, his activities were very strictly confined by the contract signed with him.⁴⁶ We learn from this that he needed the duke's exclusive permission for all publications and the content of the books was subject to censorship.⁴⁷ After all this, I suppose it is not impossible that the typographer and book vendor acting as the medium of the Medicis' propaganda needed to be so critical with the analysed text place, because that totally contradicted to the mentality represented by Cosimo de' Medici, and as a consequence to the laudation of the Medicis which can be discovered at various other places in the text and for which among other things—as he explained it in the introduction—he considered the text to be worth publishing.

Finally as an important literary historical parallel of the Florentine relations of the topic, it is worth to mention that in the year when Bernardo da Siena was attacking homosexuals in his sermons delivered in the city, that is in 1425, Antonio Beccadelli also dedicated his poem *Hermaphroditus* to a Medici, who was Lorenzo's grandfather, Cosimo de' Medici—the first book of which poem thematizes love between men in a rather realistic way. His contemporaries condemned the poet for this, the preacher himself burnt the book in public. However Beccadelli—similarly to Galeotto—later also defended

⁴⁴ Its viewpoints and realization are summarized in: Antonio RICCI, *Lorenzo Torrentino and the Cultural Programme of Cosimo I de' Medici*, in: EISENBICHLER, *ibid.*, 103–119.

⁴⁵ See: Domenico MORENI, *Annali della tipografia fiorentina di Lorenzo Torrentino impressore ducale*, edizione seconda, corretta, e aumentata, Florence, 1819 (reprint: Florence, 1989).

⁴⁶ The contract (ASF, Notarile Antecosimiano 9330) is published in: G. J. HOOGWERFF, *Laurentius Torrentinus (Laurens Leenaertsz Van der Beke) boekdrukker en uitgever van den hertog van Toscane, 1547–1563*, *Het Boek*, 15(1926), 273–288, 369–381.

⁴⁷ RICCI, *ibid.*, 106. It would be the task of further research to estimate what effect here and now the bull of Pope Leo X's had, which was approved by the Lateran Council in 1517 and which made the censorship of the church obligatory for all publications. Its real significance however arose only after the Council of Trent and against protestant books, although I suppose that this topic could also pretty much strike the eye of the censors of the church.

homoerotic poetry on Plato's behalf.⁴⁸ Galeotto could meet *Hermaphroditus* also due to Guarino, as his master initially praised this poem then he tried to withdraw it.⁴⁹ Galeotto's and Beccadelli's similar contemporary judgement is well supported by Lorenzo Valla's *De voluptate*, in which the latter poet represents Epicurean philosophy just like our author in Bonfini's *Symposion*. Another work of Beccadelli, already written in the service of the Aragonians in Naples, became an important model for Galeotto's *De dictis ac factis Regis Mathiae*.

I would like to connect the developments of Florentine social and idea history reviewed so far primarily with the censorial behaviour that published the *editio princeps*, as I can not see enough basis to originate the author's intention from here as well. Galeotto surely knew about the situation in Florence; he knew that despite the prohibitions there were homosexuals among the Medicis too, and that the Neo-Platonists' thinking about this also became more gentle in the meantime. I still have the feeling that while he is scorning the Neo-Platonists⁵⁰ at other places, thus he does not show much sensitivity towards the preferences of the dedicated, it would be boldness to assume that with this choice of topic Galeotto would like to refer to any actual Florentine tendency—even if this attitude were not totally far from him.⁵¹ As I intend to review it in the following, the question of homosexuality appears in contemporary medical scholarly texts as well; our author follows his usual resources with this too. Naturally, we can suspect that if he had had serious aversions against the topic, he would surely not have tried to relativize the question to such an extent as he does it in the cited passage; and surely his knowledge about Florentine relations also had some role in discussing unisexual relationships at all. Anyway, the ambivalent attitude towards the question is common for both Galeotto's text and the contemporary Florentine behaviour.

In my opinion, this basically homosexuality historical by-pass of *De doctrina* is definitely an instructive resource for today's reader, even if we only examine its medical historical and not its actual social historical context. Not only because the approach to the topic has a mentality historical feature but because the presentation of homosexuality in the light of the processes going on in the body illustrates that the context of *medicina* in certain cases represented different viewpoints and values to contemporary theological judgement. This does not mean that doctors did not usually consider homoerotic attrac-

⁴⁸ See more on this: CSEHY Zoltán, *Ars abutendi sexus atque naturae: A homoerotika alakzatai a Quattrocento és a korai Cinquecento neolatin költészetében* (The forms of homoeroticism in the neolatin poetry of the Quattrocento and the early Cinquecento), in: ID., *A szöveg hermaphrodituszi teste: Tanulmányok a humanizmus, az antikvitás és az erotográfia köréből* (The Hermaphroditus body of the text: Studies from the field of humanism, antiquity, and erotography), Bratislava, 2002, 235–268.

⁴⁹ Donatella COPPINI, *Hermaphroditus: Appendice I*, Rome, 1990.

⁵⁰ Chapter 20: *De philosophis, qui viventes sunt mortui*.

⁵¹ Furthermore it is absolutely far from me to draw any kind of a biographical consequence from this part of the text; I am now referring to a publication that dissects Janus Pannonius' homoerotic feelings for Galeotto: SZÁNTÓ Gábor András, *A Janus-krimi* (The Janus-thriller), in: „Szabad ötletek...” *Szöke György tiszteletére barátaitól és tanítványaitól* (“Free ideas...” in honour of György Szöke from his friends and students), eds. KABDEBŐ Lóránt, RUTTKAY Helga et al., Miskolc, 2005, 214–234.

tion, especially among men, an “abnormal” phenomenon, however they tried to give a physical explanation to the phenomenon which was one of the most serious moral defects in the eyes of the theologians. Galeotto’s lines are remarkable also because intercourse between men quite rarely occurred in medieval medical works, which can surely be explained with the contemporary judgement on this attraction. This is well illustrated by Thomas Aquinas’ point of view who similarly to autoeroticism and intercourse with animals categorized intercourse between men as a sin against nature, which is the gravest sin within the category of lust.⁵² It is worth to recall here the attitude of Avicenna’s commentators: Gentile da Foligno in the 14th century analyses the parts relating to intercourse between men very briefly and vaguely, on the contrary Good Philip’s doctor, Jacques Despars precisely comments the parts in question but he expresses his serious despise every time.⁵³ Only Pietro d’Abano takes over the cited part from *Canon* without any special comment in his *Conciliator*.⁵⁴

In the cited passage, Galeotto already separates the judgement of Christian theology and law, mentioning the example of Sodom and Gomorrah, from the medical attitude. He explains the grounds of the latter with a thought quoted from Horace: “de Christianitate quid loquar, cum apud nos teterrimum id esse iudicetur, sed *quod medicorum est promittunt medici, tractant fabrilia fabri*,⁵⁵ unde non damus vitio eis, si ex arte sua loquuntur, sicut philosophis propter eorum dogma multa dicenda promittimus, quae tamen fides christiana falsa esse convincit.”⁵⁶ So in his opinion, although this action is in contradiction with Christian faith, the doctor is still allowed to judge it in a different way or at least to deal with the topic at all. Following this, Galeotto moves on to a less piquant topic at the end of the chapter and he talks about the judgement of virginity which varies from age to age: while the Jews condemned it, Christianity almost appreciates this virtue the most. This part did not need to be censored.

Galeotto basically justifies the discussion of the topic of *coitus* at the beginning of the next chapter and he closes his thoughts relating to *scientia sexualis* with this. Chapter XX is titled *De philosophis, qui viventes sunt mortui* in which our author repeatedly explains his standpoint in connection with psychology. The philosophers, addressed as dead by

⁵² *Summa theologiae*, IIa-IIae, q. 154, art. 11 co. The medieval moral (theological, ethical) arguments raised against homosexuality are reviewed in detail in: John BOSWELL, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*, Chicago, 1980. On the ways of punishing homosexuality (eg. burning at stake) and on the relating legal rules see: BRUNDAGE, *ibid.*, 212–214, 313–314, 398–400, 533–535. (He discusses the question until the 16th century.)

⁵³ JACQUART–THOMASSET, *ibid.*, 155–159.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, Diff. 124. Similarly to Avicenna, Pietro d’Abano tries to give medical, “organic, physiological” explanation to anal intercourse in his commentary written to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* (*Expositio problematum Aristotelis*, IV, 26). He distinguishes two groups of men who are inclined to it; there are those who “are born like this” but there are others who adopt this habit later, and he calls these latter ones sodomite, see: CADDEN, *ibid.*, 214–216.

⁵⁵ HORACE, *Epistolarum liber alter*, I, 115–116.

⁵⁶ F. 107r–107v.

Galeotto, who despise the body and want to disconnect from that in their lives surely disdain this topic: “quid enim rei est mortuis cum coitu?”⁵⁷ He refers to the Neo-Platonists with the lines quoted and arguing with them he emphasizes that human life can only consist of the unbreakable bonds of the body and the soul, and therefore one must care about the desires of the body within the frameworks of “ars medica”. Furthermore, by the Platonic concept of *pulchritudo*, Galeotto means not only psychical but corporal beauty as well: “amor autem ex divi Platonis definitione est fruendae pulchritudinis desiderium. Sed pulchritudo duplex, *et corporis et animae esse* perhibetur...”⁵⁸ Thus the medical⁵⁹ and cultural historical discussion of sexuality in *De doctrina* is to be interpreted together with the psychic philosophical context as in the end this legitimates the topic to our author.

It is worth to compare this to Ficino’s opinion: in *De vita* he indeed advises temperance from the viewpoint of the right lifestyle for scholar men inclined to melancholy, to which his explanation is that it is better for a Saturn-like, contemplative mind not to get under the influence of Venus that has an opposite effect.⁶⁰ Applying Foucault’s expression, we could say that sexual life fell under different judgement in Galeotto’s and Ficino’s “self-culture”, as he called the interpretations of the order of *cura sui*, which varied in certain philosophical schools.⁶¹ It is not an accident either that Bonfini gave Epicurus’ role right to our author in the Neo-Platonist-minded *Symposion* that glorifies virginity. Although the birth of *Symposion* can be dated to a few years earlier than that of *De doctrina*, as if we were still hearing the “real” Galeotto at the feast talking about the detrimental consequences of temperance: as a consequence of suppressing the desires for love, the inner organs exhale fumes to the brain, heart, liver, and stomach, and they cause fearful diseases.⁶² The author of *De doctrina* thought it to be important for similar reasons to fit this topic into his work that is also considered as a guide to life conduct.

All this knowledge can be found in the works of those authors whom we can regard as Galeotto’s resources also in the case of other fields that he liked—such as medical astrology or physiognomy. For example in *Liber physiognomiae* dedicated to Frederick II,

⁵⁷ *Ed. princ.*, 182.

⁵⁸ *Ed. princ.*, 175.

⁵⁹ It is worth to mention that Galeotto does not refer to the topics of fertility, begetting or sterility and the related knowledge at all, which are otherwise often discussed in similar types of texts.

⁶⁰ Marsilio FICINO, *Three Books on Life*, a critical edition and translation with introduction and notes by Carol V. KASKE, John R. CLARK, Arizona State University, 1998 (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 57), lib. II, cap. XVI.

⁶¹ FOUCAULT, *Histoire de la sexualité*, III, *ibid.*, 48 ff.

⁶² Antonio BONFINI, *Beszélgetés a szüzességről és a házasság tisztaságáról* (Discussion about virginity and the purity of married life), trans. MURAKÖZY Gyula, Budapest, 1985, 80. On *Symposion* and Galeotto’s character formed by Bonfini see: Klára PAJORIN, *La rinascita del symposio antico e la corte di Mattia Corvino*, in: *Italia e Ungheria all’epoca dell’Umanesimo Corviniano*, ed. Sante GRACIOTTI, Cesare VASOLI, Firenze, 1994, 179–228; BÉKÉS Enikő, *Galeotto Marzio alakja Bonfini Symposion című művében* (Galeotto Marzio’s figure in Bonfini’s work titled *Symposion*), in: *Szolgálatomat ajánlom a 60 éves Jankovics Józsefnek* (I offer my services to the 60-year-old József Jankovics), eds. CSÁSZTVAY Tünde, NYERGES Judit, Budapest, Balassi Kiadó–MTA Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2009, 42–47.

Michael Scot puts the topic of sexuality into the context of physiognomy, and he presents the external signs of the connection between the various female types, sexual desire, and fertility in such a detailed way that is very rare in physiognomic literature.⁶³ Scot's work in the context of *De doctrina* is interesting to us also because according to the historian of Frederick II, Matthew Paris, the emperor applied his scientist's guidelines in practice as well when he supposed to tell the gender of his child to be born based on his wife's corporal signs.⁶⁴ The doctor Arnaldo de Villanova (1234/1240–1312/1313) dedicated a separate treatise to the topic, the structure of which basically follows Constantine the African's work. The author agrees with Galen, who thinks that complete temperance is unhealthy, and he places sexual intercourse among the most important health preserving activities together with physical exercise, eating-drinking, bathing, and sleeping.⁶⁵ Pietro d'Abano also follows Avicenna when he discusses the effect made on health by *coitus* in *Conciliator*.⁶⁶ The questions related to sexuality can be found in the *Questiones*-literature of the Salerno medical school as well, but also in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata*-collection translated into Latin by Pietro d'Abano, which shows that the topic was included in the education and natural philosophy of scholasticism too. These texts were popular later, in the 15th century as well; *Problemata* was translated into Latin by Politian too, but the roots of *De homine* written by Girolamo Manfredi, who had much in common with Galeotto's education, should also be sought in the mentioned works.⁶⁷ Furthermore in his main medical work titled *Practica maior*, Michele Savonarola, a number of whose works are close to Galeotto's mentality, writes about the ways of facilitating conception and the right amount of *coitus* depending on personal habit.⁶⁸ In another one of Savonarola's work dedicated to Borso d'Este and titled *Del felice progresso di Borso d'Este*, which is a treatise similar to a mirror for princes, we can read another example to the case when sexuality occurs expressively in the context of information considered useful for rulers. As the duke's doctor, Savonarola also deals with healthy sexual life

⁶³ Surprisingly, he describes fertile women with a great sexual appetite having small breasts, see cap. IV: *Signa mulieris calidae naturae et quae coit libenter*.

⁶⁴ According to Scot, the gender of the child to be born can be forecasted from some certain external signs of the mother's body such as the form of the belly or the breasts, *ibid.*, cap. XVI: *Signa masculini concepti in muliere gravida*. To Matthew Paris see: *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. RICHARDS LUARD, Rolls Series, vol. 57; repr. London, 1964, III, 324, at the year 1235.

⁶⁵ Arnaldo de Villanova was among others the royal doctor of Robert of Anjou King of Naples; besides his numerous own works it is worth to mention the publication of the medical work of the Salerno school titled *Regimen sanitatis salernitanum*. See *De coitu* in: *Haec sunt opera... recognita ac emendata*, Venetiis, B. Locatellus, 1514, 317–319.

⁶⁶ Diff. 124: *An coitus competat in re sanitatis*.

⁶⁷ Brian LAWN, *The Salernitan Questions: An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature*, Oxford, 1963. On the afterlife of the works in the Renaissance see: 92–112. On Manfredi see: G. M. ANSELMI, E. BOLDRINI, *Galeotto Marzio ed il De homine fra Umanesimo bolognese ed europeo*, *Quaderno degli Annali dell'Istituto Gramsci*, 3(1995–1996), 3–83.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, II, I; VI, pp. 20–21.

scelus putauit antiquitas ut mimice i
 oec hominū esset quod simile uidetur
 illi edicto quo cautū est ne iconis templi
 diane ephesiane nominaretur ut eo quod
 optabat scelus ille si uideretur famaz
 n. querebāt. S3 mutatis moribus lati
 norum pmulte et libere qdem appi
 lationes prodire proderitate sceleru
 et huiusmodi: cumu loqui et pedicōnes
 siue emasculatores: et fututores et alia
 huiusmodi turpia coitu comitantia effu
 xerūt Nos uero ipresentiatu honesto uo
 cabulo coitum uisurpabimus. Coitus si
 quidem iste duo diuersissima cōmet: naz
 mediocri saluberrim^{us} nimius autem
 punitissimus habetur. Caesentia n.
 auerone uicesima tertij Coitus citas
 et cogitationes in hōretes excludit. auda
 ciam prelat uam mitgat. quauz imo
 ribus hominū reddidit: et atrebili que pte
 ruiq; mentes hominū similes demen
 tie uocat medetur fumos. n. aggregatos
 acorde cerebriq; depellit dolorib; remū
 subuenit: ingenium acut et ab ignib;

quod medicoru est pmittit medicā trac
 tant fabrilia fabri unde nō damus ut
 tio eis si exarte sua locatur sicut philo
 sophis pp corū dogma multa dicenda
 pmittimus que tamen fidel christiana
 falsa eē cōiunct. Nulla n. schola bene
 instituta lectōem philosophic abhorret
 qua pp platonū ut pto nō iputabimus
 euz puerorū complexū militib; dandū
 cenit. Coitus n. audacaz prelat ut
 supra diximus, et poeta nō tacuit. Qui
 et ibelles dant prelia cerui. audacaz
 uero militib; eē necessariam nemo pro
 fecto dubitat si igitur imilitia p tuen
 da re publica omnia temtandā se nō
 erit uitio dandū si coitu q; militū ani
 mos uirtutēq; exatemus. nec hoc co
 mode cū mulierib; faciendū fortal
 sis hac ratione plato putauit quia mu
 lieres casta comitantes exercitūz enu
 uant: mollitūq; blanditūz pugnatūz
 honorosiores sunt. an i comoda pluri
 ma pugnatūm. et manus et aios debi

colidq; abscessus quos gicatas aposth
 mata uocat penitus remouēt. In igitu
 poeta ilibro de arte amadi ait pax omis
 in uno Concubitu. Nocuita uero in
 nimio coitu spone infinita qm ni
 hil fer mag homiem enuat: podā
 gem q; generat: dorsi: ueruz: uesice
 dolorū. nec nō colicam ori sp; fetoz
 efficit oculos hebetans et alia plūria.
 Vnum tū aduertendū est qd omēm
 libidinem equalis iuuanti nocenti
 uesice Naz cū muliere coire et si scim
 uisilep humani grūs cōseruatiōe eē nō
 scatur. attamen cā eo plus humidū cōsi
 tur: sua. caliditate mulier uirūz exha
 unt: S3 coitus masculi minus euacuat
 testiaucenna. q; q; sit foedus iloge ut ei
 uado uir et recte nā ap iudex quanta
 fuerit ei masculū coire foedus. foedo
 ma comoria q; testantur et ap macho
 meli imitatores exaucernō edico cō
 paxendūz: emasculatiōem eē rez turpi
 sumam de christianitate qd loquar cur
 pnos. teterrimūz id eē iudicetur S3

litina orientur. pretrea i greca plu
 rimos habere amatores adolēcentib;
 cat: honorificūz plato igitur ratione o
 apparente ad ductus. morib; patūz bu
 sus. salia que nos delitāmēta putāmus
 effudit. S3 rectius romana grauitas cen
 suit. casta n. uocauit ut q; castriati mili
 tes i continentia pelleret ita ut et mu
 lierū et puerorū coitu excluderent. uo
 luit n. sine aliquo ad iunūto. omi medi
 cina seposita auditate glorie et amore
 pūz animatos fortiter pericula adire
 pugnaq; euz uictoria capessere. secundu
 illud uirgilij uicit amor patrie laudū
 q; imensa cupido. Is diuisē regione di
 uisus morib; ornatur ap hēbreos uirgi
 nitaz punitio habebatur. filia n. septē ad
 mēzq; destinata. tempore spatūz pe
 nit. ut uirginitatē suam desleret. et
 hūc eadem inter phos uisio daretur.
 hūc uisus est medicūz uitorū utriūq;
 edidit testē flacco. s. auctore aristotele
 q; uirūz dicit eē habitū electūz in
 media citate cōsistentēz. Virginitas aut

among the pieces of advice given for eating and life conduct at the end of his work.⁶⁹ All these authors were worth to be listed here also because we can see that the chapters relating to sexuality—as case studies—shed light on the intellectual historical resources of Galeotto's wider medical education, too.

Text publication

based on Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 52.18, f. 107r–108r

Sed coitus masculi minus evacuat, teste Avicenna,⁷⁰ quamquam sit foedus in lege, ut eius verbo utar, et recte, nam apud Iudeos quanta fuerit cum masculis coire foeditas, Sodoma Gomorraque testantur, et apud Machometti⁷¹ imitatores, ex Avicennae dicto comprehenditur, emasculationem esse rem turpissimam, de Christianitate quid loquar, cum apud nos teterrimum id esse iudicetur, sed *quod medicorum est promittunt medici tractant fabrilia fabri*,⁷² unde non damus vitio eis, si ex arte sua loquuntur, sicut philosophis propter eorum dogma multa dicenda promittimus, quae tamen fides christiana falsa esse convincit. Nulla enim schola bene instituta lectionem philosophiae abhorret, quapropter Platoni, ut philosopho non imputabimus, cum puerorum complexum militibus dandum censuit.⁷³ Coitus enim audaciam praestat, ut supra diximus, et poeta non tacuit, qui et *inbelles dant proelia cervi*.⁷⁴ Audaciam vero militibus esse necessariam nemo profecto dubitat, si igitur in militia protuenda republica omnia temptanda sunt, non erit vitio dandum, si coitu quoque militum animos virtutesque excitemus. Nec hoc commode cum mulieribus faciendum fortassis hac ratione Plato putavit, quia mulieres castra comitantes exercitum enervant molliuntque blanditiis pugnantium animos et praegnantem onerose et partitae onerosiores sunt, unde incommoda plurima pugnantium et manus et animos debilitantia orientur. Praeterea in Graecia plurimos habere amatores adolescentibus erat honorificum, Plato igitur ratione apparente adductus moribus patriae imbutus talia, quae nos deliramenta putamus, effudit. Sed rectius Romana gravitas censuit, castra enim vocavit, ut quasi castrati milites incontinentiam pellerent ita, ut et mulierum et puerorum coitum excluderent. Voluit enim sine aliquo adiumento, omni medicina seposita, aviditate gloriae et amore patriae animatos fortiter pericula adire pugnamque cum victoria capessere secundum illud Vergilii *vincit amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido*.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ Michele SAVONAROLA, *Del felice progresso di Borso d'Este*, a cura di Maria Aurelia MASTRONARDI, Bari, 1996.

⁷⁰ Ibn Sīnā, doctor, philosopher of Persian origin (980–1037).

⁷¹ Prophet Muhammad (570–632).

⁷² HORACE, *Epistolarum liber alter*, I, 115–116.

⁷³ *Symposium*, 178e–179a.

⁷⁴ VIRGIL, *Georgica*, III, 265.

⁷⁵ *Aeneis*, VI, 823. The original one includes *vincet*; also quotes it with *vincit*: St. AUGUSTINE, *De civitate Dei*, III, 16.