

CHARLES BURNETT

*Warburg Institute, London*

**«Magister Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis»  
and Qusṭā ibn Lūqā's *De differentia spiritus et animae*:  
a Portuguese Contribution to the Arts Curriculum?**

The only text of the *Libri naturales* studied in the European universities which was generally recognized not to be by Aristotle, was the *De differentia spiritus et animae* of Qusṭā ibn Lūqā. This was translated, according to the earliest manuscript, by «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis». This article investigates the identity of this «Iohannes», who could have been from the region of Lima (Limia) in Portugal, and considers the early history of the *De differentia* up to the time of its inclusion among the *Libri naturales*. Two of the manuscripts of the *De differentia* discussed are from the British Isles, and it would seem appropriate for a Britisher honouring a distinguished Portuguese professor, to show how these manuscripts shed light on a Portuguese scholar of an earlier century.<sup>1</sup>

The *Libri naturales* were the texts on Aristotelian natural philosophy prescribed to be read within the Arts Faculties of the European universities. The earliest collection, known to modern scholars as the *Corpus vetustius*, was put together in the first decades of the thirteenth century from translations from Greek and Arabic, and provided Ro-

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful for the help of Michael Evans, Emma Gannagé, Marilyn Nicoud, Judith Wilcox, Roger Wright, and especially Dag Nikolaus Hasse.

bert Grosseteste, Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis, Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus with their knowledge of the texts of Aristotle's natural science. Towards the end of the thirteenth century this collection was superseded by the *Corpus recentius*, in which Arabic-Latin translations of Greek works were replaced by William of Moerbeke's translations directly from the Greek. The *Libri naturales* consisted both of Aristotle's genuine works — *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De generatione et corruptione*, *Meteora*, *De anima* and the *Parva naturalia* — and works which were believed to be by Aristotle, such as the *De plantis* of Nicolaus of Damascus, the *De mineralibus*, which was three chapters from Avicenna's *Shifā'*, and the *De causis*, in reality a cento of texts from Proclus's *Elements of Theology*.<sup>2</sup> One text, however, was included, even though it was generally recognized not to be by Aristotle at all: Quṣṭā ibn Lūqā's *De differentia spiritus et animae*.<sup>3</sup>

The *De differentia* is divided into three parts, preceded by a brief prologue. The first part (lines 33-293) concerns the spirit, which is a subtle body diffused from the heart through the blood vessels (as

---

<sup>2</sup> For a convenient account of the constituents of the *Corpus vetustius* and *Corpus recentius* see B. G. DOD, «Aristoteles Latinus», in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, eds N. KRETZMANN, A. KENNY and J. PINBORG, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 45-79.

<sup>3</sup> The edition used is that of Judith C. WILCOX in *The Transmission and Influence of Quṣṭā ibn Luqā's 'On the Difference between Spirit and the Soul'*, Ph. D., City University of New York, 1985, and the references are to the line numbers of this edition. In preparing her edition Wilcox has taken into account all the MSS known to her, and so replaces the inadequate edition of C. S. BARACH (*Excerpta e libro Alfredi Anglici de motu cordis; item Costa-Ben-Lucae de differentia animae et spiritus*, Bibliotheca philosophorum mediae aetatis, 2, Innsbruck, 1878) which is based on only three MSS. She also rightly calls into question the existence of two versions along the lines proposed by the editors of *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices* (2 vols, Rome and Cambridge, 1939-55; see I, p. 197): the 'Translatio Hispalensis' and 'Recensio anonyma'. Instead, she discerns a different two versions: 'John of Seville's version' which is found in the majority of the manuscripts and shows several 'revisions' of an original translation; and 'Hermann of Carinthia's version' which is found complete in one manuscript and in three further fragments. 'Hermann of Carinthia's version' is an abbreviation, with some changes in terminology and phraseology, of 'John of Seville's version', but is unlikely to have anything to do with Hermann of Carinthia; see Appendix II.2 below, p. 266 [46].

the «vital spirit»), giving rise to the «animal spirit» in the brain which operates sensation, cogitation and understanding, and memory, and spreads to the rest of the body through the nerves. This section is largely medical in sources and content. The second part (lines 294-519) concerns the soul and is structured round the definitions of Plato and Aristotle respectively (This is discussed in detail below). The third part (lines 520-75) summarises the differences between the spirit and the soul.

That the *De differentia* was regarded as integral to the *Libri naturales* is indicated by the fact that Adam of Buckfield in Oxford in the 1240s comments on it along with almost all the other texts of the *Corpus vetustius*,<sup>4</sup> and that the statutes of the Arts Faculty of the University of Paris in 1255 prescribe its study alongside the other *Libri naturales*.<sup>5</sup> Moreover the overwhelming majority of manuscripts that contain the work are manuscripts of the *Corpus vetustius* or *recentius*. Over 150 such manuscripts are listed in *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices* and in Wilcox's edition.

That the work was recognized not to be by Aristotle is clear from the citations of Qusṭā's name by Alfred of Shareshill and Albertus Magnus.<sup>6</sup> Qusṭā's authorship is indicated by the rubrics that appear

<sup>4</sup> C. H. LOHR, «Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors A-F», *Traditio*, 23 (1967) pp. 313-414; see p. 323, no. 22, where six manuscripts of Adam's commentary are listed.

<sup>5</sup> H. DENIFLE, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 vols, Paris, 1891-9, I, p. 278 (no. 246): «librum de differentia spiritus et anime in duabus septimanis».

<sup>6</sup> Albertus Magnus, *De anima*, I.2,13, ed. C. STROICK, Münster, 1968, p. 52.46 ('Constabenuce'); Alfred of Shareshill (Sareshel), *De motu cordis*, c. 10, ed. C. BAEUMKER, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 23.1-2, Münster, 1923, p. 40: «Costa quoque (v. l. Constantinusque) Leuce filius in libro quem de differentia animae et spiritus edidit duos tantum esse ostendit, vitalem scilicet et animale, et a vitali animale originem sumere docet.» Note that in the *Corpus vetustius* and *recentius* no attribution is given, but that the work was recognized not to be by Aristotle is indicated by a gloss in certain manuscripts of the *Corpus* which reads: «Aristotiles in libro de sompno et vita in fine primi docet quod .iii. talami sunt in corde. Similiter in fine primi de animalibus dicit quod .iii. sunt ventriculi in corde, et ita autor iste [i.e., the author of *De differentia*] contrariatur Aristotili, quam contrarietatem inter medicos et Aristotilem recitat Aluredus in libro de motu cordis et determinat docens quomodo sunt .iii. secundum Aristotilem et quomodo sunt .ii. se-



in many of the manuscripts.<sup>7</sup> One family of manuscripts has the following heading:

Incipit liber differentie inter animam et spiritum quem Consta-  
ben Luce cuidam amico suo scriptori cuiusdam regis edidit et  
Iohannes Hispalensis ex Arabico in Latinum Raimundo Toletano  
archiepiscopo transtulit.<sup>8</sup>

This attribution tells us that the *De differentia spiritus et animae* was translated by «John of Seville» for «Raimundus» who must be Raymond de La Sauvetat, archbishop of Toledo from 1125 to 1152. In the earliest manuscript of the text, however — a manuscript which probably provides an unrevised version of the translation — the translator's name is given in a fuller form, in the colophon to the text:

Perfectus est liber Costaben Luce in spiritus et anime differentia  
interpretatus a Iohanne Hispalensi et Limiensi. Sit laus Deo per  
infinita secula. AMEN.<sup>9</sup>

The manuscript with this colophon is Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates 18.6.11, which belonged to a doctor called «magister Herbertus».<sup>10</sup> Herbertus owned several books, mostly of a medical nature, amongst which the late-eleventh-century Arabic-Latin translations of Constantine the African are prominent. He donated his books to the cathedral of Durham in the third quarter of the twelfth

---

cundum medicos qui medium talamum et sinistrum reputant pro eodem» (London, British Library, MSS Royal 12.G.II, fol. 358v, and Harley 3487, fol. 202r).

<sup>7</sup> A convenient list of the MSS and their ascriptions is given in M. ALONSO ALONSO, «Traducciones del Árabe al Latín por Juan Hispano (Ibn Dawud)», *Al-Andalus*, 17 (1952) pp.129-51 (136-9).

<sup>8</sup> The oldest representative of this family is, according to Wilcox, Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, 2772-89, of the 12th century; Wilcox uses this as her base manuscript.

<sup>9</sup> See Plate.

<sup>10</sup> M.-T. D'ALVERNY, «Conclusion», in *Pseudo-Aristotle, The Secret of Secrets: Sources and Influences*, eds W. F. RYAN and C. B. SCHMITT, London, 1983, pp. 132-40 (135-6).

century.<sup>11</sup> The *De differentia* has been added to the manuscript in a tiny hand, written with a thin pen, and apparently filling in a gap left by previous scribes.<sup>12</sup> The Edinburgh manuscript then could have been written as early as the mid-twelfth century, and may be expected to be authoritative. The epithet «Limiensis» is written clearly. Who then was this «Magister Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis»?

The same form of name (sometimes with the additional or alternate information that the work was translated «in Limia»), and a similar form of colophon are found in four other translations from Arabic:<sup>13</sup>

1) Māshā'allāh, *De rebus eclipsium* (or *In radicibus revolutionum*), which gives as the explicit in Paris, BN, 16204, p. 391b: «Et perfectus est Messehalla translatus a Iohanne Hispalensi in Limia (without diacritical points on the minims) ex Arabico in Latinum».

2) 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān al-Ṭabarī, *Liber universus*; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 194, fol. 127v: «Perfectus est liber universus Aomar Benigan Tyberiadis cum laude dei et eius auxilio quem transtulit magister Iohannes Hispalensis atque Lunensis de Arabico in Latinum».<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The list of his donations in Durham Cathedral, MS B.IV.24, fol. 2r, is published in *Catalogi veteres librorum ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelm.*, Surtees Society, 7, London, 1838, pp. 7-8. How the manuscript went from Durham to Edinburgh is unclear.

<sup>12</sup> D'ALVERNY («Conclusion», p. 135) describes the hand as having «une apparence méridionale avec des caractéristiques anglaises: œuvre d'un voyageur insulaire en séjour dans des contrées méditerranéennes?» The twelfth-century list of contents at the beginning of the manuscript does not mention the *De differentia*, and corresponds to the description in the list of Herbert's donation: «Liber febrium Ysaac qui dicitur Liber Constantini de febribus. Liber simplicis medicine». Although this should make us cautious, it should not rule out the likelihood that the *De differentia* was added before the manuscript entered the cathedral library, for other texts in the manuscript are omitted in the descriptions, and the hand of the *De differentia* is definitely of an early date.

<sup>13</sup> The following list supplements, with examples sometimes taken from different, but authoritative, manuscripts, M. ALONSO ALONSO, «Juan Sevillano: sus obras propias y sus traducciones», *Al-Andalus*, 18 (1953) pp. 17-49 and L. THORNDIKE, «John of Seville», *Speculum*, 34 (1959) pp. 20-38.

<sup>14</sup> D. PINGREE, «The 'Liber Universus' of 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān al-Ṭabarī»,

3) Thābit ibn Qurra, *De imaginibus*; Paris, BN, lat. 16204, p. 539: «Finit liber <imaginationum> Thesbith bencorath translatus a Iohanne Hispalensi atque Luniensi in Lunia (*no marks on the first four minims of each of these names*) ex Arabico in Latinum».

4) Al-Farghānī, *Rudimenta*; Erfurt, Amplonian Q. 351 (s. xii<sup>2</sup>): «perf<ectus> lib<er> Alfr<agani> in sc. ast. et rad. mot. cel. interp. a Ioh. Ispalensi Ilimia [= in Limia?] atque Limensi et expletus est die XXIII [die] V mensis lunaris anni Arabum DXXIX.XI die mensis Marcii era MCLXXIII [= March 11, 1135]» (variants: «Interpretatus in Luna a...» [Paris, BN, 7377B and Florence, Bibl. Naz. Centrale, Conv. soppr. J.II.10]; «interpretatus in Limia a...» [Paris, BN, 14704, fol. 248r]).

In all the above cases, «Limiensis» and «Limia» seem to be the correct readings, sometimes corrupted into «Lunensis/Luna», and often without marks on the minims — hence indicating hesitation on the part of the scribes. Limia is the region which straddles the present-day northernmost province of Portugal (Minho) and Spanish district of Orense (Galicia), through which the river Limia (Spanish)/Lima (Portuguese) flows. The river Lima on the Portuguese side of the border flows through the heart of the original county of «Portucale», which lay between the rivers Minho and Douro. The main town on its banks — Ponte do Lima (sometimes called «Limia» itself <sup>15</sup>) — is some thirty kilometres from Braga, the ancient ecclesiastical capital of Portugal, which in turn was only a few kilometres from the first secular capital of the kingdom of Portugal — Guimarães (capital 1128-43).

The counties of «Portucale» and Coimbra had been part of the kingdom of León, but had been given by Alfonso VI to his natural daughter, Teresa, and her husband Henri of Burgundy as their hereditary county. After Henri's death in 1112, his widow was proclaimed

---

*Journal for the History of Arabic Science*, 1 (1977) pp. 7-12. Pingree identifies and translates the work, and shows that it is not part of 'Omar' on nativities, which precedes it in many manuscripts.

<sup>15</sup> According to GRAESSE, *Orbis Latinus*, new ed. by H. and S.-C. PLECHL, Braunschweig, 1972, s.v. Pons Limicorum.

queen by the «Portuguese». <sup>16</sup> This challenge to Leonese sovereignty was carried further by Henri and Teresa's son, Afonso Henriques, who became the first «King of Portugal» in 1128. The battle for superiority between the nascent state of Portugal and León-Castile can be seen from the time when Henri and his step-brother-in-law (and cousin) Raymond of Amous attempted to divide the spoils of Toledo between them, and Maurice Bourdin, archbishop of Braga, sought to oust the archbishop of Toledo; he later arrogated the papacy to himself (as anti-Pope Gregory VIII from 1118-21). Alfonso VII, king of León and Castile («the Emperor») was fighting Afonso Henriques over control of Portugal, and, between 1139 and 1152, was promoting Raymond de La Sauvetat's claim for the primacy of the Toledan see in the face of the rival claims of Braga. <sup>17</sup> That the Lima valley was regarded as a region is clear from the frequent references to «Limia» or the «castles in Limia» in the struggles between the Emperor and Afonso Henriques. <sup>18</sup> It is in this context that the activity of «Iohannes Hispanensis et Limiensis» should be viewed.

One of the texts attributed to this John — the *De imaginibus* of Thābit ibn Qurra — is accompanied by a preface in several manuscripts. The manuscripts with the preface are all of the fourteenth century or later, and Thorndike, who printed the text from a corrupt manuscript in Milan, was sceptical about its authenticity. <sup>19</sup> The main

<sup>16</sup> *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (written 1147), I, 73, in *Chronica Hispana Saeculi XII*, eds A. FALQUE, J. GIL and A. MAYA, I, Turnhout, 1990, p. 184: «mortuo autem comite Enrico Portugalenses vocaverunt eam [Teresam] reginam».

<sup>17</sup> The information in this paragraph has been taken mainly from P. DAVID, «Annales Portugalenses Veteres», *Revista Portuguesa de História*, 3 (1945), pp. 81-128, D. W. LOMAX, *The Reconquest of Spain*, New York, 1978, and P. LINEHAN, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain*, Oxford, 1993 (especially pp. 269-70 and pp. 328-9).

<sup>18</sup> See *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, I, 73-7, pp. 184-6. On p. 186 'Ferdinandus Iohannis' is described as being 'princeps Limie'; on p. 243 he is 'dux Limie'.

<sup>19</sup> L. THORNDIKE, «Traditional Medieval Tracts Concerning Engraved Astrological Images», in *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer*, Louvain, 1947, pp. 217-74 (231-3). The manuscripts containing the preface are: Erfurt, Amplonian, Folio 380, s.xiv, fols 139v-140r; *ibid.*, Quarto 189, s. xiv, fols 68r *et seqq.*; Milan, Ambrosiana, A 183 inf., s.xiv, fols 73v-74r; Paris, BN 7282, s.xiv (but s.xv according to Thorndike), fol. 29r (information from F. J. CARMODY, *Arabic Astronomical and Astrological Sciences in*

ground for his scepticism was that the author of the preface describes himself as seeking «Hispanae partes» for books on astronomy and talismans. This, Thorndike wrote, «hardly fits John of Seville, who was of Spain to begin with... Perhaps the preface of some other translator has become attached to John of Seville's text.» Perhaps as a consequence of this negative judgement and the corrupt nature of the text printed by Thorndike, the data to be inferred from the preface have not been considered by other scholars investigating the identity of John of Seville.

When the preface is read in a more reliable manuscript, it does have a ring of authenticity.<sup>20</sup> The zealous search for a book and its discovery in an «armarium» have parallels in the prefaces of other translators of the time.<sup>21</sup> So also does the justification of its subject-matter in the light of Christianity.<sup>22</sup> More telling is the fact that the author was aware of a partial translation of the same text by «quidam Auriocenus». This partial translation exists: it is the *Liber prestigiorum Thebidis secundum Ptholomeum et Hermetem* of Adelard of Bath, who could, indeed, be the «quidam Anglicanus» or «Angligena» implied in the corrupt form «Auriocenus», and would have completed his translation before «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis». A later forger would hardly have been aware of this other translation.<sup>23</sup>

---

*Latin Translation*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955, pp. 126-7). The *De imaginibus* is found in two versions, one derivative from the other; both versions are edited by F. J. CARMODY in *The Astronomical Works of Thabit b. Qurra*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1960; Carmody, however, does not edit the preface and provides only scant information concerning the attributions in the manuscripts.

<sup>20</sup> A new edition and translation of the preface is given in Appendix I below.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Hugo of Santalla's preface to his translation of the commentary of Ibn al-Muthannā' on the tables of al-Khwārizmī (before 1151): «huius commentii...quod super eiusdem auctoris opus edictum in Rotensi armario et inter secretiora bibliotece penetralia tua insaciabilis filosofhandi aviditas meruit repperiri»; see C. H. HASKINS, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, 2nd ed., New York, 1927, p. 73.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. the preface to the translation of the *Liber trium iudicium* edited in C. BURNETT, «A Group of Arabic-Latin translators Working in Northern Spain in the mid-Twelfth Century», *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, year 1977, pp. 62-108 (80-9).

<sup>23</sup> Richard LEMAY, «The True Place of Astrology in Medieval Science and Philosophy: Towards a Definition», in *Astrology, Science and Society*, ed. P. CURRY, Woodbridge, 1987, pp. 57-73 (70), interprets 'Auriocenus' as 'Antiochenus', but still

The fact that the preface (along with the attribution to «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis») is found in manuscripts of both versions of the text published by Carmody also argues in favour of its authenticity. It might have accompanied the text before it split into two versions. The existence of such a text is implied by a citation of the opening of the *De imaginibus* in a late twelfth-century manuscript of the revision of Adelard of Bath's tables of al-Khwārizmī by Robert of Chester. Here we read: «Nota: Dixit Ar(istoteles) in tractatu secundi libri sui, nulla radix est sapientie apud eum qui caruerit astronomia, nec lumen est geometrie cum vacua est astronomia». <sup>24</sup> It must be admitted that the Latin style of the preface to *De imaginibus* is more elegant than that of other texts of John, and that of the *De imaginibus* itself, which might argue for a revision by a Latin stylist. <sup>25</sup> However, it is not uncommon for prefaces to be in a different style from the texts they introduce.

---

believes that the reference is to Adelard, who visited Antioch. The *Liber prestigiorum* will appear in a collection of Adelard's scientific works edited by myself. It is interesting to note that already in the 1260s, Albertus Magnus was apparently not aware that Adelard's and John's translations were of the same Arabic text; for in the *Speculum astronomiae* he places Adelard's version among the illicit necromantic books, but advertises John's version as one of only two texts on talismans that are not execrable (see edition and translation of *Speculum astronomiae* in P. ZAMBELLI, *The Speculum Astronomiae and its Enigma*, Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1992, pp. 242-3 and 248-9). It is true that John omits the necromantic elements (i.e., the prayers to spirits), perhaps out of the same religious scrupulousness that is manifest in this preface.

<sup>24</sup> Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, 10016, fol. 3r. The text is a mixture of the two versions that Carmody edits (see n. 19 above), which suggests that it may predate the separation of the tradition into two versions. All the manuscripts of the *De imaginibus* are of the fourteenth century or later, except Florence, Laur. Plut. 30, cod. 29, which is described by THORNDIKE («Traditional Medieval Tracts Concerning Engraved Astrological Images», p. 235) as being of the thirteenth century, and also includes John's translation of the *Secret of Secrets*.

<sup>25</sup> The most conspicuous difference is that, in the preface to the *De imaginibus*, the verbs tend to be at the end of their clauses, whereas in the preface to the *Secret of Secrets* (edited in Appendix I below), they are where they would be in a Romance vernacular. Also, the *Secret of Secrets* preface betrays some slackness in Latin grammar in its use of the infinitive for a purpose clause ('Egressus sum diligenter querere'), of an adjective with a noun in the genitive, instead of in agreement ('a nullo

The preface ends with a clear statement that the author of the translation is «Iohannes Hispalensis atque Limiensis» and the place of composition is «in Limia». The author tells us that he had travelled into «Hispanae partes» in search of the text that he was looking for. This involved much hardship amongst people who were not of his own religion (i.e., presumably he was among Muslims), but, in the end he found what he wanted in the hands of a «magister» who possessed a library that included at least one book in Arabic. It is unclear whether the search and the «master» were both within Muslim regions, and whether «Hispanae partes» is the place of both events. But, in a way, this is irrelevant, for «Hispania» in the early twelfth century meant as much the areas under Muslim domination as those in the hands of the Christians. It is possible that «Hispanae partes» could mean the border regions, which would apply to Portugal inasmuch as the country south of Coimbra was still in Muslim hands (Lisbon was not recaptured until 1147). But the implication of the words, if we take the preface as authentic, is that John came from outside the Iberian peninsula, as did counts Henri of Burgundy and Raymond of Amous, archbishops Maurice Bourdin and Raymond de La Sauvetat and many of their retinue. Seville could even have been the Muslim area in which John stayed, and his sojourn there could have been the reason why he became known as «of Seville». <sup>26</sup>

---

interpretum'), and of 'in+abl.' where 'in+acc.' would be expected ('locum...in quo introivi').

<sup>26</sup> Compare Daniel of Morley's reference to the translator Gerard of Cremona as 'Girardus Tholetanus' in his *Philosophia* (1175x87), *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch*, 14 (1979), p. 244. Richard Lemay's proposal — that 'John of Seville and Limia' may have been related to Sisnando Davidiz who had been captured from Christian territory as a boy, became vizier of Muslim Seville, escaped to the north to help Fernando, king of León, capture Coimbra, and was made count of Coimbra — a position he held from 1063 until his death in 1091 — is based on the contention that 'John of Seville' is 'John David' (the distinguished mathematician who received dedications from Plato of Tivoli and Rudolph of Bruges), and 'Avendauth' (= 'Davidiz' in the Romance language); R. LEMAY, «Dans l'Espagne du xii<sup>e</sup> siècle: les traductions de l'arabe au latin», *Annales. Economies. Sociétés. Civilisation*, 18 (1963), pp. 639-65 (648-50) and ID., «De la scolastique à l'histoire par le truchement de la philologie: itinéraire d'un médiéviste entre Europe et Islam», in *La diffusione delle scienze islamiche nel medio evo europeo*, Convegno internazionale promosso dall'Accademia

«Hispania» appears in another preface of «Iohannes Hispalensis». In the same Edinburgh manuscript that gives the fullest and most authentic form of the name of the translator of the *De differentia*, there is the earliest extant copy of the translation of the short version of Pseudo-Aristotle's *Secret of Secrets*. This text and the *De differentia* (and no other texts) have been added in the same small hand, which fills in gaps in the manuscript.<sup>27</sup> The translation of the *Secret of Secrets* is here attributed to «Iohannes Yspalensis». It might be worrying that the addition «et Limiensis» (or «in Limia») is missing,<sup>28</sup> but, on the other hand, the full version of the name tends to occur only in colophons, and the colophon to the *Secret of Secrets* is absent.<sup>29</sup> What is more significant is the title John gives to his dedicatee:

Domine T. gratia dei Hispaniarum regine, Ioh(anne)s Yspalensi(s)  
sal(utem)

This «T» appears in other manuscripts as «Tarasia»,<sup>30</sup> and scholars have had little hesitation in identifying her with Teresa, who, as we have seen, was proclaimed «queen» by the Portuguese after the

---

nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, 1987, pp. 399-535 (410-8). As Lemay himself points out, Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny had shown that the names 'Johannes' and 'Avendauth' are never brought together in the manuscripts (M.-T. D'ALVERNY, «Avendauth?» in *Homenaje a Millás-Valllicrosa*, I, Barcelona, 1954, pp. 19-43). Whether 'John David', sometimes called 'of Toledo' is 'John of Seville (and Limia)' remains unproven.

<sup>27</sup> See p. 226 [6] above.

<sup>28</sup> D'ALVERNY («Conclusion», p. 135) is wrong in implying that the epithet 'Limiensis' is found in the *Secretum secretorum* text also. See Plate.

<sup>29</sup> One might add that if, as I suspect, the scribe copied the *Secret of Secrets* and the *De differentia* from the same source, he (or his source) might have felt it unnecessary to repeat the full name of the translator. The variation 'Hispalensis' / 'Yspalensis' need cause no anxiety, especially since the scribe shows traits of an (Iberian?) uncertainty of whether to include 'h's or not: see Appendix below for examples in the preface to the *Secret of Secrets*, and the spellings 'onoret' and 'ypocrat' in the opening of the text of *De differentia*.

<sup>30</sup> S. J. WILLIAMS, *The Scholarly Career of the Pseudo-Aristotelian Secretum secretorum in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Century*, Ph. D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1991, pp. 12-13 and 183. The earliest reference to 'Tharesia' being the dedicatee is in Thomas of Cantimpré, *De natura rerum* (ca. 1230), ed. H. BOESE, Berlin, 1973, p. 79 with n. 24.

death of her husband. For there was no other «Spanish» queen with this name (or even with the initial «T») during this period. But, to address someone as the «queen of the Spains» is still contentious at this time, when the royal families of León-Castile and Aragon-Navarre were also seeking supremacy in the Iberian peninsula.<sup>31</sup> It suggests that the dedicatee is pandering to the pretensions to power of the former countess Teresa, at the very time when the archbishop of Braga was proclaiming himself pope. We learn from the preface to the *Secret of Secrets*, in the Edinburgh manuscript, that John and Queen Teresa had been talking about «utilitas corporis»,<sup>32</sup> but that he was not a doctor himself. He describes his method of translation, in which he errs on the side of literalness, because he is not sure of his competence in the subject-matter.

Another medical fragment may be attributable to this «John». For, in a Vienna manuscript of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, a cure for the disease of the kidneys is said to have been sent from John of Seville to «Pope Gregory». This could be Maurice Bourdin himself, who, as we have seen, set himself up as pope Gregory VIII. The recipe is astrological, suggesting either (a) the carving of the figure of a lion on a sigil of pure gold when the Sun is in Leo and the other planets are in specified places, and binding that sigil to the loins opposite the kidneys, or (b) stamping the image in frankincense and giving it to the patient to drink. This recipe would appear to be taken from the text on talismans attributed to Hermes, which it is very likely that John would have been interested in.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> From the account in the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (n. 16 above) it is quite possible that the Portuguese too were calling Teresa 'queen of the Spains'. For the expression 'of the Spains' (which is often interchangeable with 'of Spain' and 'of the Spanish'), see J. A. MARAVALL, *El concepto de España en la Edad Media*, 2nd ed., Madrid, 1964, pp. 63-5 and 411.

<sup>32</sup> THORNDIKE, «John of Seville», p. 25, interprets this as 'human physiology'. The preface is edited and translated in Appendix I.

<sup>33</sup> The recipe is found in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 5311, fol. 41vb: 'Mirabilis cura contra malum calculi vel lapidis vel contra malum yliorum Hermetis, quam misit magister Johannes Ispalensis Gregorio Pape patienti id malum'. Thorndike's suggestion ('John of Seville', p. 27) that the anti-pope Gregory VIII is the recipient is turned into a certainty by LEMAY («Dans l'Espagne du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle:

One more piece of evidence must be considered in reconstructing what is known about «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis». This is to be found in one early manuscript of the *De differentia* which has not been taken into account by anyone who has written on the text of the *De differentia*, and is not included either in *Aristoteles Latinus*, or in Wilcox's list of manuscripts. The manuscript is Medieval MS no. 1 of the GPA Bolton Library of Cashel, Tipperary. It consists of several booklets, probably put together in the abbey of Tewkesbury (near Gloucester) in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.<sup>34</sup> The *De differentia* shares a booklet with a text on Arabic arithmetic by a pupil of Adelard of Bath called Ocreatus, and a fragment of a commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Since the *Helcep sarracenicum* of Ocreatus occurs in only one other, inferior, manuscript and the commentary appears to be unique, there is reason to believe that these copies of the two texts are close in date to their composition.

The text in the Cashel manuscript is almost exactly that of the twelfth-century Brussels manuscript that Wilcox chose as her base manuscript. It omits the same passages in the prologue and includes the full account of the history of the work in its rubric. But here it differs in one important respect from the Brussels manuscript. It reads:

Incipit liber differentie inter animam et spiritum. Constabe Luce cuidam amico suo scriptori cuiusdam regis eddit (*sic*) et Ioh(anne)s ispolñsis (*sic*) episcopus ex Arabico in Latinum Raimundo Tolentino archiepiscopo transtulit.<sup>35</sup>

---

les traductions de l'arabe au latin», p. 652). The 'lion sigil' was well-known in the Middle Ages; it was referred to by Pietro d'Abano and Arnold of Villanova, and appears (a) in the text of Hermes's *De imaginibus* incorporated into the Latin translation of the magical handbook *Picatrix* (ed. D. PINGREE, London, 1986, p. 82), and (b) in the *Liber imaginum signorum Hermetis cum additionibus magistri Arnaldi de Villanova*, in MS Vatican, lat. 4082, fols 213v-214r; see D. PINGREE, «The Diffusion of Arabic Magical Texts in Western Europe», in *La diffusione delle scienze islamiche nel medio evo europeo*, Convegno internazionale promosso dall'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, 1987, pp. 57-102 (91).

<sup>34</sup> This provenance is indicated by the calendar in one of the booklets, which shows the closest parallels to that of Tewkesbury Abbey (OSB). I owe this information to Professor Nigel Morgan.

<sup>35</sup> See Plate.

No other manuscript of the *De differentia* (on the evidence of *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices* and Wilcox's dissertation) mentions that this John was a bishop. There are, however, at least two manuscripts of 'Umar's *Liber universus* attributed to «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis» which *do* call him a bishop:

1) British Library, Harley 3731, fol. 81v: «perfectus est universus liber hacmar beniganu (?) tiberiadis cum laude Dei et eius auxilio quem transtulit magister Iohannes Hispalensis et Lunensis *epc* (= episcopus) ex Arabico in Latinum».

2) Erfurt, Amplonian, Q. 365, fol. 119: «quem transtulit magister Iohannes Hyspalensis atque Lunensis episcopus ex Arabico in Latinum». <sup>36</sup>

That two completely different works should designate John as a bishop means that we have to take the epithet seriously. Is it possible that «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis» was a bishop? Approaching this question from a completely different (i.e., Arabic) direction, and without the knowledge of the Latin manuscripts, P. Sj. Van Koningsveld made exactly the same suggestion. For he noticed that «the only report on commenting activities in Arabic concerning Latin texts» occurred in the *History of Spain* of Rodrigo Jiménez who described a certain Mozarabic bishop of Seville in the following terms:

Et in isto medio fuit apud Hispalim gloriosus et sanctissimus Ioannes Episcopus, qui ab Arabibus Caeit almatran vocabatur, et magna scientia in lingua Arabica claruit, multis miraculorum operationibus gloriosus effulsit, qui etiam sacras scripturas catholicis expositionibus declaravit, quas in formationem posterorum Arabice conscriptas reliquit. <sup>37</sup>

«Between [those two dates] there was in Seville the glorious and most saintly bishop John, who was called *Sayyid al-maṭrān* [the Ara-

<sup>36</sup> ALONSO, «Juan Sevillano», pp. 41-2. This must be the manuscript referred to erroneously as 'of Omar on nativities' that Thorndike mentions as adding 'episcopos' to 'Iohannes Hyspalensis atque Lunensis': see 'John of Seville', p. 23 and n. 14 above.

<sup>37</sup> P. Sj. VAN KONINGSVELD, *The Latin-Arabic Glossary of the Leiden University Library*, Leiden, 1977, pp. 51-2.

bic honorific title for «Metropolitan»] and was well-known for his great knowledge in the Arabic tongue; he shone out, glorious for working many miracles. He also explained the sacred scriptures with orthodox commentaries, which he left written in Arabic for the education of posterity».

Van Koningsveld identified this bishop with the archbishop of Seville at the time of the submission of the city to the Almohads, in 1148, who fled to Talavera and died there.<sup>38</sup> He would be one of the bishops that Ibn 'Abdun in his description of Seville in the early twelfth century complained about (in our only Arabic reference to Christian translations in Spain), when he warned Muslims that they «should not sell to the Jews or Christians books concerning science...[because] they translate them and attribute them to their co-religionists and their bishops».<sup>39</sup> It is difficult, however, to equate the «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis» who may have come to «Hispanae partes» from elsewhere with a Mozarabic bishop who presumably was born and brought up in an area of Muslim domination. The epithet «episcopus» (if it represents a function and not a surname<sup>40</sup>) remains a mystery.

«Magister Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis» therefore emerges as a translator to whom at least five medical and astrological works are attributed. To confirm that the same author was responsible for all these translations would need further investigation of the texts

---

<sup>38</sup> Richard Lemay did not consider this possibility, but suggested rather that the translator John of Seville began to call himself 'John David' (or 'Avendauth') after the bishop had fled to Christian Spain, in order to distinguish himself from the bishop 'John of Seville'; see his «Dans l'Espagne du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle: les traductions de l'arabe au latin», p. 660, n. 1. The suggestion that John of Seville was the bishop of Segovia (1149-52) who succeeded Raymond as archbishop of Toledo, and held the see from 1152 to 1166, proposed by ALONSO («Notas sobre los traductores toledanos Domingo Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano», *Al-Andalus*, 8, 1943, pp. 155-88 [174-7]) and aired again by Lemay (*ibid.*), must now be viewed in the light of our knowledge that archbishop John, like his two predecessors in Toledo, was a Frenchman — Jean de Castelmoron-sur-Lot.

<sup>39</sup> E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL, *Séville musulmane au début du xii<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1947, section 206 (p. 128).

<sup>40</sup> A 'Richard Bishop' was a teacher of John of Salisbury (see p. 250 [30] below).

themselves, which in turn would require producing reliable editions of the Latin texts and their Arabic originals (where they exist) and the compilation of Arabic-Latin glosses.<sup>41</sup> A few provisional observations, however, may be made. In the preface to the *Secret of Secrets*, John states that he was discussing «utilitas corporis» with the Queen of the Spains. The exact meaning of this phrase is unclear, but it is striking that amongst the sources listed at the beginning of the *De differentia*, Galen's book *De usu partium* is referred to as «in utilitate membrorum». <sup>42</sup> Thus we see the use of the same term — «utilitas» — and the possible knowledge of the same text, on the part of the translators of both the *De differentia* and the *Secret of Secrets*. One can add that the *Secret of Secrets*, like the *De differentia* often

---

<sup>41</sup> Of all the texts concerned only the *De differentia* has received an edition that reaches a sufficient standard (that of Wilcox). Wilcox has compared the text with the Arabic MS Gotha 1158 as edited by G. GABRIELI — «La risālah di Qusṭā b. Lūqā, 'sulla differenza tra lo spirito e l'anima'», *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. 5, 19 (1910), pp. 622-55; another manuscript, from the Khālīdī Library in Jerusalem, was edited by L. CHEIKHO in *Al-Machriq*, 14 (1911), pp. 94-109; a third, Istanbul, Ahmed III, 3447 by H. Z. ÜLKEN, *Ibn Sina Risaleleri*, 2, Istanbul, 1953, pp. 84-100. All these editions were to be replaced by a new edition from all the manuscripts by André d'Alverny, which was left unfinished at his death: see M. T. D'ALVERNY, «Les traductions d'Aristote et ses commentateurs», *Revue de synthèse*, 3rd series, 49-52 (1968), pp. 125-44 (142), where two readings from this edition are given: 'ṣiyāgha' ('jewelry') for 'ṣinā'a' ('skill', line 380) and the root 'b.d.n.' for 'Phaedo' (line 9). The editions of Thābit's *De inaginibus* (n. 19 above) and al-Farghānī's *Rudimenta (De scientia astrorum)*, Berkeley, California, 1943) by F. J. CARMODY need revising. The editions of the short version of the *Secret of Secrets* by SUCHIER (in *Denkmäler Provenzialischer Literatur und Sprache*, Halle, 1883) and J. BRINKMANN (*Die apocryphen Gesundheitsregeln des Aristoteles für Alexander den Grossen in der Uebersetzung des Johann von Toledo*, Leipzig, 1914) need replacing, and A. R. BADAWI's edition of the Arabic text in *Fontes graecae doctrinarum politicarum Islamicarum*, Islamica 15, Cairo, 1954, needs supplementing in the light of the considerable amount of new information we now have concerning the short and long versions in Arabic (see the studies in *Pseudo-Aristotle, The Secret of Secrets, Sources and Influences*, eds W. F. RYAN and C. B. SCHMITT, London, 1982). The works of Māshā'allāh and 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān al-Ṭabarī have not been edited in modern editions.

<sup>42</sup> The early translation from the Arabic was called *De iuvamentis membrorum*.

accompanied Aristotle's *Libri naturales*, and received a scholastic commentary from Roger Bacon.<sup>43</sup>

Then, there are the seeming additions from Aristotle's *De anima* in both the *De differentia* and Thābit's *De imaginibus*. Wilcox points out that the second of the two definitions of the soul attributed to Aristotle in the Latin text of the *De differentia* is omitted in Gabrieli's Arabic text. This is the one introduced by «In libro autem Aristotelis quem fecit de anima, talis est diffinitio», and Wilcox claims that since this definition is followed by the words «Redeamus ad opus» and, indeed, by a return to the Arabic text, the definition must be an addition by the translator.<sup>44</sup> In fact, the situation is not as clear-cut as this, since the first definition in the Latin text, which is the same as the single definition given at the beginning of the second part of the *De differentia*, does not correspond to any definition in the three Arabic editions, nor to Aristotle (the discordant words are «agentis et» in place of «naturalis instrumentalis»<sup>45</sup>). The second definition in the Latin text, however, combines two definitions of Aristotle, which are kept separate in all three editions of the Arabic text of the *De differentia*. The Latin text reads: «anima est perfectio corporis naturalis instrumentalis viventis potentialiter» («the soul is the perfection of a natural body which has organs and has life potentially»). Aristotle had written in his *De anima*, that «the soul is the first perfection («entelekheia») of a natural body which has life potentially» (412a27-8) and that «if one has to give a definition which applies to all souls universally, it would be the first perfection of a natural body which has organs» (412b5-6). These words of Aristotle are accurately reproduced at the beginning of the second part of the Arabic text of the *De differentia*, where we read: «Aristotle defines the soul as the

<sup>43</sup> See WILLIAMS, «The Scholarly Career», pp. 146-52, giving a list of 'Manuscripts [of John of Seville's version] of Scholarly Provenance'.

<sup>44</sup> WILCOX, *The Transmission*, p. 236, note 23, referring to lines 404-9. The text is reproduced below in Appendix II.

<sup>45</sup> It is difficult to see whether 'agentis' is an alternative translation for 'ḥayy' (living) — hence giving the doublet 'agentis et viventis' and explaining the presence of 'et' — or meant to be an equivalent for 'ṭabī'ī' ('natural') or 'ʿālī' ('having organs'). The first explanation is more likely, given John's propensity for using doublets (see Appendix II below).

«first<sup>46</sup> perfection of the natural body possessing organs» or, in another definition different from the first, he writes 'the definition of the soul is that it is has life potentially'». That this is Qusṭā's original text, and that John's version represents a distortion of it, is indicated by the fact that, at the very end of the discussion of Aristotle's definition of the soul Qusṭā claims that «having organs» and «having life potentially» are synonymous<sup>47</sup> and that the two definitions are in fact one. John's text repeats this statement (lines 476-80 and 486-7) which no longer makes sense since in *his* two definitions the differentiating feature is not between «instrumentalis» («having organs») and «viventis potentialiter» («having life potentially»), but rather between «agentis» and «naturalis instrumentalis». <sup>48</sup> John's combination of the two definitions is not, then, in the Arabic manuscripts of the *De differentia* that have been edited, and could (as the words «redeamus ad opus» suggest), be his addition. But he did not take the combined definition directly from the *De anima*, but could rather have been following both Arabic and Latin authors who had already combined the two definitions in exactly the same way as John does. <sup>49</sup>

The addition of a reference to the *De anima* (even though it is inaccurate) occurs also, in a similar way, at the beginning of the *De imaginibus*. We have the beginning of one version of the Arabic text in the *Picatrix*. It reads as follows:

---

<sup>46</sup> 'First' is missing in Gabrieli's and Ülken's editions, but present in Cheikho's.

<sup>47</sup>This statement (equivalent to the Latin lines 486-7) is in Cheikho's and Ülken's editions.

<sup>48</sup>The confusion here is manifest also in the obscure wording of John's text: 'Quod autem videtur corrumpere primam particulam et in loco eius ponere 'viventis potentialiter', non multum discordat ab alia, quia interpretatio utrarumque diffinitionum est una' (lines 476-80).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Qusṭā's own translation of a Greek doxography: Aetius Arabus, *Placita philosophorum*, IV,2,6, ed. H. DAIBER, Wiesbaden, 1980, pp. 190-1: 'Aristotle believed that the soul was the first perfection of a natural body having organs and living potentially; by the word 'perfection' he means the thing which actually ('fi'lan') is'; Calcidius's rendering of Aristotle's definition is «prima perfectio corporis naturalis organici possibilitate vitam habentis»: Plato, *Timaeus*, a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus, eds P. J. JENSEN and J. H. WASZINK, London, 1962, c. 122 (p. 235.8-9).

«Thābit ibn Qurra said in the book he composed on talismans: 'The noblest part of the science of the stars is the science of talismans', and he adds: 'No body has life which lacks spirit'». <sup>50</sup>

Adelard's translation gives only: «Whoever is skilled in geometry and philosophy, but has no experience of the science of the stars, is useless. For, of all the arts, the science of the stars is most excellent in fact and most useful because of the effect of talismans». <sup>51</sup> John's translation appears to take up the first sentence in his Arabic original and amplify it by a reference, precisely, to Aristotle's *De anima*:

«Thābit said that Aristotle said that he who has read philosophy and geometry and every science, but is ignorant of the science of the stars, is unable to do anything, because the science of talismans is more worthy than geometry and higher than philosophy. 2 The Philosopher (Aristotle) said in the second treatise of his book [i.e., the *De anima*] that, just as there is no movement for a body that lacks a soul, nor life to an animate body except through food which is digested and suited to the body's nature, <sup>52</sup> so there is no light of wisdom when the science of the stars has been left out. 3 And just as the spirit cannot live except by the food which is suited to the body's nature, so there is no root of wisdom for him who lacks philosophy (*or* the science of the stars), nor is there the light of geometry when he lacks the science of the stars; and the height and summit of the science of the stars is the science of talismans.» <sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> *Picatrix*, I.v.36 (ed. PINGREE, p. 23): «...Thebit ben Corat in libro quem composuit De ymaginibus, qui sic ait: sciencia ymaginum est nobilior pars astronomie. Et subdit: corpus caret vita deficiente spiritu».

<sup>51</sup> MS Lyon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 328, fol. 70r: «Quicumque geometria atque philosophia peritus, astronomie expertus fuerit, ociosus est. Est enim astronomia omnium artium et re excellentissima et prestigiorum effectu commodissima».

<sup>52</sup> This statement has only a general equivalent in the first chapter of the second book of Aristotle's *De anima*.

<sup>53</sup> *De imaginibus*, 1-2, ed. CARMODY, p. 180: «Dixit Thebit Bencorah: Dixit Aristoteles: Qui philosophiam et geometriam omnemque scientiam legerit et ab astronomia vacuus fuerit, erit occupatus et vacuus, quia dignior geometria et altior philosophia est imaginum scientia. 2 Et iam dixit Philosophus (v.l. + Aristoteles) in secundo tractatu sui libri quia sicut non est motus corpori anima carenti nec vita animato cor-

In the *Picatrix* the meaning of «body without spirit» is explained in necromantic terms: talismans which are not fit for receiving the spirits of the planets are similar to dead bodies in which there is no «spirit». <sup>54</sup> John would seem to equate the soul of the philosophers with the «spirits» of the necromancers and alchemists. As has been suggested above, <sup>55</sup> John may have deliberately left out the necromantic elements of Thābit's treatise. If he was also adding what he thought were the words of Aristotle, <sup>56</sup> then he proves not to be as literal a scholar as «John of Seville» has always been held to be.

John's translation of the *Secret of Secrets* would presumably have been made between 1112, when Teresa took over the rulership of the county of Portugal from her deceased husband, and 1128, when she was imprisoned by her son. His translation of the *De differentia* shows a different allegiance, since it is dedicated to Raymond de La Sauvetat, archbishop of Toledo from 1125-52, and, as we shall see below, probably dates to before 1143. Three other translations were made «in Limia» including the translation of al-Farghānī's *Rudimenta*, which is precisely dated to 11 March, 1135. John had discussed the «utilitas corporis» and may have advised the anti-Pope Gregory VIII on a cure for kidney-stones, but, in the preface to the *Secret of Secrets*,

---

pori nisi per cibum quo diriguntur (v.l. digeruntur) et aptantur eius nature, ita non est lumen sapientie cum astronomia evacuata fuerit. 3 Et quemadmodum spiritus non poterit subsistere nisi per cibum quo aptantur nature corporis, ita non est radix scientie apud eum qui philosophia caruerit (v.l. apud eum qui caruerit astronomia) nec est lumen geometrie cum vacua fuerit astronomia; sublimitas autem et altitudo astronomie est imaginum scientia.» (Carmody's Version I, with variant readings from Version J).

<sup>54</sup> *Picatrix*, l.v.36 (ed. Pingree, p. 23): «Et hoc dixit (Thebit) propter ymagine que non fiunt temporibus congruis et opportunis, que non erant apte ad recipiendum spiritus planetarum et tunc erunt similes corporibus mortuis in quibus non est spiritus. Et quando fiunt congruis temporibus debitis et opportunis, recipiunt spiritus et infusiones virium planetarum et erunt similes corporibus viventibus ex quibus postea sequuntur mirabiles effectus.»

<sup>55</sup> See n. 23 above.

<sup>56</sup> The one other possible addition to Qusṭā's text made by John is the reference to Empedocles's *De anima* (see n. 68 below). Wilcox refers to several other additions vis-à-vis Gabrieli's Arabic text, but these almost invariably are present in Cheikho's and Ülken's texts.

he denies that he is a doctor. In the preface to the *De imaginibus* (if we take this to be genuine) he implies, rather, that his main interest is in the science of the stars, for which he had sought a book or books in «Hispanae partes», an area which included Muslim territory. Whether the large number of astrological texts attributed to «John of Seville» (without the further epithet «and Limia») are also translations by «Johannes Hispalensis et Limiensis» remains to be investigated.<sup>57</sup> It appears, however, that none of these other texts refer to their translator as «episcopus» or imply any connection with Portugal. Nor did «John of Seville» tackle any further texts on medical matters.

\*

As we have seen, the *De differentia* was addressed to Raymond, archbishop of Toledo. The fact that the text was in Toledo is testified by its use by an archdeacon of Segovia resident in Toledo in the time of Raymond's successor, John, archbishop from 1152 until 1166.<sup>58</sup> This archdeacon, Dominicus Gundissalinus, had collaborated with a certain «Avendauth» in translating the *De anima* portion of the *Shifā'* of Avicenna, which the two translators dedicated to archbishop John. Some time after this translation, Gundissalinus wrote an original work on the soul in which he made his starting point and main source the *De anima* of Avicenna.<sup>59</sup> However, in addition to Avicenna, he used, without acknowledgement, the *De differentia*.

---

<sup>57</sup> The starting-point of this investigation should be a thorough and scientific investigation of the language and style of the translations, preferably based on good editions furnished with Arabic-Latin glossaries. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello's detective work on the identity of the translators of Aristotle's works from Greek into Latin in the Middle Ages provides an excellent model.

<sup>58</sup> Another Toledan connection could be provided by the use of Qusṭā's work in the *Dialogus* of Petrus Alfonsi who could have been in Toledo in the second quarter of the twelfth century. That Petrus was indebted to John's translation rather than the Arabic original is argued in BURNETT, «The Works of Petrus Alfonsi: Questions of Authenticity», in *Pedro Alfonso*, ed. J.-M. LACARRA, Zaragoza, 1996.

<sup>59</sup> J. T. MUCKLE, «The Treatise *De Anima* of Dominicus Gundissalinus», *Mediaeval Studies*, 2 (1940), pp. 23-103. The parallels between Gundissalinus's text and the *De differentia* have been pointed out by Muckle and Wilcox (*op. cit.*, pp. 102-3), but are set forth in full in Appendix II below.

Gundissalinus seems only to use the second part of Qusṭā's work — that on the soul — but draws material from almost the whole of this part. It is clear that the text he knows is the more common version (called by Wilcox the «John of Seville» version), rather than the abbreviated version. However, Gundissalinus does not simply excerpt from this version; rather, he adapts the material to his other sources, and fits it into the framework of his own treatise.

The bases for the discussion of «What is the soul?» for both Qusṭā and Gundissalinus (chapter 2) are the definitions of Plato and Aristotle, each word of which is explained in turn. In the case of Plato's definition — that the soul is an incorporeal substance moving the body — Gundissalinus, following Qusṭā, first shows how the soul is a substance, in that it can receive contraries. Gundissalinus substitutes «contraria» for Qusṭā's «opposita», and adds to the moral opposites of Qusṭā (virtues and vices), aesthetic and intellectual opposites (joy and sadness, and knowledge and ignorance). Then he shows that the soul is not body, taking three out of Qusṭā's five arguments and reversing the order of the questions of whether the soul can be inanimate or animate body. The last words in the definition («moving the body») Gundissalinus has already discussed in a separate section of his previous chapter («How the soul moves the body»), using Qusṭā's arguments. In the latter section Avicenna's discussion of whether the soul moves is the starting point,<sup>60</sup> and this has led Gundissalinus to distort Qusṭā's arguments. For Qusṭā explores the different ways in which *anything* can be moved by a non-mover, as a preliminary to discovering how body can be moved by the non-moving soul; Gundissalinus makes the *soul* the subject of the different ways of moving and thus confuses the issue.

In exploring Aristotle's definition Gundissalinus omits all mentions of the troublesome first definition in the Latin text (line 310: «Anima est perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentialiter») and only gives the second definition: that soul is the perfection of the natural body which has organs and has life potentially. However, Gun-

<sup>60</sup> «Si autem anima movetur dum movet, tunc aliquo sex motuum movetur...» (ed. MUCKLE, p. 33, lines 31 *et seq.*): this passage comes from Avicenna, *De anima*, I.2.

dissalinus adds «first» to «perfection». This may be because of Qusṭā's later specification (repeated by Gundissalinus) that by «perfection» is meant «first» rather than «second» perfection, but may also reflect Calcidius's reporting of Aristotle's definition.<sup>61</sup> When it comes to explaining what kind of «natural body» is involved, Qusṭā differentiates between simple bodies and composite bodies, and defines simple bodies as one of the four elements; these are not ensouled. Gundissalinus, aware of a fifth element, perhaps through knowing the pseudo-Avicennan *De caelo et mundo*, adds to the simple bodies «another which is not an element or made from the elements, such as a celestial body», but then has to qualify this statement by saying that Plato believes that these bodies *are* ensouled. Finally, Gundissalinus tries to make sense of John's confused account of the equivalence of «having life potentially» and «possessing organs» (lines 480-7) by dropping the reference to «two definitions» and simplifying the argument.

The fact that such prominence is given to the *De differentia* in Gundissalinus's *De anima* is remarkable. For Plato and Aristotle's definitions of the soul he could have made more use of Calcidius's commentary on the *Timaeus*, or of Nemesius's *Premnon physicon*, both of which were widely read in the twelfth century.<sup>62</sup> These texts he seems to have neglected. The *De differentia* may have been chosen instead because it so clear and logical: the arguments are developed step by step and there is nothing superfluous. Moreover, Qusṭā was well served by his translator. But another reason why he turned to

---

<sup>61</sup> Plato, *Timaeus*, a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus, c. 122 (p. 235.8-9): «prima perfectio corporis naturalis organici possibilitate vitam habentis». The definition including 'first perfection' (but without 'having life potentially') is also in Avicenna, I.v, in *Avicenna Latinus. Liber de anima*, ed. S. VAN RIET, 2 vols, Louvain and Leiden, 1968-72, I, p. 80.1: «perfectio prima corporis naturalis instrumentalis». For a convenient list of definitions of the soul available in Latin in the twelfth and early thirteenth century see D. A. CALLUS, «The Treatise of John Blund On the Soul», in *Autour d'Aristote, offert à A. Mansion*, Louvain, 1955, pp. 490-1, to which may be added the definition of Isaac, *De definitionibus*, ed. J. T. MUCKLE, in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 11 (1937-8), p. 312.

<sup>62</sup> Plato, *Timaeus*, c. 126 (p. 241.8-9) and c. 122 (p. 235.8-9); Nemesius, *Premnon physicon*, ed. C. BURKHARD, Leipzig, 1917, c. 2, p. 24.

the *De differentia* may have been that the text had already been used by a scholar in Spain whose work was well-known to Gundissalinus.

This scholar is Hermann of Carinthia, who completed his cosmological masterpiece, the *De essentiis*, at Béziers in 1143. In this work, Hermann, like Gundissalinus, gives Plato and Aristotle's definitions of the soul as they were reported in the *De differentia*.<sup>63</sup> That the source was Qusṭā in John's translation is indicated not only by the nearly exact reproduction of the definitions (Hermann replaces «potentialiter» by «potentia»), but also by his indication of the source of Plato's definition: «Plato...in Cadone». Here we see the perpetuation of John's reading of «—ف» («f») as «—ق» («q») — a confusion that can arise very easily in the *maghribī* (Western) form of Arabic script. It appears, however, that Hermann added information from the *De differentia* after the first draft of the *De essentiis*, because the whole section reproduced in Appendix II below is not in the earliest version of Hermann's text.<sup>64</sup>

Hermann adapts Qusṭā's definitions to his own thought on the soul in a much more radical way than does Gundissalinus. He labels Plato's statement as a «definition», and Aristotle's as a «description», in line with his assertion earlier in the *De essentiis* that «a definition applies to species and genera; a description only to individuals».<sup>65</sup> Aristotle's statement can only be a description because its object is not a substance (and therefore cannot be a species), but rather a power («virtus») of the *anima mundi*. Plato's statement, on the other hand, is a definition, but only of the human soul which alone is a substance and incorporeal.

---

<sup>63</sup> That the definitions of the soul in the *De essentiis* come from Qusṭā's work was noted by M. ALONSO («Traducciones de Juan Hispano», p. 139) and T. SILVERSTEIN, «Hermann of Carinthia and Greek», in *Medioevo e Rinascimento: Studi in onore di Bruno Nardi*, Florence, 1955, pp. 688-92. The parallels are given in Appendix II below.

<sup>64</sup> This version is a twelfth-century fragment of the text in the private collection of Marvin COLKER who describes it in «A Newly Discovered Manuscript of Hermann of Carinthia's *De essentiis*», in *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 18 (1988), pp. 213-28.

<sup>65</sup> *De essentiis*, 62vE, ed. C. BURNETT, Leiden and Cologne, 1982, p. 108. The difference between 'definition' and 'description' is spelt out in Isaac, *De definitio-nibus*, ed. MUCKLE, p. 300 and *passim*.

There is another connection between the *De essentiis* and *De differentia* which has, up to now, not been noticed. Just before the section which draws on the *De differentia*, Hermann writes:

Nec mirum quod ipse altissimus omnium Auctor proprie dignitati conformare voluit. Unde nec ex aliena materia, nec laborante repugnantium nexu, sed quemadmodum Platoni visum est et a Pantocle presertim enodatum est, ne semel natum, umquam occidat et nisi proprio arbitrio degeneret, post hoc exercitium ad originalem dignitatem rediturum.<sup>66</sup>

This passage only makes sense if «Pantocle» is regarded as a corruption of «Empedocles», and the passage is translated:

«Nor is it surprising that the very Author of all things wished it [the soul] to conform to its proper worth. Hence it is not from alien material nor from a straining bond of warring elements, but as Plato thought and especially as was explained by Empedocles — <such that>, once born, it should never die, and unless it degenerated by its own will, after its struggle in this world, it should return to its original worth.»

This doctrine is not Qusṭā's, but must come from some work referring to Empedocles's opinions extant in Muslim Spain, such as *The Book of the Five Essences*, the *Aim of the Wiseman* (translated in the late thirteenth century as *Picatrix*), or, most likely, the *Theologia Aristotelis*.<sup>67</sup> In John's translation of the *De differentia*, however,

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 71vD, p. 174.

<sup>67</sup> The first two Empedoclean sources are discussed by A. NAGY in «Di alcuni scritti attributi ad Empedocle», *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. 5, 10, pp. 307-20 and 325-44, and M. ASÍN PALACIOS, *Ibn Masarra y su escuela*, Madrid, 1914, and summarised by WILCOX, *The Transmission*, pp. 64-76. For the *Theologia Aristotelis* — i.e., portions of Plotinus, *Enneads* IV and V in Arabic translation — see in particular I.30-34: «Empedocles says that the souls were in the high and sublime place, and when they erred they fell into this world... (31) God... call[ed] men... to go back to their own original world, the high and sublime... (34) The sublime and divine Plato has described the soul and... has mentioned in many places how the soul descends and enters this world and that she will surely return to her own world, the true, the first

«Empedocles on the soul» is added to the end of the list of authorities given by Qusṭā at the beginning of the text.<sup>68</sup> This addition could have been made either in the *maghribī* manuscript used by John, or by the translator himself. In any case, the reference to the authority of Empedocles in both the *De essentiis* and the *De differentia* is an indication of the lively interest in the Presocratic Greek philosopher in the Iberian peninsula in the twelfth century.

The name, too, in both authors, shows a similar process of distortion, especially when one looks at the earliest manuscript of the *De differentia*, that of Edinburgh. Here one finds the form «**h̄m̄edcl̄i** in anima» in the list of authorities at the beginning of the text (fol. 104v). However, at the second reference to Empedocles (fol. 106r; at the beginning of the section on the soul), the name is spelt out more fully: **h̄m̄edcl̄iz**. In this manuscript, therefore, we catch in the act, as it were, the assimilation of the letters «cl» to «d», which can happen very easily in a Latin manuscript. Almost all the other manuscripts of the *De differentia* show this second «d». <sup>69</sup> A form «Bendecliz» could be the original translator's transliteration of an Arabic form «Bāndaklis» or «Bānduklis» («e» and «o» [= Arabic «u»] easily being confused in Latin script). The usual Arabic form of the name is

---

world» (translation from the Arabic by G. Lewis in Plotinus, *Opera*, II, eds P. HENRY and H.-R. SCHWYZER, Paris and Brussels, 1959, pp. 227-9). I do not intend here to go into the thorny problem of what was genuine Empedocles and what was Pseudo-Empedocles. The whole question has been reopened in a magisterial way by Peter KINGSLEY (*Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*, Oxford, 1995), to whose advice I am indebted. Suffice to say that genuine Empedoclean theories were included in the so-called pseudo-Empedoclean works.

<sup>68</sup> See Appendix II below. Empedocles appears in none of the Arabic editions of the *De differentia* nor in the earliest manuscript of the 'vulgate' Latin text (the Brussels MS used by Wilcox as her base manuscript).

<sup>69</sup> NAGY, «Di alcuni scritti», p. 315, gives the variants 'benededinis, bendedis, bendedes, bendedis, bendedis, bendediis, b̄n̄didis, b'nedediz, b̄n̄ dicendis' and 'bideudis'; and only 'bendeclarum' and 'bendeclinis' with the 'cl'. Wilcox chose the reading 'benededis' (*The Transmission*, pp. 143 and 167). *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices*, I, p. 197 gives 'audidis' (Vat. Urb. Lat. 206, fol. 335r) and 'anbemdeclus' (Paris, BN, lat. 6325, fols. 167v). Wilcox's alleged 'Hermann of Carinthia' version omits all mention of Empedocles, perhaps because the name was unintelligible (hence, too, this version substitutes or omits most Arabic terms).

«Anbāduklis», but, since the ductus of the «n» and «b» is exactly the same in Arabic and alephs tend to be dropped or put in the wrong places, a misreading or miscopying as «Bänduklis» is not unlikely. Hermann's «Pantocle» implies a nominative «Pantocles» which shows the same transposition of «n» and «b/p», and the same ending as the form in the *De differentia*. As for the change of voiced consonants into unvoiced, this might have been influenced by Hermann's attempt to restore a Greek root in an Arabic word which he knows has an ultimately Greek origin, as he commonly does.<sup>70</sup> There is no «p» in Arabic, and Hermann may have guessed (wrongly, as it turns out) that the root «pan/pant-» (= «all») lay behind the proper name he saw before him. On the other hand, another text probably translated from Arabic in Hermann's time, also gives a «pan» as the first syllable of Empedocles' name, though its final syllable is different.<sup>71</sup>

The use of the *De differentia* by Hermann of Carinthia proves that it was already translated by 1143 (assuming always that this is the date of the revised version of the *De essentiis*). How had Hermann acquired a copy? We know his movements only between 1138 and 1143. He is not known to have visited Toledo, but he was working somewhere in the valley of the Ebro with his colleague Robert of Ketton, when Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, met them and persuaded them to translate some texts on the Muslim religion, including the Qur'ān. One of these texts Hermann translated at León. He was not, therefore, far from the Limia region.

Hermann could, too, have been the conduit through which the *De differentia* reached the archdeacon of Segovia. For Gundissalinus is the only person known to have made use of Hermann's *De essentiis*, and he might therefore have had a privileged access to Hermann's books. It is clear that neither Hermann nor Gundissalinus took the quotations from the *De differentia* from each other's works; they quote

<sup>70</sup>Examples are 'telematici' from Arabic [aṣḥāb] al-ṭilasmāt ('masters of talismans'; originally τελεσματικοί), and 'genezia' replacing Arabic 'mawālīd' ([astrological] nativities'; γενέθλια).

<sup>71</sup>This is the *Turba philosophorum* (the relevant section does not survive in Arabic) which includes 'Pandolfus' among its philosophers. This is clearly Empedocles, but doctrines on the soul are not included in the extant Arabic or Latin portions of this text; see KINGSLEY, *Ancient Philosophy*, chapter 5.

different phrases. However, as far as can be discerned, the text they used was the same,<sup>72</sup> and both used it without citing the Arabic author or the translator.

Hermann's «magister» was Thierry of Chartes who is well-known for having brought together the most comprehensive collection of texts on the Liberal Arts of his time in his *Heptateuchon*, probably compiled in the 1130s in Paris. Hermann of Carinthia dedicated one of his translations from Arabic (that of Ptolemy's *Planisphere*) to Thierry, and recommended other Arabic-Latin translations in his preface.<sup>73</sup> The *Heptateuchon* included two of the new translations — a version of Euclid's *Elements* possibly by Robert of Ketton,<sup>74</sup> and the astrological tables of al-Khwārizmī in a revision probably made by Hermann himself. Moreover, the *Heptateuchon* is the earliest manuscript to include a text of the «new Aristotle»: Boethius's translation of Aristotle's *Topics*.

The debate continues as to how, when and by whom the «new Aristotle» was introduced into Europe. Several of Aristotle's logical texts (the *Logica nova*) and *Libri naturales* had been translated in the second quarter of the twelfth century by James of Venice (*Posterior Analytics*, *Physics*, *De anima*, *De memoria*, *De intelligentia* and the *Metaphysics*) and an anonymous translator (*De generatione et corruptione* and parts of the *Nicomachean Ethics* [*Ethica vetus* and *nova*]).<sup>75</sup> The earliest direct evidence for this is an entry that Robert of Torigny, abbot of Mont Saint-Michel from 1154 until 1186, added

<sup>72</sup> One distinctive feature shared by Hermann and Gundissalinus against the common version published by Wilcox is the transposition of the words 'movens corpus' in Plato's definition.

<sup>73</sup> Hermann of Carinthia, *De essentiis*, pp. 4-10, and C. BURNETT, «Advertising the New Science of the Stars, c. 1120-50», in *Le XIIIe siècle: Mutations et renouveau en France dans la première moitié du XIIIe siècle*, ed. F. Gasparri, Paris, 1994, pp. 147-58 (150-1).

<sup>74</sup> Robert of Chester's (?) Redaction of Euclid's *Elements*, the so-called Adelard II Version, eds H. L. L. BUSARD and M. FOLKERTS, 2 vols, Basel, Boston and Berlin, 1992, I, pp. 22-31. 'Of Ketton' is the more correct designation of the 'Robert' associated with Hermann.

<sup>75</sup> L. MINIO-PALUELLO, *Opuscula: the Latin Aristotle*, Amsterdam, 1972, pp. 189-228.

to his *Chronicle* between 1157 and 1169, which mentions that James of Venice translated and «commentatus est» (i.e., perhaps «revised») several of the texts of the *Logica nova*, including the *Topica*. Moreover, in two of the manuscripts in Mont Saint-Michel are the earliest copies of the *De generatione et corruptione*, *Ethica vetus* and *nova*, *Metaphysics*, *Physics*, *De intelligentia*, *De anima*, *De longitudine et brevitate vitae* and *De memoria* (now Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale, 221 and 232). Probably in 1167 John of Salisbury asked his former teacher, Richard Bishop, for copies of Aristotle's works that he had in his possession. Richard Bishop had taught John in Paris but was archdeacon of Coutances from 1163 to 1170, and bishop of Avranches from 1170 until his death in 1181. He was a neighbour and friend of the abbot of Mont Saint-Michel; so he could have been responsible for bringing copies of the «new Aristotle» from Paris to Mont Saint-Michel.<sup>76</sup>

In one of the two Mont Saint-Michel manuscripts — Avranches, 232 — the *De differentia* is also included.<sup>77</sup> It is in the same fascicle

<sup>76</sup> The story outlined in this paragraph is told by F. Bossier and J. Brams in the introduction to their edition of the *Physica, translatio vetus* (Aristoteles Latinus, VII.1, Leiden, 1990, pp. xxi-xxiii). They base their conclusions on the research of Minio-Paluello, but end with the suggestion that Richard Bishop had passed his manuscripts to his friend Robert of Torigny. This suggestion also occurs in the thorough study of the manuscripts of Aristotle's works from Mont Saint-Michel of Coloman VIOLA, S. J.: «Aristote au Mont Saint-Michel», in *Millénaire monastique du Mont Saint-Michel, 2: Vie Montoise et rayonnement intellectuel du Mont Saint-Michel*, ed. R. Foreville, Paris, 1967, pp. 289-312; see also M.-T. D'ALVERNY, «Les nouveaux apports dans les domaines de la science et de la pensée au temps de Philippe Auguste: La philosophie», in *La France de Philippe Auguste*, Colloques CNRS, Paris, 1982, pp. 863-80 (870-3).

<sup>77</sup> For a detailed description of this MS see Yūḥannā ibn Māsawayh (Jean Mesue), *Le livre des axiomes médicaux (Aphorismi)*, eds D. JACQUART and G. TROUPEAU, Geneva, 1980, pp. 48-52. Different scholars have proposed different dates for the fascicle that includes the *De differentia* and *Ethica nova* (e.g., D'ALVERNY, «Nouveaux apports», p. 871 [fin du xii<sup>e</sup> siècle], Wilcox, p. 138 [late twelfth or early thirteenth cent.], *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices*, no. 408 [s.xiii<sup>in</sup>], Jacquart and Troupeau, p. 52 [s. xiii]). In any case, there is no other twelfth-century copy of the *Ethica nova*. René Gauthier's argument that the *Ethica nova* was translated by a different person (Michael Scot?) from the *Ethica vetus* and *De generatione et corruptione* (*Ethica*

as the *Ethica nova* and is written in the same hand. This fascicle was bound together with the *De generatione et corruptione*, *Ethica vetus*, *Physics*, *De memoria*, *De longitudine et brevitate vitae* and *Metaphysica vetustissima*, at an early date. Here we see, for the first time, the *De differentia* in the company of Aristotle's *Libri naturales*. Might this text have been recommended to Thierry of Chartres by Hermann of Carinthia, and have arrived at Mont Saint-Michel from Paris in the company of texts of the «new Aristotle»? The editors of the individual texts of *Aristoteles Latinus* have recognised that the copies of the texts of Aristotle in the two Mont Saint-Michel manuscripts are, in most cases, the earliest witnesses to the versions which became the vulgate.<sup>78</sup> It is either from them or their near relations that the manuscript tradition of Aristotle's *Libri naturales* descends. Wilcox has shown that the Mont Saint-Michel copy of the *De differentia* is a revised version in respect to the Edinburgh copy and that it too has a respectable progeny.<sup>79</sup> In the manuscripts that may be earlier than this copy, the *De differentia* accompanies medical texts (the Edinburgh manuscript), miscellaneous scientific texts (the Cashel manuscript), and theological texts (Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, 2772-89<sup>80</sup>). We may be justified then, in seeing the combination in Avranches 232 as the beginning of the association of the *De differentia* with the *Libri naturales* — an association which was to prove lasting.

---

*Nicomachea, Praefatio*, *Aristoteles Latinus*, 26.1-3, Leiden and Brussels, 1974, pp. cxxxviii-cxlvii) has been attacked by Joanna Judicka who, in her edition of *De generatione et corruptione* (*Aristoteles Latinus*, 9.1, Leiden, 1986, pp. xxxiv-xxxviii), defends Minio-Paluello's claim that one translator was responsible for all three texts. Judicka suggests that, in the case of the *De generatione et corruptione*, Avranches 232 is 'sans doute légèrement postérieur à [Oxford, Bodleian Library, Selden supra 24]'; its text is a revised version in respect to that of the Selden MS, in much the same way as the text of *De differentia* is revised in respect to the Edinburgh manuscript version.

<sup>78</sup> This is the case at least for the *Physics*, *Metaphysics* and the *Ethica vetus*.

<sup>79</sup> Wilcox, *The Transmission*, p. 127. For examples of the revisions see Appendix II below.

<sup>80</sup> J. VAN DE GHEYN, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique*, 2, Brussels, 1902, pp. 310-1 (with works by Fulbert of Chartres, St Jerome, Drogo, Anselm and Hugo of St. Victor; this catalogue dates the manuscript to the

## Appendix I

## The Prefaces of «Magister Iohannes Hispalensis (et Limiensis)»

In the following editions modern conventions of punctuation have been followed. However, the orthography of the texts has been retained. Square brackets indicate words in the manuscript which appear to be redundant; angle brackets indicate editorial additions.

**1. The preface to Thābit ibn Qurra, *De imaginibus*** (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7282, fol. 29r).

Cum, ceteris astronomie libris perlectis, veluti cursu<u>m planetarum aliisque que ad hanc artem pertinere videbantur, nichil horum ob quorum intentionem Hispanas petieram partes adeptus fuisset, tanto tedio per aliquot dies affectus, tabui ut, sopita desperatione quod inter huius scientie peritos iam sciolus habebam, tanti frustra laboris inchoati sollicitudinem [sollicitudinum] abiecerim. Videbam me namque in hac diutissime ante elaborasse, preterea de propriis non pauca in ea, cum nichil aliunde lucri facerem, expendisse, presertim cum gentes inter efferas constitutus, procul a fidei domesticis tocuis propter Deum, expers consilii degerem. Quid animi haberem non est meum vestram instruere prudenciam.

Hac igitur tanta me sollicitudine male pertractum, magister intuens atque quid haberem sollicite querens, audito mentis mee langore subrisisse visus est. Demum librorum suorum volumina perquirens, non magni corporis librum Arabico sermone conscriptum ex armario suo, in quo libri eius non pauci continebantur, protulit. De quo, cum que contineret attenta mente indesinenter percunctarer, se in hec verba resolvit: «Ne credideris, karissime, omnes qui in hac scientia student ad eius usque interna pertingere posse. Sunt enim nonnulli qui adeo planetarum cursus copulacionesque eorum norunt, preterea signorum demumque ferme tocuis celi machinam mente contemplantur, ut nil

---

13th century). Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 18917, listed by Wilcox as being of the 12th century (p. 310), is described as being of the 14th and 15th centuries in *Aristoteles Latinus. Codices*, no. 1071.

sibi de hac arte deesse putant, set, ut verum fatear, tanto ab ea distant intervallo quanto qui numquam ex eo gustaverit quicquam. Sapientes namque nostri eorum subtilius considerantes naturam planetarum atque significationem nunc in bono, nunc in malo esse videntes, ex sui capacitatis ingenii immensitate quedam quasi argumenta atque exemplaria excerpere eaque totius huius artis summam posuere (MS posuisse) — librum scilicet componentes quem ymaginum esse dixerunt, in quo qualiter prodesse aut etiam obesse sibi vel alii possint, sicut in sequentibus declarabitur, habetur. Unde et quidam sub religionis obtentu hanc scienciam velud ignominiosam diiudicant, non attendentes Deum hanc potius servis suis adaptationem terrarum suarum et ad vindictam malefactorum, ad laudem vero iustorum, eum in suis mirabile pre ceteris agnoscendum largitum fuisse. Sed forte michi quis ex aliis obiciat affirmans non velle Dei fore quisquis malum operatur. Ad quod ego: 'An nescis securim ad incidenda ligna factam? Numquid si quis cum ea hominem mente perversa occiderit, ob hanc causam securis usus quasi calumpniatus reprobandus sive abiciendus est? Non ita est, inquam,' sed quia adversariorum questiunculis sufficienter responsum est, de aliis agamus.»

Hunc ergo librum ab ipso, Dei iuvante spiritu, habui, quem nullus Latinorum preter quendam Auriocenum, qui quondam eius partem habuit, adeptus fuerat. Si quis ergo huic dans operam hunc scire voluerit, modo de omnibus studeat hunc librum, videlicet ymaginum, habere. Nam per eum si ibi providus fuerit, ad totius huius doctrine summam proculdubio pertinet. Adhibe ergo animum, quisquis es, atque mente sollicita revolve que in ipso legenda sunt, atque planetarum significaciones tam in bono quam in malo sollerter considera. Finit prologus.

Liber ymaginum incipit Thebit ben Cora a Johanne Hispalensi atque Limensi in Limia ex Arabico in Latinum translatus.

### *Translation:*

Having read through the other books of astronomy, e.g. of the courses of the planets and others which seemed to be relevant to this art, and when I had obtained none of the things for the sake of which I had sought *Hispanae partes*, for several days I lay wasting away and affected by such aversion that, sedating my desperation on being now thought to be halting among the

experts of this science, I threw from me the worry of such labour undertaken in vain. For I saw that I had laboured in this for too long a time, and, moreover, that I had expended not a little of my own resources in this — since I was making no profit from elsewhere — especially when, placed amongst wild races, I was living without help far from the domestic <comforts of people having> complete faith towards God. It is not necessary for me to tell you, wise as you are, what state of mind I was in.

The Master, seeing me in a bad way because of such worry and solicitously enquiring what was wrong, when he had heard about the weariness of my soul, seemed to smile. Finally, looking through the volumes of his books, he produced a small book written in Arabic from his bookcase, in which several books of his were enclosed. When I was demanding from him incessantly with an eager mind what it contained, he started to say this about the book:

«Do not believe, dearest friend, that all those who study this science can arrive at the heart (esoteric knowledge) of it. For there are some who know the courses and conjunctions of planets and also of the signs, and contemplate in their minds the machine of almost the whole sky, to such an extent that they think nothing is lacking to them of this art. But, to confess the truth, their distance from it is as great as that of him who has never tasted anything of it. For our wise men, considering the nature and significations of the planets more subtly, seeing them now to be for the good, now for evil, from the hugeness of the capacity of their intelligence have excerpted certain, as it were, proofs and examples, and have made them the sum of this whole art — composing a book which they have called ‘on talismans’. In this is contained how the talismans can help or hinder the wise men or another person (as will be shown in what follows). Hence also certain people under the pretence of religion, judge this science to be, as it were, shameful, not noticing that God has bestowed this utility of His world rather on His servants, and, for the punishment of ill-doers and the praise of the just, He has made the art to be acknowledged amongst His works as wonderful beyond all others. But perhaps someone may object saying among other things that it is not the will of God that anyone should operate evil. To which I reply: ‘Do you not know that an axe is made for splitting wood? Surely, if anyone kills a man with the axe, with a wicked mind, the use of an axe should not for this reason be blamed or rejected as if condemned? This is not the case, I say’. But because I have replied sufficiently to these petty objections of our adversaries, let us turn to other things.»

This book, then, I obtained from him, with the help of God’s Spirit — a book which no Latin other than a certain Auriocenus, who once obtained

a part of it, ever had. If anyone, therefore, paying attention to this, wishes to know it, he should only make every effort to have (of all things) this book, i.e., a book on talismans. For through it, if he pays careful attention, he will without doubt obtain the sum of all this teaching. Pay attention then, whoever you are, and with a careful mind, think about what should be read in it, and consider diligently the significations of the planets both for the good and for evil. The prologue ends.

The book of talismans of Thābit ibn Qurra, translated from Arabic into Latin in Limia by John of Seville and Limia, begins.

## 2. The oldest version of the preface to *Secret of Secrets* (Edinburgh, Adv. 18-6-11, fol. 82r [= E]): <sup>81</sup>

Domine .T. gratia dei Hispaniarum <sup>82</sup> regine, Iohannes Yspalensis salutem. Cum hutilitate corporis olim <sup>83</sup> tractarem et a me quasi <sup>84</sup> essem medicus vestra nobilitas quereret ut brevem libellum <facerem> <sup>85</sup> de observatione diete vel de continentia corporis, id est qualiter se deberent continere qui sanitatem corporis cupiunt observare, accidit ut mee menti cogitanti vestre iussioni obedire huius rei exemplar et Aristotilis philosophi Alexandro edite <sup>86</sup> repente occurreret, quod

<sup>81</sup> Other editions of this preface, from later manuscripts, appear in *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, ed. R. STEELE, 5, Oxford, 1920, pp. xvii-xviii (from British Library, MS Add. 26770 = R), Brinkmann (n. 41 above), and H. SUCHIER, *Denkmäler provenzalischer Literatur und Sprache*, Halle, 1883, p. 472. I have consulted British Library, Burney 360 (= B) as a representative of the later tradition of the text and have checked R. The texts of the preface in later manuscripts differ considerably from each other and from the early version in the Edinburgh MS. I mention variants from R and B only when they are significant or might help correct the Edinburgh manuscript.

<sup>82</sup> Hispanorum B.

<sup>83</sup> Cum de utilitate corporis hominis B, Cum de utilitate corporis olim R. Note the spelling of 'hutilitate' indicating that the scribe is uncertain about where to put 'h's; see 'hedificaverat' and 'exibui' below.

<sup>84</sup> cum B, ac si R.

<sup>85</sup> facerem, *add.* Steele (not in R).

<sup>86</sup> et Aristotilis...edite] E is difficult to construe, RB give a more understandable text: 'ab Aristotile philosofo Alexandro editum'.

excerpsi de libro quod Arabice vocatur *aracelas*,<sup>87</sup> id est secretum secretorum, quem fecit, sicut predixi, Aristoteles philosophus Alexandro regi magno, de dispositione regni,<sup>88</sup> in quo continentur multa regibus utilia. Quem quidam<sup>89</sup> interpres, iussu imperatoris sui cum multo labore quesivit. De cuius inventione sic ait:

«Egressus sum diligenter querere quod mihi preceptum est ab imperatore et non cessavi sollicite circuire loca vel templa in quibus suspicabar philosophos sua abscondisse opera vel in quibus commendaverunt suas doctrinas, donec pervenirem ad quoddam altare quod sibi hedificaverat Hermes, in quo Sol venerabatur a quibusdam. Ibique inveni quendam senem prudentem et religiosum scientia et doctrina seu moribus ornatum. Huic adhesi et ei cum summa reverentia placere studui, et amabilem me illi exhibui et verbis dulcissimis eum linivi, quousque secretum locum michi detegeretur in quo introivi.<sup>90</sup> Et sic auxiliante Deo et fortuna imperatoris invento quod michi preceptum fuerat et quod diu quesieram, cum gaudio <...> translatum est.»

Ex quo ego presens opus tantum in Latinum transtuli,<sup>91</sup> non ex toto litteraturam sequens — quod a nullo interpretum posse perfici /82v/ arbitror — sed, iuxta posse meum, in quibusdam sensum, in quibusdam etiam sensum et litteraturam<sup>92</sup> secutus sum. Nec mirum

<sup>87</sup> This corruption of the Arabic 'sirr al-asrār' is difficult to explain; B gives 'cyrecesar', R 'tirosesar'.

<sup>88</sup> regiminis B, regiminum R.

<sup>89</sup> The abbreviation in E suggests 'quidem' which is also the reading of R.

<sup>90</sup> B and R substitute a longer passage for 'in quo introivi': «in quo inveni plura philosophorum scripta et secreta inter que hunc librum aureis litteris inveni» (B). However, this appears to be a later addition rather than an omission in E, since it does not occur in Philip of Tripoli's long version of the *Secret of Secrets* (ed. Steele, *Opera hactenus inedita*, p. 39) or in the Arabic preface from which this story is taken (ibid., p. 177).

<sup>91</sup> cum gaudio...transtuli] R and B give a fuller text, of which the return home and the information concerning which languages the translation was made from and to have parallels in Philip's version and the Arabic; cf. B: «reversus sum cum gaudio, portans mecum desiderium meum. Post hec ab eodem a Greco in Arabicum translatum, transtuli in Latinum presens opus». There seems to be a lacuna in E after 'cum gaudio'.

<sup>92</sup> It is possible that the second 'sensus' should be omitted, with R and B.

si imperitia mea hoc egi<sup>93</sup> cum pene omnes sapientes qui fuere interpretes ita egisse noscuntur. Nam diversitas translationum indicat quod nullus valet sequi semper litteraturam. Ego autem in omnibus magis litteraturam secutus sum ne longius a veritatis tramite recederem. Nemo ergo me in aliquo diliquisse miretur aut culpet, dum coram omnibus confiteor me totius scientie pati inopiam. Possideat ergo, iubente<sup>94</sup> Deo, nobilitas vestra<sup>95</sup> cum magna fortuna corporis incolunitatem, et sciat se habere in hoc opere magnum profectum si ascultaverit consilium. Michi autem pro labore a domino donetur<sup>96</sup> in futuro premium.<sup>97</sup>

*Translation:*

Lady .T. by the grace of God, queen of the Spains, John of Seville gives greetings!

When we were once discussing the uses of [the parts of] the body and Your Nobility was asking from me, as if I were a doctor, that I should compose a short booklet on the observation of a regimen (*dieta*), or about the continence of the body, i.e., how those should discipline themselves (*continere*) who wish to preserve the health of their bodies, it happened that there suddenly occurred to my mind, which was thinking about obeying your command, an example of this thing — being an edition of Aristotle the philosopher to Alexander. I excerpted this from the book which in Arabic is called «Aracelas», i.e. the Secret of Secrets, which, as I have said, Aristotle the philosopher made for Alexander, the great king, concerning the disposition of the kingdom, in which many things useful for kings are contained. This book a certain translator, by the command of his emperor, sought with much effort. About its discovery he says this:

---

<sup>93</sup> egit RB.

<sup>94</sup> It is possible that 'iuvante' is the right reading, confused with 'iubente' by a Spanish-speaking scribe.

<sup>95</sup> vestra B, una E.

<sup>96</sup> donech' E.

<sup>97</sup> et sciat...premium] not in RB. Note the similarity, however, between this ending and the ending of the *De differentia*: «Auferat a te deus omnem tristitiam...et det tibi fortunam in hoc et in futuro seculo».

«I went out to seek diligently what I had been ordered by the emperor, and I did not cease carefully to go round places or temples in which I thought philosophers had hidden their works, or (men) in whom they had entrusted their teachings, until I arrived at a certain altar which Hermes had built for himself, in which the Sun was venerated by certain people. There I found a certain wise and religious old man, adorned with knowledge and teaching or good conduct. I stuck to this man and strove to please him with the greatest reverence and made myself loved by him, and flattered him with the sweetest words until he revealed to me a secret place, into which I entered. Thus with the help of God and the good fortune of the emperor, having found what had been commanded of me and what I had sought for a long time, with joy <...the book> was translated.»

From this book I translated the present work only into Latin, not following the letter entirely, which I think no translator can do perfectly, but, to the extent of my ability, I have followed the sense in certain cases, the [sense and the] letter in others. Nor is it surprising if through my inexperience I have done this, since almost all wise men who have been interpreters are known to have acted in this way. For the differences between translations indicates that no one is able to follow the letter always. As for me, I have rather followed the letter in all cases lest I might depart from the path of truth by any extent. For no one should wonder at or blame me if I make mistakes in anything, since I confess before all men that I suffer a lack of competence in every branch of knowledge. Let Your Nobility possess, by God's command, health of body with good fortune, and let her know that she has in this work great profit, if she listens to the advice. To me, however, may a reward from God be given in future for my efforts.

## Appendix II

In the following parallels between Qusṭā ibn Lūqā's *De differentia spiritus et animae* and Gundissalinus's *De anima* and Hermann of Carinthia's *De essentiis*, italics indicate the use of the same words, and bold type-face significant differences in terminology. The line-numbers of Judith Wilcox's edition of *De differentia* are given; for Gundissalinus the page and line number of Muckle's edition, and for Hermann the folio division in Burnett's edition, are provided. The discussions of each of the ways in which a thing is moved, and of each of the words in the definitions of Plato and Aristotle are numbered, and further proofs (introduced by «item») are indicated by letters of the alphabet. Comparisons with the Arabic texts of the *De differentia*, as edited by Gabrieli, Cheikho and Ülken, are made in the footnotes, and comments on the «unrevised» version of the *De differentia* complete the Appendix. For a discussion of the differences between these passages in *De differentia* and the corresponding passages in Hermann and Gundissalinus see above pp. 242-5 [22-5].

The editions:

G. GABRIELI, «La risālah di Qusṭā b. Lūqā, 'sulla differenza tra lo spirito e l'anima'», in *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. 5, 19 (1910) pp. 622-55 (with Italian introduction and translation).

L. CHEIKHO, «Risāla fi'l-farq bain al-rūḥ wa'l-nafs», in *Al-Machriq*, 14 (1911) pp. 94-109 (in Arabic).

H. Z. ÜLKEN, *Ibn Sina Risaleler*, 2, Istanbul, 1953, pp. 84-100 (Turkish and Arabic).

Judith C. WILCOX, *The Transmission and Influence of Qusta ibn Luqa's 'On the Difference between Spirit and the Soul'*, Ph. D., City University of New York, 1985 (Latin, Hebrew and English translations).

J. T. MUCKLE, «The Treatise De Anima of Dominicus Gundissalinus», in *Mediaeval Studies*, 2 (1940) pp. 23-103.

Hermann of Carinthia, *De essentiis*, ed. C. BURNETT, Leiden and Cologne, 1982.

1. Gundissalinus's use of the *De differentia**De differentia*

(368) Dicamusque quod omne quod movetur aut movetur per motum sui moventis, quemadmodum movetur plaustrum per (370) motum bovum, vel movetur cum id quod movet eum **non moveatur**, quia quod movet aliquid aut movet et movetur vel movet et non movetur. Et hoc fit **quatuor** modis: quia (1) aut erit *per desiderium eius* a quo movetur, quemadmodum movetur amator ad eum quem amat, (2) *aut per* (375) *odium* aut fugam sive *terrorem*,<sup>98</sup> quemadmodum movetur inimicus ab inimico suo vel contra eum; (3) aut per **actum**<sup>99</sup> *naturalem*, quemadmodum movetur lapis a pondere cum pondus per semetipsum sit immobile; (4) vel quia id quod movet est occasio *principalis* vel *causa*<sup>100</sup> illius quod (380) movetur, quemadmodum **magisterium** est causa motionis motus **magistri** cum magisterium non moveatur per motum magistri. Sic *anima movet corpus* et ipsa non movetur per motum eius. Anima igitur est *causa motionis animalium per voluntatem et opus atque mutationem* et (385) *ipsa non movetur aliquo modo motionis corporis* eo quod ipsa sit incorporea.

## Gundissalinus

(p. 33.30) *Omne enim quod movet aliud, aut quiescit dum movet, aut movetur dum movet. ...[the intervening argument comes from Avicenna]...*

(p. 36.14) *Quicquid autem a re quiescente movetur, uno **quinque** modorum movetur, quoniam movetur **anima** (1) aut *per desiderium eius* quod appetit (2) *aut per odium* eius quod respuit (3) *aut per terrorem* eius quod refugit (4) *aut per vim naturalem* sursum vel deorsum tendit, ut *lapis* deorsum, *ignis* sursum, vel sicut *ferrum* movetur ab *adamante*, (5) *aut quia res movens rei motae causa principalis* existit, sicut **scientia** movet **artificem**, ipsa tamen non moveatur. Hoc ergo quinto modo *anima movet animalia*, quia est *causa motus animalium* per desiderium et *per voluntatem et per opus atque mutationem*; *ipsa tamen non movetur aliquo modo motionis corporum*.*

<sup>98</sup> 'fugam sive terrorem' is a doublet, translating the single Arabic word 'al-tanāfi' ('mutual incompatibility') in Gabrieli's text, 'al-munāfir' ('avoidance') in Cheikho's, and 'al-tanāfura' ('avoidance') in Hülken's.

<sup>99</sup> Arabic 'fi'l' ('act').

<sup>100</sup> 'ocasio principalis vel causa' translates a single Arabic word 'sabab' ('cause') in Gabrieli's text, or two words 'sabab bādi' ('principal cause') in Cheikho's and Ülken's.

*De differentia*

(307) Dicamus itaque quod *Plato* philosophus *diffinivit animam sic*: «*Anima, inquit, est substantia incorporea movens corpus*'... [Aristotle's definition; see p. 265 [45] below] ... (313) (1a) Ostendamusque *quod anima sit substantia, et dicamus quia quicquid recipit opposita cum sit unum* (315) *numero et immutabile in sua essentia est substantia: sed anima recipit virtutes ac vitia cum sit una numero. Ut anima Platonis, que inmutabilis est in sua essentia, recipit virtutes ac vitia, que sunt opposita; anima igitur recipit opposita cum sit una numero et* (320) *inmutabilis in sua essentia, et ita est substantia...* (b) ...

(325) (2) Nunc ostendamus quod anima sit incorporea et dicamus: (a) uniuscuiusque corporis *qualitates sunt perceptibiles* (MS B adds «sensu»), <sup>101</sup> et cuius *qualitates non percipiuntur a corporeo sensu incorporeum est. Qualitates autem anime sunt virtutes ac vitia, que sunt insensibiles*; (330) *anima ergo est incorporea.* (b) Et *item, omne corpus subiacet omnibus sensibus* aut quibusdam ex eis, *sed anima non subiacet omnibus sensibus* neque quibusdam ex eis; *anima igitur non est corpus.*

<sup>101</sup> Arabic 'mahsūsāt'.

Gundissalinus

(37.8) *Plato animam sic definit* dicens: «*Anima est substantia incorporea corpus movens*». (1) *Quod autem anima sit substantia sic probatur: quicquid recipit contraria, cum sit unum et idem numero, substantia est. Sed anima, manens una et eadem numero, recipit contraria* quae sunt *virtutes et vitia, gaudium et tristitia, scientia et ignorantia. Ergo anima substantia est...* [the next section from Avicenna]

(39.38) (2) Item quod anima non sit corpus sic probatur. (a) Omne corpus habet *qualitates perceptibiles* aliquo sensu; sed *qualitates animae non sunt perceptibiles* aliquo sensu; ergo anima non est corpus. (39) (b) *Item omne corpus subiacet omnibus sensibus* vel aliquibus; *sed anima nullis subiacet sensibus*; ergo anima non est corpus.

## De differentia

(c) *Item, omne corpus aut animatum est aut inanimatum, et si anima est corpus (335) aut est animata aut inanimata; et impossibile est ut anima sit inanimata si est corpus, quia inconueniens est ut anima sit inanimata. Et si dixerimus quod anima sit animata, reiterabitur nobis sermo de anima anime utrum sit corpus vel non, et (340) ascendet hoc ad infinitum. Non est ergo anima corpus...*(d) (e)... (366) (3) Et quia iam patet quod *anima sit substantia incorporea, nunc exponamus quibus modis movet corpus (the description of the 4 modes of movement by an unmoved thing follows, as above, p. 260 [40])*

(404) Aristotiles philosophus ita diffinit (405) animam: ut diceret quod esset perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentialiter. In libro autem Aristotelis quem fecit de anima, talis est diffinitio: «*Anima est perfectio corporis naturalis instrumentalis viventis potentialiter.*» Redeamus ad opus.<sup>102</sup> ... (425) Dicamus ergo quod perfectio duobus modis dicatur: *est enim perfectio prima, et est secunda.* Prima namque perfectio in homine est sapientia atque magisteria. Secunda vero perfectio in homine est studere in his que novit ex magisteriis et (430) scientiis. Verbi gratia: medicus dicitur *perfectio prima propter scientiam medicine; cum vero ceperit operari quod scit, dicitur perfectio secunda.* Anima igitur *est perfectio prima, quia* qui dormit etsi careat sensu tempore dormitionis, est ei tamen anima (435) sensibilis. Et omnis species atque perfectio est species atque perfectio alicuius rei. Anima ergo est *species et perfectio corporis.*

## Gundissalinus

(c) *Item omne corpus aut est animatum aut inanimatum. Ergo si anima est corpus, aut est inanimata aut animata. Si autem anima est animatum corpus — sed omne animatum corpus aliqua anima est animatum — tunc anima est animata ab alia anima; et similiter illa eadem quaestio de illa alia anima, et sic in infinitum. Anima ergo non est animatum corpus; sed nec est corpus inanimatum, quia quod non vivit aliud vivificare non potest; anima autem corpus vivificat; ergo anima nullo modo est corpus sed est substantia. Ergo est anima substantia incorporea. Quod autem sit movens corpus iam superius demonstratum est. Vera est igitur definitio animae secundum Platonem, quod anima est substantia incorporea corpus movens.*

(40.13) Aristoteles autem sic diffinit animam, dicens: «*Anima est prima perfectio corporis naturalis, instrumentalis, viventis potentialiter. Perfectio autem alia est prima, alia secunda.* Prima perfectio est per quam species fit species in effectu, ut figura ensi; secunda perfectio est ut aliquid eorum quae consequuntur speciem rei aut ex actionibus eius aut ex passionibus eius, sicut est incidere ensi.<sup>103</sup> *Prima perfectio est scientia medicinae in cognitione, secunda perfectio est medicina in operatione. Anima ergo est perfectio prima quia* statim cum unitur copori fit in eo plena potentia vivendi vel sentiendi, et sic per animam *perficitur species corporis* animati quod ante animam erat in sola potentia. ...

<sup>102</sup> For the Arabic text here see pp. 238-9 [18-9] above.

<sup>103</sup> «Prima perfectio est...incidere ensi» from Avicenna, *De anima*, I.1., ed. S. Van Riet, I, p. 27.

*De differentia*

Modi autem corporum sunt duo, quia sunt quedam corpora in quibus est species *naturalis*, ut animalia et *arbores*, ignis (440) et aqua et quicquid habet motum naturalem in semetipso. Et sunt quedam quibus acquiritur species per *magisterium ut ostium et scamnum*... (448) Modi quoque corporis naturalis sunt duo, quia sunt quedam *simplicia*, quedam vero (450) *composita*. *Simplicia* vero ut ignis, aer, aqua, terra; *composita* ut animalia et arbores. Anima autem non est species simplicis corporis sed *compositi naturalis*, quia quicquid habet animam, est animatum, id est vivit, et quicquid vivit est convertible vel dissolubile (455) et necesse est ei cibus quo possit recuperare quod dissolutum est ab eo, et qui auxilietur eius vegetationi dans ei incrementum.

Cibus quoque indiget diversis *instrumentis ex quibus* sunt quedam ei *necessaria* ut deferant eum ad **corpus reficiendum** (460) eumque currere ac penetrare faciant, ut *guttur et vene* in **animalibus**, torusque (*truncus* quoque MS A) ac *rami* in arboribus. Et quedam sunt necessaria refecturo corpori ut *eiciant* ab eo queque *superflua*, ut sunt in **animalibus pori** sive **exitus resine** in arboribus. *Multiplicantur* quoque (465) *instrumenta* in **animalibus** propter magnitudinem perfectionis eorum et *multitudinem operum* eorum.

Gundissalinus

(40.26) Corpus autem aliud *naturale* est ut *arbor*, aliud **artificiale** ut *scamnum* quod animatum esse non potest. Ut ergo removeatur artificiale appositum naturale. Sed naturale aliud est *simplex*, aliud *compositum*. *Simplex* autem aliud est quodlibet elementorum quatuor, aliud nec elementum nec elementatum ut quodlibet caeleste corpus. Sed nullum elementorum est animatum nec ali-quod caelestium corporum secundum Aristotelem, licet aliter videatur Platoni.

(40.33) Nullum ergo simplex corpus est animatum; sed nec omne compositum naturale ut lapis. Ideo appositum *instrumentalis*, id est habentis *instrumenta quibus* iuvatur ad vitam. Instrumentorum autem alia sunt *necessaria* ad (44) **recipiendum nutrimentum**, alia ad *superflua eiciendum*. Necessaria autem ad recipiendum nutrimentum in vegetabilibus sunt *truncus*, radix et *rami* et alia huiusmodi; in *sensibilibus* autem *guttur et venae* et alia huiusmodi. necessaria vero ad *superflua* expellendum in **utrisque** sunt *pori*, sed in *sensibilibus* etiam alia. *Multipliciora* enim sunt *instrumenta sensibilium* quam vegetabilium propter *multipliciores* eorum. ...

*De differentia*

(479)...interpretatio utrarumque  
 (480) diffinitionum est una. *Dicens*  
 enim *viventis potentialiter* noluit per  
 hoc intelligi quod corpus ita esset in  
 sua essentia antequam esset anima;  
 post hec (?) recepisset animam per  
 hoc quod possibile fuit sibi vivere;  
 sed voluit intelligi per hoc quod dixit  
 (485) «potentialiter» quod esset ei  
*instrumentum cui esset possibile uti*  
*actibus vite*. Idem ergo significat  
 ‘instrumentalis’ quod ‘viventis  
 potentialiter’.

## Gundissalinus

(43.11) *Dicens* ergo *viventis*  
*potentialiter* tantum illud ostendit  
 corpus per animam perfici, quod ante  
 animam habuit potentiam vivificari,  
 quod pene idem sonat *instrumentale*,  
 scilicet *cui possibile est uti actibus*  
*vitae*.

## 2. Hermann of Carinthia's use of *De differentia*

### *De differentia*

(9) et ecce scribo tibi quedam collectiva que excerpti de libro (10) *Platonis* qui vocatur *Cadon* et eius libro qui vocatur *Tymeus* et ex libris Aristotelis philosophi et Theofra(s)ti ac Benededis in animam; ex libro quoque Galieni quem fecit de concordia quarumdā sententiarum gloriosissimi Ypocratis atque Platonis et ex libro (15) eiusdem Galieni quem fecit in opere chirurgie et in utilitate membrorum... (307) Dicamus itaque quod Plato philosophus *diffinivit* animam sic: «*Anima*» *inquit* «*est substantia incorporea movens corpus*». Aristoteles vero in diffinitione anime (310) ait sic: «*Anima est perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentialiter*»... (404) Aristoteles philosophus ita *diffinivit* (405) animam: ut diceret quod esset *perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentialiter*. In libro autem Aristotelis quem fecit *de anima*, talis est diffinitio: «*Anima est perfectio corporis naturalis instrumentalis viventis potentialiter*». Redeamus ad opus ... (337) inconveniens est ut anima sit *inanimata* ... (473) Et hec *diffinitio* [Aristotelis] est *universalis*... (480) Dicens enim *viventis potentialiter*... (484) voluit intelligi per hoc quod dixit (485) «*potentialiter*» quod esset ei instrumentum cui esse possibile uti actibus *vite*.

### Hermann, *De essentiis*

(71vE) Recte quidem quale Plato *diffinit*, Aristoteles *describit*. Plato quidem in *Cadone*, «*Anima est*» *inquit* «*substantia incorporea corpus movens*». Aristoteles vero in libro *De anima* sic: «*Anima est*» ait «*perfectio corporis naturalis instrumentalis potentia viventis*». Et alibi: «*Anima est perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentia*». Videtur itaque diffinitio quidem (F) magis propria tertio generi, seu quia solum hoc incorporeum dicimus, cum in germine sive animali bruto nichil supersit ultra triplicem illum spiritum quo vivit, spirat, sentit, quem corpus esse secundum originis rationem scimus, seu quia neutrum illorum substantia sit, si (*read sed?*) potius dicamus ea duo animandi genera virtutes anime mundi, quemadmodum visum est eis qui si ea corpora esse concedant, superesse sibi putant alias item eis corporibus animas requirendas. Nec enim *inanimata* dici (G) consonum est. **Descriptio** [sc. Aristotelis] vero *universalis*. *Perficit* enim *anima corpus potentia vivens* dum vitam actu ministrat («*vivens*» inquam «*potentia*» cuius dispositio *vite* animeque actionibus parata).

Hermann has swapped the order of the two definitions of Aristotle, but made sure that the reference to the *De anima* is still attached to the correct definition. The abbreviated version (called by Wilcox «Hermann of Carinthia's version») has mistakenly assigned the first of the two definitions to Aristotle, perhaps because of unclear punctuation in its archetype. This, and the fact that the abbreviated version makes no mention of «Cado» are arguments against an attribution to Hermann. The equivalent passages in this abbreviated version are as follows:

(204) *Anima, inquit Plato, est substantia incorporea corpus movens. Aristoteles autem sic: Anima, inquit, est perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentialiter. ... (281) Anima inquit [Aristoteles] est perfectio corporis agentis et viventis potentialiter in libro suo de anima; et aliter: anima est perfectio corporis naturalis instrumenti viventis potentialiter.... (225) et ridiculum est si dixeris eam [in]animatum... (the sentence about Aristotle's definition being universal is omitted)...(331) Igitur «potentialiter» ...sed voluit intelligi quod esset instrumentum cui esset possibile uti actibus vite.*

Indications that the text in Edinburgh, Advocates 18.6.11 is unrevised in the above passages are:

1) the common placing of the copula before its complement: e.g., «est incorporeum» (328); «est anima» (334); «sit anima» (336, 337, 338 and 341), etc. This follows the Arabic order «in kānat al-nafs...» (*vel sim.*).

2) The use of «et» where other manuscripts have «atque» (e.g., 430). Note that this manuscript calls the author «Iohannes Hispalensis et Limiensis» while most other manuscripts of other texts of his call him «Iohannes Hispalensis atque Limiensis».

However, some terms and passages are closer to the Arabic in the revised version:

1) «Insensibiles» (325) for the Edinburgh MS's «invisibiles»: here «insensibiles» is a better translation for «lā maḥsūsāt».

2) In line 450 «ignis, aer, aqua, terra» is exactly what is found in the Arabic; the Edinburgh manuscript has «est aer et cetera elementa».

One may notice also (1) the indiscriminate use of «in + abl.» which appears in the title of the text in the colophon of the Edinburgh manuscript («in spiritus et anime differentia»; the regular version is «de differentia inter

spiritum et animam») and in the preface to the *Secret of Secrets* («secretum locum...in quo introivi»; an accusative would be expected in good Latin), and (2) the fact the Edinburgh manuscript has no dedication, and may therefore represent a version of the text that predates the copy dedicated to Raymond de La Sauvetat.