There are several ways to pay tribute to scholars in whose tradition one wishes to step, but to the late sixteenth-century humanist a printed portrait was perhaps the most attractive one. Indeed, it enabled humanists not only to indulge in antiquarian scholarship, but also to present their readers with a range of illustrious models for a virtuous life. Thanks to the printing press, the fame of humanist icons could be spread throughout Europe. The popularity of learned portrait collections was stirred by the study of ancient coins, biographies of emperors and other illustrated genealogies. The earliest examples include the series of lawyers by Antonio Lafreri (1566) and that of scholars from various disciplines by Philip Galle (1569). Perhaps the most famous example is the historian, physician and bishop Paolo Giovio (1483-1552) who had started by collecting in his villa near Como approximately four hundred painted portraits of different men, historical and contemporary, derived from widely divergent sources.

In this article one particular portrait book is examined as a prism of the history of science and the culture of scholarship in the sixteenth century. It is the first printed collection of portraits of physicians, entitled *Veterum aliquot ac recentium medicorum philosophorumque Icones [...] (Some portraits of ancient and recent physicians and philosophers).* It was edited by the Hungarian humanist Joannes Sambucus (1531-1584) and first published by Christopher Plantin in Antwerp in 1574. Pieter van der Borcht was probably responsible for the engraved portraits. In the book ancient philosophers such as Thales, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle precede sixteenth-century scientists like Andreas Vesalius, Leonhard Fuchs and Conrad Gesner. Ancient gods and legendary characters like Apollo, the centaur Chiron and Socrates are followed by the names of the less familiar pharmacologists Cratevas, Niger and Pamphilus.
Humanism and Medicine in the Sixteenth Century

To the modern reader medicine and philosophy may not seem such a natural combination, but in the early modern medical curriculum the two disciplines were deeply connected. Besides practical knowledge of diseases and therapies based on the works of Hippocrates and Galen, and their medieval intermediaries, Aristotelian logic and natural philosophy were central elements in the training of young physicians. This is also reflected in the names of faculties, frequently showing the combination of medicine and arts, or medicine and philosophy.¹

In the sixteenth century, the impact of humanism revolutionised the study of medicine, thus paradoxically also advancing the emergence of empirical studies, such as botany. The movement is often referred to as medical humanism,
or *hellenism*, since the most important sources for medicine were Greek. The rediscovery of important sources, such as Theophrastus’ *Historia plantarum* and Dioscorides’ *Materia medica*, or the publication of the collected works of Galen required philological skills. The heyday of medical humanism was in the middle of the century. Once the main texts had been edited, Latin translations appeared causing a gradual shift in the debate from philological discussions to matters of evidence and method. The role of the Greek texts was reduced. Simultaneously, the empirical approach to the study of nature became a prominent feature of natural history. Explorations of new worlds led to new discoveries and collecting naturalia became increasingly popular, all of which contributed to the systematic description of nature. Both the rediscovery of ancient texts and the explorations of nature itself led to an institutionalisation of botanical studies. In the 1530s the first structural chairs of botany were established at Italian universities and in several places botanical gardens were founded.

These developments are also reflected in the organisation of medical scholarship. Dissemination of the latest developments and findings was of vital importance for the medical community. The Dioscorides editions of Pier Andrea Mattioli may serve as a case in point. From the 1540s onwards these numerous editions were an important pharmacological manual. Rather than a text edition, Mattioli’s work became an encyclopaedic project in which the old text was enriched, corrected and illustrated. For all this, Mattioli relied on the help of specialists from all over Europe, whose assistance was acknowledged in an ever-growing preface to the book. In this way, the new editions gradually replaced the original. Moreover, they made Mattioli the co-ordinator of a new scholarly community.

*Portraying a Scholarly Community*

Published near the end of Mattioli’s life, the *Icones* constitute a gallery of this scholarly community and its history. Mattioli is included, and in the poem beneath his portrait he is praised for having surpassed Dioscorides, whose portrait appears earlier in the book. Clearly, the book highlights the humanist tradition, rather than the empirical approach. How, then, did the makers present the history of medicine?

The collection of images opens with the goddess of healing, Hygiaea, who is invoked to ‘bring to light what is scarce, to disclose the abundant treasures’. After this, six portraits represent the mythical phase of archaic medical history from Apollo to Homer. A large group of 21 portraits of famous and less familiar ancient scholars and philosophers follows, including important medical authors from this period, such as Hippocrates, Galen (fig. 1) and Dioscorides. The main
part of the gallery consists of 35 portraits of early modern medical scholars from all over Europe. It is hard to detect particular patterns within this group: it seems the portraits are not ordered thematically, chronologically or geographically and there are no explicit references to a macro-structure either. The next two portraits represent, somewhat unexpectedly, the classical writers Seneca and Strabo. Finally, the last three portraits are reserved for the medieval naturalist Pier de’ Crescenzi, the famous neo-platonist Marsilio Ficino and Sambucus himself. Although the order of portraits is not strictly chronological, a general historical development is suggested, in which the humanist representatives are natural heirs of the classical tradition. Arabic intermediaries, such as Averroes and Avicenna, are not represented in this overview. Also lacking are important contemporary innovators of botanical studies, such as Ulysse Aldrovandi or Carolus Clusius. Rather, the collection is focused on medical humanism in its traditional forms. Seen from this perspective, it is perhaps correct to place Sambucus more or less at the end of the historical line. Significantly, only six of those portrayed were still alive when the collection was published.

In the accompanying poems, mostly consisting of two elegiac distichs, Sambucus concisely evaluates scholarly merits and literary status of the portrayed, or his relevance for the history of medicine or philosophy. In most cases, the poem is complimentary, although in the epigrams accompanying Pliny, Pamphilus and Paracelsus some reservation can be noticed. In the case of the early modern scholars, contributions to the study of philology are praised in particular. Although non-classical developments are referred to – Vesalius of course is acclaimed as the pioneer of anatomy, while Rondelet is hailed as an ichthyologist – in general, the restoration of the ‘monumenta’ of classical authors receives more attention than empirical research. The epigrams do not contain much biographical information, but often include name punning and references to the scholars’ regional backgrounds. Rather than trying to educate the readership, the epigrams confirm the values and taste of a humanist audience. The readers are assumed to know about the scholars included in the portrait book. At the time of publication, however, this may have been a rather optimistic approach. For good reasons, Plantin’s successor in Leiden, Francis Raphelengius, added a biographical section to the second edition. Significantly, in preparing this edition, Raphelengius had to ask his cousin Balthasar Moretus, who ran the officina planitiana in Antwerp, to send a copy of the first edition, which he needed to place the epigrams beneath the correct portrait. This once illustrious scholarly community had clearly become difficult to identify. From a celebration of medical humanism, it seems the Icones had turned into a monument commemorating an episode in medical history.
Thus, when the selection and textual presentation of the portraits are seen from the perspective of contemporary scientific developments, the Icones may seem rather old-fashioned. Yet Sambucus had concrete ideas about its added value and, on a more implicit level, probably thought it a practical social instrument as well. Both the concrete motivation behind, and the social use of, the portrait book can best be perceived when situated in the context of Sambucus’ life.

While still a student, Sambucus confessed that he preferred literature to medicine. In a poem published in 1555, he shows himself to be a pragmatic student:

I have devoted myself to Phoebus Apollo and medicine, until something more elegant comes along, which also pleases my taste. By this study, however, I wish to help my dear ones and my own good health.14

It seems the quest for this something more elegant soon so distracted Sambucus that he broke off his medical studies in Padua and continued his academic tour through Italy, France, Germany and the Low Countries.15 He settled in Vienna in 1564, after more than twenty years of travelling. Until his death, Sambucus worked here as a historiographer and court physician at the service of the emperors Maximilian II and Rudolf II.16 Sambucus’ record as a practising physician is not particularly impressive. He was appointed titular court physician (‘medicus aulae titularis’) in 1567, a post without an annual allowance and the first step in a medical career at court. In fact, Sambucus would never make a second step. As soon as 1567, serious problems arose, when the Vienna faculty of medicine did not allow him to become a member, since he failed to produce a doctoral degree. Membership of the faculty was a prerequisite for practising physicians. Sambucus was saved from a humiliating legal procedure when the Emperor decreed that court physicians were not answerable to the faculty. However, Sambucus was never appointed to the paid post of ‘medicus actualis’, or the prestigious position of personal physician of the emperor, such as Joannes Crato of Kraetheim, Sambucus’ patron.

Sambucus’ reputation is based on his activities as a humanist and antiquarian rather than as a practising physician. He was famous in the Republic of Letters for his impressive library of books and rare manuscripts. He was active as an editor of Greek texts, but also of medieval works on Hungarian law and history. Sambucus’ interest in iconography is apparent in his edition of Johann Hüttich’s collection of numismatic portraits of Roman emperors, his influential emblem book (with a numismatic appendix), and his collection of triumphal arches, an allegorical tribute to Don Juan after the battle of Lepanto, published by Philips Galle in 1572.17
The publication of the *Icones* should be seen in the context of these antiquarian activities. Sambucus published part of the collection of portraits which he had managed to gather. ‘Please urge the person who is working on my little collection to hurry up; I shall pay him when he is ready’, Sambucus wrote to the geographer Abraham Ortelius in September 1573. The impatience is understandable, because the first plans had been made at least four years before. Sambucus had finished the epigrams as early as 1570.

Sambucus’ idea for a portrait collection coincides with the arrival of a unique Dioscorides manuscript in Vienna. In 1569 the Habsburg diplomat Augerius Ghislenius Busbeck had purchased this codex in Constantinople for the imperial library in Vienna. Dating from the first decade of the sixth century and illustrated with remarkable coloured plates, it was a unique source for medical scholarship. Moreover, it contained a collection of portraits of fourteen ancient
physicians (figs. 2–3). On the basis of this manuscript Sambucus tried to make an edition of Dioscorides’ work, for which purpose he had it copied, including the illustrations in colour. This copy was probably the model for twelve of the ancient physicians in the *Icones*.53

Sambucus had originally commissioned the court medallist Antonio Abondio (1538–1591) to make the illustrations. For the publication he probably had the Basle publisher Theodor Zwinger in mind. However, Abondio did not keep his promise and Zwinger probably lost interest. When the book was finally published in 1574, it was Plantin who had taken care of its production, while Pieter van der Borcht was probably responsible for the engravings. Interestingly, the letter to Ortelius shows that Sambucus paid for the costs of the illustrations, but apparently did not know the engraver himself.55

**Fig. 3.** Second gallery of physicians from Dioscorides’ *Codex vindobonensis*, fol. 3v. Reprinted by kind permission of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
Sambucus dedicated the work as a new-year’s gift to Johann Heinrich Herwart (1520-1583), a patrician from Augsburg. Herwart was a patron of humanist philology and renowned for his botanical garden. In the short dedicatory letter dated 1 January 1574, Sambucus emphasises the antiquarian value of the Icones, rather than stressing the importance of its survey of medical history. He refers to his earlier work on portraits of Roman emperors and adds that physicians and philosophers should not be forgotten. He acknowledges that by that time, many collections of portraits had been published, but claims that the asset of the Icones was its reliance on visual sources, such as coins, old manuscripts, statues, and paintings. Rather than fashioning the portraits after literary descriptions, Sambucus thus claims to have used visual evidence in his search for authentic images. Surviving contemporaries, he adds, were represented according to their age at the time.

This is all clearly visible in the iconographical characteristics of the portraits, which vary as widely as their sources. The quest for historical realism leads to a mixed collection of poses, clothes and attributes. The case of Seneca, for instance, shows us the profile of a monk (with a shaved head wearing a habit), holding a book. The epigram beneath it refers to an old manuscript as the source for the iconography. Van der Borcht managed to secure the visual unity of the book by the uniform, circular shape of the portraits and by their frames, which are all richly decorated in mannerist style, using animals and flowers, putti and mythical creatures, festoons and scroll work. The imagery reflects the riches of nature but is not precisely tuned to the expertise of the portrayed: no fishes adorn Rondelet’s portrait, for instance, but birds and squirrels. Finally, antiquarian accuracy is apparent in the four cases (Argenterius, Goropius Becanus, Montagnana and Curtius) where no models were available. Here the space for the portrait was simply left black.

Thus, besides presenting a history of medical humanism, the Icones also represents the interest in portraits as a historical documents. As appears from the explicit motivation in the preface, collecting portraits was a goal in itself. This does not, however, fully explain why the book was published. Sambucus, for his part, already possessed the portraits. Moreover, the production of the book was extremely expensive and time-consuming. What more could have driven Sambucus and Plantin? There are indications that the book could also be seen as a useful promotional gift.

The Social Use of the Icones

For their professional activities both Sambucus and Plantin depended on a continuous exchange of services within the scholarly community. Sambucus, for
instance, helped Plantin to obtain the imperial privileges for some of his publications, while he himself depended on the services of Crato for influential assistance at court. In completing his text editions, help from colleagues all over Europe was indispensable. Although humanists often speak about the virtue of liberality in these circumstances, reciprocity, and hence social credit, was in fact an essential precondition for the survival of the system. In his correspondence, Sambucus regularly refers to gifts received or enclosed, and it is clear that these presents were not completely free of obligation. In the same letter to Ortelius, for instance, Sambucus also expressed gratitude for the copy of Ortelius’ *Theatrum* which he had received as a present. ‘I am much obliged until I can repay it with a greater favour’, he answered. As a first counter-gift he enclosed a ring, which ‘did not have much gold’, but contained a ‘remarkable stone, with an image to exercise the mind’.

Books could serve as gifts in several different ways: as a public gift by means of a dedication, but also as a personal gift from one owner to the other. Sambucus produced several publications that can be regarded as gift books *par excellence*. The most prominent examples are his emblem book, the *Arcus aliquot triumphalia*, and the *Icones*. These works were not only donated to a single dedicatee, but presented to colleagues and friends as well. Sambucus regarded the *Emblemata* and the *Icones* particularly suitable gift books since he presented them as a new year’s gifts, signing the dedicatory letters on the first of January. However, in presenting the *Icones* in this form, what did Sambucus expect in return and from whom, apart from the formal dedicatee?

Unfortunately, there are no sources to answer these questions. Still I would like to hypothesise that the *Icones* should be seen as a useful instrument for gaining social credit in the scholarly community of which Sambucus was a part. In this sense, the *Icones* might be seen as an anticipation of the most ambitious project of his life, the edition of Dioscorides’ *Materia medica*. With this project, Sambucus hoped to surpass the activities of Mattioli, not only in terms of scholarship, but also financially. ‘The work will not be less agreeable and lucrative than Mattioli’s learned collections’, he optimistically wrote to Zwinger, explaining his request for a financial compensation of 500 florins. He only needed ‘a patron’ and a ‘suitable publisher’. By that time, Mattioli’s *Dioscorides* was probably the most widely read scientific book of its time, and the editor himself was about to retire from his respected services as personal physician of the Emperor. Sambucus knew that a publication of Dioscorides could gain the editor and his publisher immense fame, wealth and standing.

In addition to investments for the publication, Sambucus needed intellectual help. Like Mattioli before him, Sambucus depended on colleagues from all over Europe for collations, emendations and corrections. With the *Icones*, he had
presented the illustrious scholarly tradition in which he wanted to place his work on Dioscorides. Sambucus was not only the compiler of this hall of fame, he is also present in it himself, and his work-in-progress on Dioscorides is mentioned explicitly. It seems a clever move on Sambucus’ part to use the portrait as a means to anticipate a new role in the community of medical humanists. The exchange of portraits (painted, printed or on medals) was a popular way of circulating one’s image, confirming a shared identity and establishing friendly relations. In this context, the compiler of a portrait book had something to offer. Hugo Blotius, for instance, wrote to colleagues asking for portraits he could publish. Similarly, Galle asked for new suggestions in the preface to his 1572 edition. In this case, correspondence shows how Joannes Crato, for instance, becomes impatient when the publication in which he will be included is taking longer than expected. By publishing a gallery of medical humanists, Sambucus put himself in a position similar to that of Galle with his portrait book.

In fact, bad timing thwarted the strategy. By 1570 there were few scholars who wished to follow in Sambucus’ footsteps on the path of medical humanism. Carolus Clusius, for instance, was sceptical of the relevance of the Vienna Dioscorides manuscript. As I indicated above, ancient medical texts had gradually become marginalised in favour of empirical research. In fact, Sambucus would never succeed in realising the Dioscorides edition, and got caught up in endless logistical problems. Moreover, the printers with whom Sambucus tried to co-operate were not prepared to comply with his financial demands. ‘Il mio Aristotele et Dioscoride sono sepulti in Basilea et Geneva’, Sambucus wrote not without a sense of resignation to Fulvio Orsini in 1576. In 1598, fourteen years after Sambucus’ death, an edition appeared in Frankfurt incorporating some of Sambucus’ work on the text. By this time, however, all the physicians of the Icones had left the Republic of Letters for the Olympus.

Notes


2 For Lafreri, see Pelc, Illustrium Imagines, no. 99; for Galle, see Pelc, Illustrium Imagines, nos. 61-64 and Sellink, Philips Galle, esp. 41-67.

3 Part of it published by Pietro Perna (Basle, 1575) with Giovio’s biographies.


8 ‘Matthiolo primas qui defert, lector, in herbis, / lure facit: gratos talibus esse decet. / Cumque dies aliam doceat, tamen omnibus unus / plus tulit hic lucis nonne Dioscoridì?’

9 In some cases there appears to be grouping of like-minded scholars, as in the sequence of Da Monte, Fernel, Trincavelli and Dubois, sharing their attitude towards Galen, or in the case of Crato and Biesius, both personal physician of the Emperor. However, in both cases other relevant portraits are not included in the sequence, but present elsewhere, such as Corti and Mattioli respectively.

10 In the case of Cuspinianus the poem comprises three distichs, that of Sambucus himself four. This latter poem, however, is not written by Sambucus; in the case of Homer, Sambucus explains his presence in the collection by referring to Apollo’s wish that physicians should have sufficient literary training.

11 For references to philological skills, see the poems for Andernacus, Biesius, Brassavola, Cornarius, Crassus, Crato, Ficino, Gesner, Montagnana, Mattioli, Sambucus, Scaliger, Sylvius, and Trincavelli.

12 In the case of Xenocrates the lack of biographical information is subject of the epigram. For name punning see, for instance, Altomare, Apollonius, Bock, Fernel, Massa and Trincavelli; for references to regional backgrounds, see for example Aristotle, Biesius, Gesner, Guinter, Junius and Lazius Pythagoras, Thales, Trincavelli. There is no particular stress on specific regional identities; compare the use of portrait books for constructing national images, Karl Enenkel, ‘Het Nederlandse “nationale bewustzijn” in biografische reeksen: Miraëus’ *Elogia Belgica en Meursius’ Athenae Batavae*, in K.A.E. Enenkel et al. (eds.), *Typisch Nederlands. De Nederlandse identiteit in de letterkunde* (Voorthuizen, 1999), 27-54.


14 ‘Phoebò me ac medicis dedi colendum, / Donec quid magis accidit venustum / Et meo placet simul palato. / Consultum hoc studio tamen propinquus / Et meae cuperem bonae saluti.’ Sambucus, *Poemata quaedam [...]* (Padua: G. Perchacinus, 1555), fols. 30v-31r.

15 Sambucus stopped after attaining a licentiate; see Stephan Bálint-Nagy, ‘Der
17 Johann Hüttich, Romanorum principum effigies [...] (Strasburg: W. Köpfel, 1551) [see Pelc, Illustrium imagines, 201, no. 90]; J. Sambucus, Emblemata cum aliquot nummis antiqui operis [...] (Antwerp: C. Plantin, 1564 and later editions), and Arcus aliquot triumphales [...] (Antwerp: Ph. Galle, 1572).
21 Ibid., 28–33; there are four folio’s with portraits, the first two (2v and 3v) of which depict seven physicians each, whilst the two subsequent leaves contain allegorical compositions of Dioscorides.
22 Ibid., 5; part of this copy is preserved in the Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, sig. Cod. Lat. 1478.
23 See the appendix for the portraits involved. In the engravings the heads are enlarged; also the pose of the originals is reduced to cover the head only.
24 As early as 1570, Sambucus complains that the artist still has not produced the portraits. Gerstinger and Vantuch (eds.), Die Briefe des Johannes Sambucus, letters nos. xxxv, xli and xliii.
26 This is similar to the production process of the Emblemata; see Visser, Joannes Sambucus, 49–84.
27 ‘Ac scio multos hoc ipso argumento libellos hodie in vulgus produci: sed, quod Plinius, et Adrianus de Homero fatebantur, idem censeo de multorum editionibus; Icones ad historiarum descriptiones penicillo informatas, non de pro[s]typis ecotypa reddita.’
28 Sambucus, preface to the Icones: ‘[...] ista, amicorum fide, ac testimonio, de statuis, signis, tabellis, partim nummis, haud recentis memoriae, atque vetustissimorum codicum vestibulis comportarim; superstites ad cuiusque aetatem simulandos curaverim.’
29 Except for the illustration of Hygiaea, which gives a full image, all portraits are half-length, about a third of them being represented in profile (which in some cases points to
coins and medals as sources), one frontally and the rest in three quarters view.

30 Except for the opening print of Hygiaea.

31 The design of the border is part of the portrait; only in the case of the four blank ones, existing frames are used. The borders of Cordus’ portrait is used for Curtius, Theophrastus’ for Montagnana, Givio’s for Goropius Becanus and Plato’s for Argenterius.

32 Visser, Joannes Sambucus, chs. 1 and 2.

33 Hessels, no. 44: ‘De Theatro, non vulgari, ut tu extumes munere, itemque deorum imaginibus te vehementer amo, habeoque gratiam, dum beneficio maiori redimam’ and ‘Tibi vero nunc levidense δωρηµάτιον istum anulum mitto: auro non copiosum, lapillo non vulgari, et ad studia, cogitationumque occupationibus usitato [...].’


35 The Emblemata contained numerous dedications, which can be seen as small presents; Sambucus also sent a copy to Paulus Manutius in Venice (Gerstinger and Vantuch [eds.], Die Briefe des Johannes Sambucus, 123–125); a copy of the Arcus for instance is sent to Pietro Vettori in Florence (ibid., 133–134), who subsequently presented the copy to his patron Cosimo I de Medici, cf. Emerico Várady, ‘Relazioni di Giovanni Zsâmboky (Sambucus) coll’Umanesimo Italiano’, Corvina. Rivista di scienze lettere ed arti della Società Ungheresi-Italiana Mattia Corvino, 15 (1935), 38–39.

36 Letter to Theodor Zwinger, d.d. 6 June 1571 (Gerstinger and Vantuch [eds.], Die Briefe des Johannes Sambucus, no. xliv); for the scholarly emulation of Mattioli see also letter to Pietro Vettori, d.d. 13 September 1570 (ibid., no. xl, p. 112).


Appendix: List of portraits

Names marked with an asterisk refer to portraits based on the Dioscorides Codex Vindobonensis.

Aegina, Paul of (c. 625-c. 690) [23]
Aesculapius [4]
Agricola, Georgius (1494–1555) [38]
Alexandrinus von Neustein, Julius (1506–1590) [43]
Altomare, Donato Antonio (c. 1506–1562) [46]
Andernach, see Guinter, Johann [34]
Apollo [2]
Apollonius* [25]
Areteaus of Cappadocia (fl. 2nd c.) [11]
Argenterio, Giovanni (1513-1572) [49]
Aristoteles (384-322 BC) [13]
Biesius, Nicolaus (1515-1573) [45]
Bock, Hieronymus (1498-1554)
Brassavolus, Antonius Musa (35)
Cardano, Girolamo (1501-1576) [53]
Celsus, Aulus Cornelius (25 BC-50) [18]
Chiron* [3]
Cordus, Valerius (1515-1544) [51]
Cornarius, Janus (1500-1558) [39]
Corti, Matteo (1474/5-1544) [60]
Crassus, Junius Paulus [56]
Cratevas* (1st c. BC) [16]
Crato von Krathheim, Joannes (1519-1585) [44]
Crescenzi, Pier de’ (1233-1320) [65]
Cuspinianus, Joannes (1473-1529) [50]
Dioscorides, Pedianus* (1st c.) [20]
Fernel, Jean François (1497-1538) [29]
Ficino, Marsilio (1433-1499) [66]
Fuchs, Leonhard (1501-1566) [37]
Galen* (129?-199/216) [19]
Gesner, Conrad (1516-1565) [33]
Giovio, Paolo (1483-1552) [36]
Goropius Becanus, Joannes (1518-1572) [52]
Guinter, Johann, of Andernach (1487-1574)
Heraclius of Tarent* (c. 100-c. 70 BC) [26]
Hippocrates (c. 460-c. 377 BC) [9]
Homerus (8th c. BC) [6]
Hygiaea [1]
Junius, Hadrianus (1511-1575) [48]
Lazius, Wolfgang (1514-1565) [59]
Machaon* [5]
Massa, Nicolo (1489-1569) [47]
Martioli, Pier Andrea (1501-1578) [40]
Montagnana, Bartolomeo (†1460) [57]
Monte, Joannes Baptist da (1498-1551) [28]
Nicander of Colophon* (fl. 130 BC) [15]
Niger, Sextius* (fl. 50) [17]
Pamphilus from Alexandria* (2nd half 1st c.) [27]
Paracelsus (1493-1541) [62]
Plato (c. 429-347 BC) [12]
Plinius Secundus, Gaius (23/4-79) [22]
Pythagoras (fl. c. 520 BC) [7]
Rondelet, Guillaume (1507-1566) [42]
Rufus of Ephesos* (fl. 100) [24]
Salvianus, Hypolitus (1514-1572) [41]
Sambucus, Joannes (1531-1584) [67]
Savanorola, Michele (1385-1466) [58]
Scaliger, Julius Caesar (1484-1558) [54]
Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (c. 41 BC-65) [63]
Socrates (470-399 BC) [10]
Strabo (64 BC-after 21) [64]
Sylvius, Joannes (1478-1555) [31]
Thales (fl. 585 BC) [8]
Theophrastus (c. 371-c. 287) [14]
Tragus: see Bock [61]
Trincavelli, Vettore (1496-1568) [30]
Vesalius, Andreas (1514-1564) [32]
Vettori Faventino, Benedetto (fl. 1512?) [55]
Xenocrates* (1st c. BC) [21]