

On the translation/paraphrase/guesswork

The English version of this text is not really a translation. There are several reasons for this: for one, the manuscript is bound in such a way, that characters close to the spine are not always legible—at least not in the digitized version—which in some instances has made the interpretation uncertain. Furthermore, the writer clearly has made mistakes in several cases; at times, words or entire lines seem to have been omitted; in other places, certain letter combinations have definitely been misread in the sources; at times the writer apparently has forgotten which symbol he uses for which letter. In at least one case (95r—95v) the text also refers to illustrations which are not included in the manuscript. The orthography is sometimes bizarre, often just medieval. As regards my own shortcomings, I have not been able to identify all of the [al]chemical symbols that are used; neither am I always sure about whether a certain weight unit is intended to be 'drachm' or 'ounce'. During the work some parts of the text also turned out to be written in Italian, which I don't really understand. When browsing the “finished” text I also note that the work is quite inconsistent.

That said, I still think that the English interpretation represents the essence of the text fairly well.

Varieties of several of the described preparations etc., can be found in pharmacopoeas throughout Europe, but immediate sources of the entries have only been identified in very few cases:

28r—34v come from Marcus Graecus: *Liber ignium*;

37v—42v are found in Valerius Cordus: *Novum dispensatorium*;

One piece of advice on 43v is from Ulysses Aldrovandus: *Ornithologia*

50v—54r are largely based upon Andreas Libavius: *Alchymia*;

83r—83v is from Caesar Longinus: *Trinum magicum, sive secretorum magicorum opus*

January, 2018, Urban Örneholm