

Medieval Academy of America

John of Seville

Author(s): Lynn Thorndike

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Jan., 1959), pp. 20-38

Published by: Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2847976>

Accessed: 27/05/2010 18:24

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=medacad>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Medieval Academy of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

JOHN OF SEVILLE

By LYNN THORNDIKE

So long as the exaggerated concept of a fifteenth century renaissance dominated the intellectual history of western Europe, Christian and western scholars and writers were prone to belittle and depreciate mediaeval Latin learning and science. One particular manifestation of this was the notion that no westerner or Christian could translate a book from Arabic into Latin without the assistance of a Jew or Mozarab. Jewish scholars, who had a closer acquaintance with their own rich mediaeval learning, also were inclined to accept this notion.¹ So when Amable Jourdain² suggested the identification of a Jew named Avendauth, who, he thought, was also called John, and who had helped Gundisalvus in translating the *De anima* of Avicenna, with John of Seville, the translator of Arabic astrology, Moritz Steinschneider readily adopted this identification in his multitudinous publications,³ and it became generally repeated and accepted.⁴

Valentinelli, in his catalogue of the manuscripts of the library of St Mark's, Venice, called the Iohannes Hispalensis who translated *De differentia inter animam et spiritum* for Archbishop Raymond a Jewish rabbi, but when he came to the Iohannes Yspalensis who translated the Greater Introduction of Albumasar, remarked: "Plures nomine Ioannis Hispalensis fuere ex quibus qui fuit interpres incertum est," citing Nicolaus Antonius, *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus*, II, 267, in the one case, and the same work, II, 270-71, in the other. See J. Valentinelli, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad S Marci Venetiarum*, IV (1871), 43, 276.

In Haenel's *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum* (Leipzig, 1830), col. 523, we find listed under Basel F.III.8: "Alcabitii lib. de iudiciis astrorum per Ioannem Hispalensem ex Hebraeo in Latinum translatus, et finitus 1355; fol." But when we turn to the MS itself, there is no mention of translation from the Hebrew, only, "interpretatus a Ioanne Hyspalense" (*sic*), and, "Finitus a.d. M.CCC.lv feria secunda post Quasimodo."

Millás Vallicrosa, *Traducciones orientales* (1942), p. 9, wrote:

In Toledo, beneficiándose del mecenazgo del arzobispo D. Raimundo, encontramos al judío converso Johannes Hispanus, con el cual trabajó su joven colaborador el arcediano Domingo Gundisalvus. Parece que el nombre hebraico del primero fué Šlōmō ibn David y el nombre cristiano: Johannes ibn Dawd, hispanus; por presentarse algo vacilante su

¹ Even to this day the writer of the chapter on "La science hébraïque médiévale" in *Histoire générale des sciences: la Science antique et médiévale* (Paris, 1957), pp. 514-15, repeats the old legend that Jews played a large role in the foundation and faculty of the medical school of Montpellier, citing the eighteenth-century work of Astruc, although Wickersheimer (whose *Dictionnaire biographique des médecins de France* [1936] is cited for "le grand nombre des médecins juifs en France") pointed out in *Janus*, 31 (1927), 465-473, that in the numerous documents of that university from its foundation in 1220 neither a Jew nor a Saracen is ever mentioned.

² *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote . . .* (1819).

³ See especially *Hebräische Uebersetzungen* (1893), pp. 981-984.

⁴ Thus Robert Steele, *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, Fasc. V (Oxford, 1920), speaks at p. xvi of a well-known Jewish writer, Johannes Hispalensis or Hispaniensis, and at p. xvii, says that Johannes Hispalensis (called Avendauth) was a Jewish translator in Toledo.

gentilicio: hispanus, hispanensis, hispalensis, lunensis, de Tholeto, se ha supuesto si bajo su nombre se comprendería más de un autor.

Georg Bülow, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, 24, 3 (1935), p. xi, went so far as to allude to the preface to Avicenna's *De anima*, as, "mit dem bekannten Prolog des Johannes Hispanus," without naming Avendauth at all, although at p. vii he had said that he was called Johannes Hispanus only after his conversion.

Already in 1923, however, I had written as to this identification: "A difficulty is that John of Spain's translations are usually described as direct from the Arabic, and nothing is said of Gundissalinus, whereas in the preface to Avicenna's *De Anima* John Avendauth tells the archbishop that he has translated it word for word from Arabic into Spanish, and that Dominicus Gundisalvus has then rendered the vernacular into Latin"; and further "as far as I know, there is no MS where John of Spain is definitely called John Avendauth or vice versa."⁵ Mlle d'Alverny perhaps states my further doubts of 1923 better than I did: "Il remarque prudemment que le Johannes Toletanus traducteur des Nativitates d'Abu Ali en 1153 n'est pas nécessairement Johannes Hispalensis, et que le Johannes Hispanus qui a traduit la partie médicale du Secretum secretorum adressé à une reine Tarasia est peut-être différent de l'astronome."⁶ Similarly Charles H. Haskins wrote in 1924: "John son of David (Avendehut) is an enigmatical personage who still needs investigation."⁷ I now wish to review the evidence in so far as John of Seville is concerned.

The preface of Avendauth, or Avendehut Israelita, to the archbishop of Toledo, states that he had translated the *De anima* of Avicenna word for word into the Spanish vernacular, and that Dominicus Gundisalvus or Domingo Gundisalvo had turned this vernacular version into Latin. This would seem a clear indication that Avendauth knew Arabic and Spanish but not much Latin,⁸ just as Gundisalvus knew Spanish and Latin but not Arabic. It is therefore inconceivable that John of Seville, all of whose many translations of astrological works were made directly from Arabic into Latin, including the long *Maius Introductorium* of Albumasar which he finished in 1133, could be the same person, especially since Dominicus Gundisalvus is found as a canon of Segovia as late as 1190, as M. Alonso has shown,⁹ while the archbishop of Toledo addressed by Avendauth seems not to have been Raymond (1125-51) but his successor, John (1151-66), as H. Bédoret was the first to suggest.¹⁰ This has the further sequel, as

⁵ *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 73-74, note 5.

⁶ *Homenaje à Millás-Vallierosa*, I (1954), 23-24.

⁷ *Studies in Medieval Science*, p. 13.

⁸ Enough perhaps to compose the preface to the archbishop, or he may have had some Latinist compose it for him.

⁹ M. Alonso, "Notas sobre los traductores toledanos Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano," *Al-Andalus*, VIII (1943), 155-185.

¹⁰ In *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, xli (1948). See also *Aristoteles Latinus, Pars posterior* (1955): p. 901, MS. 1303, Cesena, Bibl. Malatest. XXII, dext. 6, fols. 2r-24v, a. 1320-1321, "Reverentissimo Toletane sedis archiepiscopo et yspanorum primati Iohanni Avendenech israelita philosophus gratum servitutis obsequium"; p. 988, MS. 1446 (omitted in Index under Avendaut) Milan, Ambros,

Mlle d'Alverny has shown, of taking the name John away from Avendauth and giving it to the archbishop.¹¹ Hence there is the less reason for identifying him with John of Seville, since no manuscript, however late and faulty, has ever been adduced in which Avendauth is called of Seville or any other place. A further corollary is that, since the epithet, Israelite, is found in the manuscripts appended only to the name of Avendauth, there is no particular reason for calling John of Seville either a Jew or a converted Jew; just as there is no particular reason for calling him a Mozarab, since he not only translated directly from Arabic into Latin but also wrote his own works of astronomy and astrology in Latin. It would have been quite *infra dig.* moreover, for him to have served as a mere go-between in the translation of the *De anima* of Avicenna.

Alonso went on to suggest that Avendauth or Ibn Daūd became Archbishop John of Toledo.¹² This seems most improbable. But the most serene John David (in some manuscripts, however, it is *dilectissimo* rather than *serenissimo*) to whom Plato of Tivoli and Rudolph of Bruges dedicated translations, is more likely to have been the future archbishop than to have been John of Seville, who is never called David.

John of Seville is sometimes called Hispaniensis instead of Hispalensis, or Hispanus, Yspanus, etc.¹³ But the second appellation is the more frequent as well

H.43.Inf., 13–14th century. fols. 89r-148v, “Reverendissimo domino Toletane sedis archiepiscopus (*sic*) et Hyspaniarum primati Iohanni, Avendhaut israelita philosophus. . . .” At pp. 1007 and 1064 MSS. 1476 (Naples VIII, E, 19, anno 1327) and 1549 (Rome, Casanatensis 957, 13–14th century) are similar, except that after “primati” *Iohanni* is omitted. Raymond, archbishop of Toledo, is addressed only in the three MSS. 1313, 1478 and 1595 of John of Seville’s translation of the *De differentia spiritus et anime*.

Another MS of the *De anima* of Avicenna in which the archbishop is called John is Bruges 510 of the fourteenth century: “Reverendissimo toletane sedis archiepiscopo hyspanorum primati Iohanni Avendanh israelita philosophus gratum debite servitutis obsequium. . . .” See Pierre Joseph Laude, *Catalogus méthodique descriptif et analytique des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique de Bruges*, (1859), p. 442. A. de Poorter, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque publique de la ville de Bruges* (1934), gives only the first four words. Yet another MS. is Basel D.III.7, 12–13th century, fol. 2r: “Reverentissimo Toletane sedis archiepiscopo et Ypanarum primati Iohanni Avendeuth Israelita philosophus gratum debite servitutis obsequium. Cum omnes homines constant ex anima et corpore. . . . Habetis ergo librum vobis precipiente et (me) singula verba vulgariter proferente et Dominico archidiacono singula in latinum convertente ex arabico translatum. . . .” Despite these statements, a rubric at fol. 2v reads: “Incipit sextus de naturalibus translatus a magistro Girardo Cremonensi de arabico in latinum in Tholeto.”

In Merton College, Oxford, 282, a folio MS of the 13–14th century, fol. 132va: “Reverentissimo Tolotane sedis archiepiscopo et hyspanorum primati Iohanni Avendenechi Israelita philosophus gratum debite servitutis obsequium enim cum omnes homines constant ex corpore et anima. . . . Habetis ergo librum vobis precipiente et me singula verba vulgariter proferente et Dominico archidiacono singula in latino communicante vel convertente ex arabico translatum. . . .”

¹¹ M. T. d’Alverny, “Avendauth?” in *Homenaje a Millàs-Vallcrosa*, 1 (1954), 19–43, especially 20–28.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 25–26.

¹³ Duhem, *Le système du monde*, III (1915), 178, held that Hispalensis was an error for Hispaniensis, rather than the contrary, saying, “Jean ne serait pas originaire de Séville, mais de Luna; il n’aurait pas été surnommé Hispalensis, mais Hispanensis, épithète en laquelle Jourdain voit un barbarisme mis pour Hispanus.”

as the more distinctive. We shall find a John, who seems to be our John of Seville, calling himself a Spaniard. But he would scarcely have been so designated by other Spaniards. Such a designation would be distinctive only outside of Spain. Similarly he would not have been called of Seville in his native town. He may have done some of his translating there and more of it elsewhere after he had made a name for himself. In many cases the place of translation is not given in the explicits of his writings. It is tempting to think that some or much of his work was accomplished at Toledo. But there again he would not be called John of Toledo in Toledo.

In any case it is highly improbable that he would be known as John of Toledo as well as John of Seville. Sometimes, it is true, a mediaeval man of learning was given two place names. The famous Conciliator was known both as Peter of Abano from his birthplace, and as Peter of Padua from his university. The latter appellation was probably first applied to him when he went to Paris to teach, or perhaps only after his death. But he is seldom, if ever, called Aponensis and Padubanus simultaneously. Yet in the Latin translation of the treatise on engraved astrological images by Thebit ben Corat, in at least eight manuscripts the translator is called "Iohanne Hispalensi atque Luniensi" (or, *Limiensis*), and the translation is said to have been made in Luna or Limia. In the case of another translation, of Omar on nativities, at least three manuscripts call the translator "Iohannes Hyspalensis et [or, *atque*] Lunensis," to which one of them adds "episcopus."¹⁴ But in this case the place of translation is not given. Here, as with Peter of Abano and Padua, an obscure place is associated with one better known. But to call a man of London and of Paris, or of Seville and Toledo, would be too confusing. It may be further noted that, unlike Petrus Aponensis, we do not find Johannes Lunensis separately but always in combination with Hispalensis or some variant thereof. Johannes Hispalensis, on the contrary, is found alone, as well as with Lunensis. Therefore, there is the possibility that there were two Johns of Seville engaged in translating from the Arabic into Latin, and that one was distinguished from the other by the addition of the place name, Luna or Limia: the one, a town in Aragon; the other a river and district in Galicia. It is perhaps a somewhat remote possibility. But it is far more likely that there should be two Johns from Seville, than that the same man should sometimes be called John of Seville and sometimes John of Toledo, sometimes John David, and sometimes Avendeth Israelita.

John of Seville is to be accepted first and foremost as an exponent of astrology in general and of Arabic astrology in particular. The great majority of the translations from the Arabic and practically all of the professedly original writings in Latin which bear his name were in the field of astrology, taking that word in its broadest sense. The burden of proof is upon those who would attribute to him translations in other fields, such as philosophy and medicine. This, however, I shall proceed to attempt in one or two cases. Even more is the burden of proof upon those who still persist in identifying other names with that of John of Seville.

¹⁴ But Luna was not an episcopal see.

What appears to be the earliest translation that has been ascribed to John of Seville is not, however, astrological but a brief medical extract from the *Secretum secretorum* of the pseudo-Aristotle, a work first translated in full into Latin by Philip of Tripoli in the next century. This medical extract covers only 188 lines in Suchier's edition,¹⁵ but is usually, though not always,¹⁶ accompanied in the manuscripts by a letter to a queen of Spain which occupies forty-two lines in Suchier's edition, where it is headed: "Domine T. gracia dei Hispanorum regine J. Hispanensis salutem!"¹⁷

It is worth remarking that, out of all the ascriptions of translations to John, whether of Spain, Seville, or Luna, this is the only one in which the translator is speaking in the first person and applies a place name to himself.

Suchier was somewhat unduly cautious in the rendering, J. Hispanensis, since, as he indicates in the footnotes, of his eight manuscripts, all in the British Museum, Harley 978, 13th century, fol. 22r, has, "Domine regine dei gracia Hyspanie Joh's Hyspañ salutem"; Arundel 459, 14th century, fol. 69va, "Dne G'. dei gracia Hyspanieñ regine Joh' salutem"; Sloane 420, 14th century, fol. 180r, "Domine Ispaniarum regine Iohannes Ispanus salutem"; Burney 350, p. 262a, "Dominae T. Hispanorum reginae Ionnes Hispanus."

There can be no doubt, then, that the translator is named John, and that, in addressing a queen of Spain, he proclaims himself a Spaniard (Hispaniensis, Hispanus, etc.). This does not necessarily preclude his being of Seville in particular, but he is not so designated in any of the manuscripts used by Suchier, nor do I know of any other of this work in which he is so called or so calls himself. In Latin MS. 16170 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, fol. 23r, it is "Domine T. Hispanorum regine dei gratia Iohannes Hispanensis salutem." In Amplon. F.32, second half 13th century, fol. 73r: "Domine T. gracia dei Yspanorum regine Iohannes Hispaniensis salutem." In Padua, Anton. II, 50, 14th century, fol. 74r, he is called only John, according to *Aristoteles Latinus*, MS. 1502: "Domine T. dei gratia hyspan. regine Iohannes salutem." But in Laurentian Plut. 13 sinis., cod. 6, he is Ioannes Hispaniensis; in Plut, 30, cod. 29, fol. 57, Ioannes Hispanus; at the Vatican, in Chigi H.VII.238, late 13th century (*Aristoteles Latinus*, MS. 1755), and Basel F.II.6, anno 1473, fol. 207va, Iohannes Hyspanus and Yspanus. In Paris, Bibl. nat. lat. 6679, early 16th century, fol. 32r-v, he is called Hyspaniensis by the cataloguer, but in the salutation: "T. Hyspanarum regine Iohannes Hyspanus salutem." And so on.

The name of the Spanish queen, to whom the Latin translation of the brief

¹⁵ Hermann Suchier, *Denkmäler Provenzalischer Literatur und Sprache* (Halle, 1883), pp. 473-80: "Anhang. Epistola Aristotilis ad Alexandrum cum prologo Iohannis Hispaniensis."

¹⁶ In the Laurentian Library at Florence, MS. Plut. 89 sup., cod. 76, fol. 228, lacks the preface: see Bandini's catalogue, III, 339.

¹⁷ The preface is sometimes found without any such salutation. Thus in Erfurt, Amplon. Q.351, the translation of Alfraganus by John of Seville at fols. 103-130, in a hand of the second half of the twelfth century, is immediately followed, at fols. 130v-133v, but in a hand of the early thirteenth century, by the opening words of the preface, "Cum de utilitate corporis . . .," without mention of queen or translator.

medical fragment from the *Secret of Secrets* was addressed, is often indicated, as we have seen, merely by the initial letter, T. Sometimes it is written out as Theophina or Tharasia. Although the former name is said to have the better manuscript authority, no queen of that name is known. But a Tharasia, who was a natural daughter of Alfonso VI of Castile and Leon, married Henry of Burgundy, count of Portugal (1057–1114); gave birth to the first king of Portugal; and herself died in 1130.¹⁸ She would perhaps more properly be called a queen of Spain much earlier in her career.¹⁹ John of Seville's dated translations fall in the decade following her death, and if, as seems likely, the translation was made for her some years before it,²⁰ a blank period would be left in his career.

Let us examine the preface or letter of the translator to the queen in order to see how it fits chronologically into the career of John of Seville, whose translation of the major work of Albumasar was finished in 1133 and whose own *Epitome of Astrology* dates in 1142, and also how it agrees with his personality and learning. There is the difficulty that the text differs in length and wording in different manuscripts and editions of it.

To begin with, the translator states that when he and the queen were once discussing human physiology, "Cum de utilitate corporis hominis olim tractaremus. . ." (but Suchier's version omits *olim*), she asked him, as if he were a medical man, "et a me ac si [quasi, BN 16170, and Basel F.II.6 anno 1472, fol. 207va] essem medicus vestra nobilitas quereret. . ." (Suchier's *cum essem medicus* seems incorrect) for a brief booklet on the rule of health and wholesome living. As he thought it over afterwards, it suddenly occurred to him that Aristotle had written that sort of advice to Alexander, which he has copied (or, excerpted — *exscripsi* or *excerpsi*) from the book called in Arabic *sirr al asrar* or *cyretesar*, that is, *Secretum secretorum*, which Aristotle wrote on kingship for Alexander. He then proceeds to quote from the preface of the translator from Greek into Arabic.

Thus the Latin translator, although not a medical man, has a broad enough acquaintance with Arabic literature to know that the *Secretum secretorum* contains a medical section of the very sort that the queen desires, although apparently it did not occur to him at once. We thus infer that some time passed before he complied with her request, and that this was presumably some years before her death in 1130.

¹⁸ Robert Steele, *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, Fasc. V (1920), p. xvii.

¹⁹ However, John XXI, although born in Lisbon, was called Petrus Hispanus before he became pope in 1276.

²⁰ Richard Förster, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, VI (1889), 2: "von Johannes Hispaniensis oder Hispalensis für die Königin Tarasia in ersten Viertel des 12. Jahrhunderts ins Lateinische übersetzt worden ist." He thus seems to have abandoned his earlier contention, *De Aristotelis quae feruntur physiognomicis recensendis* (1882), pp. 26–27, that she was a queen of Leon from 1176 to 1180. On the other hand, of 63 MSS. of the fragment translated for the queen which Förster lists, none is earlier than the 13th century, and it may seem strange that more than a century should elapse before the full translation by Philip of Tripoli of what has been called the most popular book of the Latin Middle Ages.

The rest of the letter to the queen, stating the translator's method of translating, is found in some manuscripts and not in others. Suchier²¹ gave it, but Steele²² omitted it. Here again the wording varies between manuscripts which do give it, notably in the case of Suchier's text and that of Latin MS. 16170 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, of the 13th century. The Latin translator says that he does not always translate literally which he thinks is not (or, cannot be) done by any translator: "non ex toto litteraturam sequens quod [Basel F.II.6 omits] a nullo interprete posse" [BN 16170 omits *posse*] *perfici arbitror*"²³ but to the best of his ability sometimes follows the sense and sometimes the letter equally: "sed iuxta posse meum in quibusdam sensum, in quibusdam [Suchier omits the second *in quibusdam*] et litteraturam equaliter [Suchier and Basel F.II.6 omit *equaliter*] secutus sum." Nor is it strange if his inexperience does this, since almost all the sages who were translators are known to have done likewise: "Nec mirum si impericia mea hoc egit, cum fere omnes sapientes qui fuere interpretes ita egisse noscuntur" (BN 16170, *nos contra*, which hardly makes sense). For the diversity of translations shows that no one can always translate literally: "Nam diversitas traslacionum indicat quod [quare] nullus valet semper sequi litteraturam." However, in most cases he has made a literal translation, lest he depart too far from the way of truth: "Ego attamen [*autem pene* in Suchier and Basel F.II.6] magis in omnibus litteraturam secutus sum ne longius a veritatis tramite discederem [*recederem* in BN 16170]." No one should wonder or blame him, if he has made some mistakes, for he openly confesses to inadequacy in the whole field of knowledge: "Nemo enim me in aliquibus deliquisse [*derelinquisse* in BN 16170] miretur aut culpset, dum coram omnibus confiteor me tocius sapientie [*scientie* in Basel F.II.6] pati inopiam."

The method of translation thus disclosed fits John of Seville almost to a T, since he is noted in his later astrological renditions from the Arabic for literal and word-for-word translation, and even for following the Arabic sentence structure and word order, so that his translations have even been called slavish. On the other hand, it seems a little incongruous that such an exposition and defense of his way of translating should be prefixed to such a brief and minor opuscle as this medical extract of only 188 printed lines, which moreover hardly seems to exemplify the method advocated. No Arabic words are merely transliterated,²⁴ the only least approach thereto being "lactuce agrestes quas rustici sarcallias

²¹ Hermann Suchier's text, printed in his *Denkmäler provenzalischer Literatur*, I (1883), was based on eight manuscripts in the British Museum, the fragment from MS. Sorbonne 955 (now Latin 16170 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) printed by Jourdain, *Recherches* (1843), p. 117, and the text of *Secretum secretorum* published with the works of Achillini in 1501. But he by no means covers the variant readings of the Paris MS, henceforth to be cited as BN. 16170.

²² Robert Steele, *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, Fasc. V, *Secretum secretorum cum glossis et notulis* . . . , pp. xvii-xviii.

²³ The use of *posse* as a noun in the very next line somewhat militates against having it as an infinitive here, but it makes better sense than *perfici* alone, and is found also in Basel F.II.6, fol. 207va.

²⁴ Yet in the corresponding chapters of the thirteenth century translation of the entire *Secretum secretorum* by Philip of Tripoli, who is supposed to have known and utilized the earlier translation of the medical extract from it, we find "Post hoc accipias alacod" (Steele, *op. cit.*, p. 69, line 29) where the earlier translation has "Postea accipies de generibus aloes" (Suchier lines 35-36).

vocant sive scorias, sartabas” (Suchier lines 101–102), which is paralleled by a citation of Dioscorides in the thirteenth century Herbal of Rufinus, “lactuca agrestis quam sarrallia vocant.”²⁵ Also the closing sentence of modest self-depreciation and the earlier allusion to his inexperience would seem more appropriate for a beginner than for John of Seville later in his career.

On the whole, however, I think that we may accept this medical fragment from *Secretum secretorum* as an early translation by John of Seville, with the probability that some of his undated astrological translations may be put between it and his translation of the Greater Introduction of Albumasar in 1133. This being the case, it becomes chronologically the less likely that he had anything to do with either Avendeth or Gundisalvus.

In a Vienna manuscript is a marvelous cure for the disease of the stone which John of Seville is said to have sent to pope Gregory when he was suffering from that ill. It consists of a seal or plate of pure gold, on which is to be carved the form of a lion, while the sun is in Leo, and the moon is not in aspect with the sixth house, and the lord of the ascendent is not in aspect with Saturn. It is to be bound on the loins opposite the kidneys. One physician stamped the seal in franckincense and gave it to the patient in drink, et statim liberabatur.²⁶

This cure may seem superstitious and its attribution apocryphal. There was the antipope Gregory VIII from 1118 to 1121, and Gregory VIII of 1187, thirty years after the date sometimes set for the death of John of Seville. Certainly in the case of neither could the cure have been said to be lasting. Yet it is similar to that later recommended by so great a medical authority as Peter of Abano and still later, when employed by a physician of Montpellier, condemned by Jean Gerson.²⁷ If genuine and addressed to the earlier antipope, it would tend to corroborate the early interest of John of Seville in medicine, indicated by his translation for the queen of Spain, and to indicate that he had a widespread reputation in court circles. It might even seem somewhat puzzling why he should turn to astrological translation later.

In a manuscript of the Laurentian library at Florence, Plut. 30, cod. 29, the medical extract from the *Secretum secretorum* is immediately followed, at fol. 59r, by John’s translation of Thebit ben Corat on astrological images, with the rubric: “Incipit liber imaginum Thesbith translatus a Iohanni hispaniensi atque luniensi in lunia ex arabico in latinum.” This is favorable to the conclusion that the same John, here called of Spain in the one case, and of Spain and Luna in the other, translated both works. We therefore turn to Luna and to evidence for the further conclusion that John of Spain and Luna was the same translator as the John of Seville who translated the Greater Introduction of Albumasar in 1133.

The next fixed date in the career of John of Seville after his translation in 1133 of the Greater Introduction of Albumasar appears to have been his translation of the Rudiments of Astronomy of Alfraganus in 1135 at Luna. In the manuscripts the year is usually indicated by its equivalents: the Arabic year 529 and

²⁵ Lynn Thorndike, *The Herbal of Rufinus* (1945), p. 162.

²⁶ Vienna Latin MS. 5311, 14–15th century, fol. 41vb.

²⁷ *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 899; IV, 122.

the year 1173 of the Spanish era. This is the case in what is possibly the oldest extant copy of the work: Erfurt, Amplon. Q.351, of the second half of the twelfth century, fols. 103–130, where, moreover, the translator is designated as John of Seville and of Luna: “Perf. lib. Alfr. in sc. ast. et rad. mot. cel. interp. a Ioh. Ispalensi Ilimia [in limia?] atque Limensi et expl. est die xxiii die (?) V mensis lunaris anni Arabum DXXIX, xi die mensis Martii era MCLXXIII.”²⁸ A manuscript at Florence of the 13–14th century, also puts the translation in Luna by John of Seville and Luna in 1135.

Bibl. Naz. Centrale, Conv. soppr. J.II.10, fols. 151r–175r: liber Alphragani interpretatus in Luna a Iohanne hispalensi atque lunensi et expletus 20 die 5 mensis lunaris anni arabum 529 (*Aristoteles Latinus*, MS. 1403).

In Berne 404, a membrane codex of the 13th century, fols. 53v–56v, 9r–22v, the work concludes:

. . . quod sufficiat si deus voluerit. Perfectus est liber Alphragani in scientia astrorum et radicibus motuum celestium interpretatus in Lunia a Iohanne Hispalensi atque Lunensi. Expletus est die vicesimo quarto V mensis lunaris anni Arabum quingentesimi XXVIII existente xi^o die mensis Martis era M.CLXXIII sub laude dei et auxilio.

If we believe a manuscript of the 15th century at the Bodleian, Digby 194, both Omar and Thebit on astrological images were translated by John of Seville and Luna; and the latter at Luna.

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.

147v, Finit liber O [for *imaginum*] Thesbith bencorath translatus a Iohanne Hispalensi atque Lunensi in Luna ex arabico in latinum.

This completes the evidence that the John of Spain and Luna, and the John of Seville and Luna, who made the same translation of Thebit on astrological images, were the same individual.

We do not need to identify Avendauth with John of Seville in order to bring the latter into relations with the archbishop of Toledo. Indeed, while Avendauth addresses Raymond’s successor John as to his association with Gundisalvus, John of Seville dedicates his translation of Costa ben Luca, *De differentia spiritus et anime*, to Raymond without any mention of Gundisalvus.²⁹ This is sufficiently

²⁸ From Schum, *Verzeichniss der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung* (1887), p. 590. In Amplon. F.378, c.1300, fols. 1–18v, as in some other MSS., the Arabic year is given as 528 and the other as 170, while John is called Hispaniensi atque Lunensi: *ibid.*, p. 264. For Oxford MSS. Digby 190 and Corpus Christi 224, see my *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 74–75, note 5. Of MSS at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, latin 6506, 13th century, fols. 27r–38v, Iohannes Hyspāniensis atque Lunensis is named as translator (*Aristoteles Latinus*, MS. 587); while in 7377B, 14–15th century, f. 119v, “interpretatus in luna a Iohanne Hispanensi atque lunensi . . .” the incorrect data LXXM appears again (Duhem, *Le système du monde*, III, 178).

²⁹ C. S. Barach, *Bibliotheca philosophorum mediae aetatis*, II (1878), 120–139: Costa Ben Luca, *De differentia animae et spiritus liber quem filius Lucae medici, nomine Costa-Ben-Lucaae, cuidam amico suo scriptori cuiusdam regis edidit, Iohannes Hispalensis ex arabico in latinum Raimundo Toletano Archiepiscopo transtulit.*

attested by incipits or colophons in manuscripts, although often the text is found anonymously, or is incorrectly ascribed to Augustine, Constantinus Africanus, and others.

Naples VIII.E.24, 13th century, fols. 172v-175r (from *Aristoteles Latinus*, 1955, MS, 1478): In dei nomine et eius auxilio incipit differentia inter animam et spiritum quem Contabulus luce cuidam amico scriptori cuiusdam regis edidit et Iohannes Hispalensis ex arabico in latinum Raimundo Toletano archiepiscopo transtulit.

Venice, St. Marks VI.33, 14th century, fols. 278v-283v (AL 1595) opens with practically the same words.

Cava dei Tirreni 31, 13th century, fols. 244r-245r (AL 1313): Explicit liber de differentie spiritus et anime translatus a Iohanne Hispalensi de arabico in latinum Raimundo tholetano archiepiscopo.

British Museum, Sloane 2454, late 13th century, fols. 82ra-84va: In nomine dei et eius auxilio Incipit liber differentie inter animam et spiritum quem Constantinus Luce amico suo scriptori regis edidit et Ioh's Hispaniensis ex arabico in latinum Gumundo (sic) Toletano archiepiscopo transtulit.

It agrees with our other evidence that the literary activity of John of Seville antedates that of either Avendauth or Gundisalvus.³⁰

One is therefore not surprised to find that the evidence for an association of John of Seville with Gundisalvus is less satisfactory. Mlle d'Alverny, *op. cit.*, p. 40, notes "un beau manuscrit espagnol copié vers l'an 1200," Vatican, Ottobon. latin 2186, reading, "Liber Algazelis de summa theorice philosophie translatus a magistro Iohanne et D. archidiacono in Tolet. de arabico in latinum." Another manuscript of the same work, Assisi comunale 663, 13th century, fols. 146r-153r (*Aristoteles Latinus*, MS. 1267), is similarly ascribed: "Incipit liber Algazel de summa theorice philosophie translatus a magistro Iohanne et Dominico archidiacono in Toletto de arabico in latinum et primo de logica," opening, "Scientiarum quamvis multi sunt rami. . . ." But in both these cases John is called neither of Seville, nor Luna, nor Spain, nor even Toledo, although the translation is said to have been made there.

Millás Vallicrosa, describing a manuscript of about a.d. 1200 of the *Fons vitae* of Avencebrol or ibn Gebirol,³¹ which he regarded as superior to any of the four used in Baeumker's edition of that work,³² speaks of it as "traducido por Juan Hispanus," without mentioning Gundisalvus, while his quotations from the text include no mention of either. And of the four manuscripts used by Baeumker only one had at its close the verses naming John of Spain and Domingo as the translators:

³⁰ In one MS. we have R. for Raymond and archdeacon instead of archbishop. Basel F.IV.23, early 13th century, membrane, in- 4, fols. 42v-46v: In nomine die et auxilio eius Incipit liber de differentia spiritus et anime quem Constabul' edidit et Iohannes Hispaniensis ex arabico in latinum transtulit. R. toletano archidiacono transtulit. Nothing is said as to the translator in Basel F.IV.28 of the 13-14th century, fols. 81va-86rb.

³¹ *Las traducciones orientales* (1942), pp. 79-81.

³² "Avencebrolis (Ibn Gebirol) Fons Vitae ex Arabico in Latinum translatus ab Iohanne Hispano et Domenico Gundissalino," ed. Clemens Baeumker, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, I, 2-4 (1895).

Libro prescripto sit laus et gloria Christo
 Per quem finitur quod ad eius nomen initur.
 Transtulit Hispanis interpret lingua Iohannis,
 Hunc ex Arabico non absque iuvante Domingo.

The identification of Avendauth with Abraham iban Daūd has been suggested by Mlle d'Alverny,³³ but is subject to the objection that Avendauth seems never to be called Abraham. In this connection she notes that "un fragment d'astronomie" (rather, astrological) in Madrid 10015 opens, "Dixit Abraham et Iben-deut . . ." and proposes to delete the *et*.³⁴ This is the case in two codices at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, latin 7316, "Dixit magister Abraamus Isben-deuth . . ." and 7307, "Dixit magister Abraamus Bendeur . . ." as I have shown elsewhere.³⁵ But the refutation of the Trutina of Hermes which these incipits introduce seems rather far afield from the interests of Avendeuth, although of course at that time almost anyone was interested in and might write on astrology. But by and large it would seem advisable to cease trying to identify Avendauth Israelita, which is a sufficiently distinctive and recognizable name in and of itself, with anyone else.

Albertus Magnus offers a more certain reference to Avendauth, when he says of Avendar Israelita, as his text (*De predicabilibus*, IX,1) has come down to us through copyists of manuscripts and early modern editors:

Tamen adhuc sunt quedam que utile est scire de his que de doctrinis Arabum in latinum transtulit Avendar Israelita philosophus et maxime de Logica Avicenne.³⁶

To this reference corresponds the prologue to the Latin translation of Avicenna's Logic in MS Bruges 510:

Verba Auendeuch Israhelite. Studiosam animam nostram ad appetitum translacionis libri Auicenne quem Asschife [Sifa] id est Sufficientiam nuncupavit inuitare cupiens quedam capitula intencionum uniuersalium que logico negotio preposuit in principio istius libri dominacioni vestre curauit in latinum eloquium ex arabico transmutare . . .

In a manuscript at the Bodleian, Oxford, of the 13th century, Selden sup. 24 (Bernard 3412), fols. 75r–83v, are entitled *Metaphysica Avendauth*, but actually the text which opens, "Omnis causa primaria plus est influens . . .," is the pseudo-Aristotelian *De causis* in the translation by Gerard of Cremona. See *Aristoteles Latinus*, MS. 340.³⁷

John of Seville has sometimes been confused with Geber, the Spanish astronomer, because of a passage in the *Speculum astronomiae* of Albertus Magnus which Borgnet gives as follows in his edition of Albert's *Opera*, x, 632, col. 1:

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 35 et seq.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 39–40.

³⁵ *Isis*, 47 (1956), p. 395, note 27.

³⁶ *Revue néo-scholastique*, 1938, p. 377. As quoted by Mlle d'Alverny from Jammy-Borgnet, it reads ". . . ex logicis doctrinis," and ". . . de Logica Aristotelis."

³⁷ A different text is Bodleian, Digby 217, 14th century, fols. 95–(96): "Liber Avendauth de uniuersalibus assumptus ex quinto Methaphysice Avicenne," opening, "Usus fuit ut cum hec v distinguerentur . . .," closing, "Et hoc postea certifiabitur in philosophya prima. Amen. Avendauth explic."

Corrigitur et apud Thebith motus sphaerae stellarum fixarum in libro quî sic incipit: Imaginabor sphaeram. Et apud Joannem Ulgebumb Hispalensem motus Veneris et Mercurii in libro quem nominavit flores suos.

The passage should read, "Ioannem vel Geberum Hispalensem" — John or Geber of Seville. Thus in the manuscripts of the *Speculum astronomiae*, Boston Medical Library 22 has (fol. 1v, line 8) "Et apud Iohannem vel Gebud ysipanensem motum veneris et mercurii in libro quem nominavit flores suos," while in Digby 228 of the Bodleian we read (fol. 76va) "et apud Iohannem vel Gebum hispalensem motus veneris et mercurii in libro quem nominat flores suos." Steinschneider said that he knew of no such work, though he had been collecting information concerning John of Seville for twenty years. It is, of course, the *Flores* or *Elementa astronomica* of Jâbir ibn Aflah (Geber filius Afflay), who is called of Seville in Madrid MS. 10006 of the thirteenth century: 1r, "Prologus Geber super Almagesti. Verba Geber filii Afflay hypsalensis. Scientia species habet quarum melior. . . ." But his translator was Gerald of Cremona, not John of Seville: 152r, "Hunc librum transtulit in Toledo magister G. Cremonensis de arabico in latinum."³⁸

The confusing of Geber with John of Seville was continued by Guglielmo Pastrengo, a correspondent of Petrarch, who wrote:

Ioannes Getir Hispalensis astrologus composuit
Opus quod flores suos intitulavit
Item libellum qui incipit, Intellexi . . .
Et alium qui incipit, Astronomicae considerationis . . .
Item alium qui incipit, Primum capitulum . . .
Et alium qui incipit, Cinctura firmamenti . . .
Item alium qui incipit, Forma spherica . . .
Item alium qui nominatur Secunda pars artis et
incipit, Primum est considerare . . .
Item alium qui incipit Tertia pars artis et incipit,
Est sciendum . . .³⁹

Of these titles and incipits only the Flores is surely by Geber. The second, fifth and perhaps the last two belong to John of Seville; for the other three Pastrengo seems to be our sole source. Albertus Magnus in *Speculum astronomiae* ascribed that which opens "Cinctura firmamenti . . ." to John of Seville.

With regard to John of Seville catalogues of manuscripts are not always reliable, as we have already noted in the case of Haenel. Or we find Coxe, in the Catalogue of Canonicus manuscripts in the Bodleian, failing to correct the ascription to John of Seville of the well known Theory of the Planets which opens, "Circulus eccentricus dicitur vel egressio cuspidis . . ." and is usually attributed to Gerard of Cremona (Canon. misc. 436, anno 1468, fol. 8)

³⁸ Millás Vallicrosa, *Los traducciones orientales* (1942), p. 151. Francis J. Carmody, *Arabic Astronomical and Astrological Sciences in Latin Translation: a Critical Bibliography* (1956), pp. 163-64.

³⁹ Guglielmus Pastregicus Veronensis, *De originibus rerum libellus in quo agitur de scripturi virorum illustrium . . .*, Venice, 1547, fol. 38r. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici . . .* (1905), p. 7, says that Pastrengo had a special passion for astrology and a library which included at least 25 astrological authors.

The same error was allowed to pass unnoticed in the printed catalogue of the Ashburnham manuscripts in the Laurentian library at Florence with respect to Ashburnham 139 (213.-145), 15th century, fols. 31-50v: incipit, "Circulus eccentricus dicitur . . .," but Finis, "Liber Theoricæ planetarum compositus a Ioanne Ispalensi finit."

These two examples warn us not to put too much faith in attributions of texts to John of Seville by the copyists of 15th century manuscripts or by their modern cataloguers.

Haskins in 1924 made the statement: "Various manuscripts of abu Ali's work on the same subject (of nativities) exist, all of them anonymous except one in the Bodleian (Laud. Misc. 594) which ascribes the translation to John of Seville."⁴⁰ More recently Carmody, while distinguishing another translation by Plato of Tivoli, still follows Steinschneider, Haskins, and printed editions in attributing to John of Seville the Latin version which opens, "Iste est liber in quo exposui. . . ." ⁴¹ But according to MS. Laud. Misc. 594 itself, the translator was John of Toledo, and the date of the translation, 1153. That year, therefore, must be abandoned as a date in the life of John of Seville, for whom the last certain fixed date would appear to be 1142, the date of John's own *Epitome*, when he may perhaps be considered to have ceased translating and become an author. The manuscript, which is of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, opens and closes as follows:

- 94 Albohali de nativitatibus tr. a Iohanne Toletano. Dixit Albohali, Iste est liber in quo exposui omnes significatores . . .
- 106 . . . si deus voluerit. Perfectus est liber nativitatis mense Iulii anno ab incarnatione domini millesimo clliii cum laude dei et eius auxilio.

Two manuscripts of Zael, *Liber temporum*, with quite different incipits, were noted separately in *A Catalogue of Incipits*,⁴² but have been combined as one by Carmody (p. 44), although he states that their contents are not known. He gives, presumably from MS. Dijon 449, 15th century, fol. 53, the following: "Explicit liber Zahel Benbris israelita translatus a magistro Iohanne ispalensi dei gratias," as if it also occurred in MS Canon. Misc. 396 of the Bodleian of the 14th century. But this is not noted in Coxe's catalogue of the *Canonicus* manuscripts, although he gives *titulus*, *incipit* and *desinit*. I do not believe that the two texts are the same work. The Dijon incipit, "Scito quod mutatio . . .," suggests that it is concerned with *temporum* in the sense of weather changes. That of the other manuscript, "De eo quod non sit in xii signis ex [not *et*, as in Carmody] electionibus. Cum volueris scribere epistolam . . .," indicates that it is concerned with the election of favorable times for this and that. Therefore, without further proof, John of Seville should not be considered to be its translator. Incidentally, in the case of the other work, it may be worth noting that, whereas Zahel Benbris

⁴⁰ *Studies in Mediaeval Science* (1924), pp. 76-77.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 49-51.

⁴² Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin* (1937), cols. 174, 652.

is called Israelita in the Explicit, Iohannes Ispalensis is not. Indeed, he never is, to the best of my recollection.

The Liber temporum by Zael which opens, "Scito quod tempora contingunt ex motibus . . .," is apparently without indication of a translator (see Carmody, pp. 41-43). But the text in a Munich manuscript of the 15th or 16th century (cod. lat. 2841, fols. 53r-58r), which has a variant incipit and different desinit, is there said to have been translated by master John from Arabic to Latin. But Seville or any other place is not mentioned in that connection.

- 53r Incipit liber iudiciorum astrorum translatus per magistrum Iohannem de arabico in latinum, opening, Scito quod tempora excitant motus. Sit igitur initium motus qui fit in circulo usque in finem temporis . . .
- 53v Cognicio temporum precipua
- 54r De inventione temporis significatoris
- 54v Scientia cognitionis temporum
- 55r Capitulum de vita hominis
- 55v Tempus vero interrogationis
- 56r Capitulum domus filiorum
Caput de infirmitatibus
Caput de tempore belli
- 57r Caput de peregrinationibus
- 57v Caput reversionis peregrinationis
Caput de epistola et rumoribus
- 58r (destinit) . . . cui iungitur tempus adventus epistole.

A manuscript of the 14th century in the library of St Marks at Venice, fondo antico 343 (Valentinelli, XI, 102) contains at fols. 17-95, the Latin translation of the Greater Introduction of Albumasar, at 107-131 John of Seville's own *Epitome artis astrologiae*, and at 150-153 the translation of Thebit on engraved images. All are duly ascribed to John of Seville, but in the first two instances, according to Valentinelli's catalogue, he is called merely Hispalensis, while in the third we read "Finit liber imaginum Thebith ben Chorah translatus a Ioanne Hispalensi atque luniensi in lunia ex arabico in latinum." Omar on nativities at fols. 131-148 likewise appears to be John's translation, having only a slightly variant form of incipit: "Aomar de nativitatibus libri tres, opening, Dixit Aomar ibn Alfragani, Scito quod distinctiones nativitatum in nutritione sunt quatuor. . . ." The last tract in the MS., at fols. 153-157, is an anonymous *De pluviis*, opening: "Sapientes mundi (in other MSS., Indi) de pluviis iudicant secundum lunam considerantes ipsius mansiones et conversiones vel aspectus planetarum ad ipsam. . . ." This tract is elsewhere attributed to Ja'far, who is sometimes identified with Albumasar,⁴³ so that possibly John of Seville is the

⁴³ Carmody, however, lists Ja'far Indus (Gafar) separately, though he includes Adelard of Bath's translation of *Isagoga minor Iapharis* under Albumasar. He does not note our MS either for *De pluviis* or Omar on nativities, although he does so for the other two tracts which we are about to mention.

translator of it too. The Elections of Hours of Haly Embrani at fols. 96–106, are usually ascribed to Savasorda and Plato of Tivoli as translators. No translator is named here or in the fairly numerous other manuscripts of Messahala's *Libellus interpretationum* or *De occultis*,⁴⁴ at fols. 148–150, opening, "Scito quod caespicians (usually aspiciens) in astrologia poterit errare quatuor modis . . . ," but the fact that it here is found sandwiched between John of Seville's translations of Omar and of Thebit suggests him as a likely claimant.

A number of treatises and translations by, or extracts from John of Seville in Latin manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (7292, 7293A, 7316, 7316A, 7321) have been listed or discussed more fully elsewhere.⁴⁵ It may be added here that the passage anent fixed stars in the treatise of John of Seville which in BN 7316A runs: "In Ariete est unum de syderibus primi honoris. Est ibi hodierno tempore 1146 annorum Christi complectorum 15° 36' latitudo eius syderis 19° 20' in latere dextro . . ." in Digby 38 at the Bodleian, 14th century, fol. 83v, reads: "Est in ipso de sideribus unum primi honoris. Est hodierno tempore 1102 anno 3 gradus et 32 minuta. Latitudo sideris est 19° 60' in latere dextro. . . ." Actually the correct date for the Isagoge of John of Seville, from which this passage stems, is 1142.

Moritz Steinschneider in 1905, reviewing his past investigation of European translations from the Arabic, drew up a list of those by John of Seville, with whom he identified Avendeuth, under letters of the alphabet from a to u, which may be very briefly summarized as follows:

- a Ahmad b. Jusuf or Haly eben Rodan, Commentary on the Centiloquium ascribed to Ptolemy
- b Pseudo-Aristotle, Epistola de conservatione corporis humani
- c De causis
- d Avicenna de anima
- e al-Battani (? Betheni) Centiloquium
- f Costa ben Luca, Diff. inter animam et spiritum
- g Al-Farabi de scientiis
- h Alfraganus
- i Avicebron, Fons vitae
- k Al-Gazzali
- l Alcabitius
- m Albohali on nativities
- n Al-Khowarizmi, Arithmetic (ed. Boncompagni, 1857)
- o Alkindi, De intellectu
- p Albumasar
- q Albucasim de Magerith, De astrolabio
- r Messahala
- s Omar on nativities
- t Haly Abenragel, Regulae utiles de electionibus
- u Thebit de imaginibus.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Carmody, 33–35; *Osiris*, XII (1956), 54–56.

⁴⁵ Lynn Thorndike, "Notes on Some Astronomical, Astrological and Mathematical Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris," *Journal of the Warburg Institute* (1958), 112–163.

⁴⁶ "Die europäischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Arabischen . . .," *Sitzungsberichte d. kaiserl. Akad. d. Wiss., Philos. Hist. Klasse*, Vienna, 149 (1905), 40–50.

Of these I reject c, d, e, g, i, k, and m, as by Avendeth, Gundisalvus, and other translators for reasons which have or will be given.

A more recent and much more detailed bibliography may be had by consulting the Index, under Iohannes Hispalensis, of Francis J. Carmody, *Arabic Astronomical and Astrological Sciences in Latin Translation: A Critical Bibliography* (1956). To its findings also, however, we have had or shall have occasion sometimes to take exception.

Steinschneider and Carmody seem in agreement as to the four astrological works by Messahala, of which they assign translations to John of Seville, but Carmody adds that on the astrolabe. They agree in attributing translations of Albumasar's *Maius Introductorium*, *De magnis coniunctionibus*, and *Flores* to John of Seville. Steinschneider was doubtful if he translated *De imbribus*, and Carmody makes no attribution for it, but credits John of Seville, as Steinschneider did not, with translation of *De revolutionibus annorum*. Steinschneider gave the translation of Abulcasim *De astrolabio* to John, but Carmody suggests, John of Seville and/or Plato of Tivoli. Their ascription of Albohali on nativities belongs rather as we have seen, to John of Toledo in 1153. Steinschneider listed among John of Seville's translations "al-Battani (? Betheni) Centiloquium oder lib. de consuetudinibus in iudiciis astrofum." This was rather the *Centiloquium* Bethen of Beteni, or *De consuetudinibus* of Abraham Avenezra in the translation by Peter of Abano,⁴⁷ and is not included by Carmody. Both properly include John of Seville's translations of Alfraganus,⁴⁸ of Omar on nativities, Haly Abenragel on elections,⁴⁹ and Thebit on images. Likewise, of the *Centiloquium* ascribed to Ptolemy with the commentary upon it of Haly ibn Ridwan or Ahmad ben Yusurf.

In 1857 Boncompagni published in his *Trattati d'aritmetica*, II: *Ioannis Hispalensis Liber algorismi de pratica arismetrice*, at pp. 25–136, from latin manuscript 7359 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, fols. 85r–111v. This text followed the usual arrangement of mediaeval arithmetics or algorismi, taking up first, number; then, addition, subtraction, doubling, halving, multiplication, division, fractions, and roots; but is an early instance of the use of Hindu-Arabic numerals and in closing has a little concerning hidden numbers or unknown quantities. It was not quite clear whether this was a translation by John of Seville of a text by Al-Khwarizmi, as Steinschneider listed it, or was a work of John himself. The initial rubric runs: "Incipit prologus in libro algoarismi de practica arismetrice qui editus (not *interpretatus* or *translatus*) est a magistro Iohanne yspalensi." The prologue then opens: "Quiquis (*sic*) in quatuor matheoses disciplinis . . ." and covers fourteen lines, after which is another rubric: "Incipit liber algoarismi de practica arismetrice," and the text proper then opens: "Unitas est origo et prima pars numeri. . . ."

In another manuscript of the early thirteenth century at Erfurt, Amplon.

⁴⁷ *Isis*, 35 (1944), 299.

⁴⁸ But the date in Carmody, p. 113 should be a.d. 1135, not 1137.

⁴⁹ Carmody, pp. 153, 139, assigns the selfsame text (Vienna 3124, fols. 13r-15r), to him and to Haly Embrani.

Q.355, fols. 85–115, a text with the same incipit, “Quisquis in quatuor matheseos disciplinis efficacius . . .” but closing, “. . . necessario 4 remanent,” at p. 127, line 12, of Boncompagni’s text, is represented as translated by Gerard of Cremona.⁵⁰ In a third manuscript it is anonymous: Florence, Bibl. Naz. Centrale, conv. soppr. J.V.18, 14th century, fols. 53v–70r: same incipit but the desinit does not seem to occur in Boncompagni’s text.⁵¹

Carmody has erroneously associated the two incipits of the aforesaid arithmetic and Boncompagni’s edition of it with the translation of Al-Khowarizmi’s Algebra which was edited by Libri⁵² and which opens, “Hic post laudem dei et ipsius exalationem. . . .”⁵³ Furthermore, instead of accepting Boncompagni’s text as by John of Seville, he has listed as a third translation of the Algebra of Al-Khowarizmi what is a work in five books on all branches of the quadrivium, opening, “Quoniam de quarta introducendis matheseos . . .” which Haskins showed good reason to believe was translated by Adelard of Bath.⁵⁴

On the other hand, Carmody, who lists a great many manuscripts of works by Alcabitus,⁵⁵ assigns translations of three to John of Seville, where Steinschneider distinguished only one or two.

Of the tract by Alkindi on the intellect Jourdain ascribed both Latin versions, respectively entitled *De intellectu* and *De ratione*, to Gerard of Cremona. *De ratione* is attributed to him in Latin manuscript 6443 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, while *De intellectu* is found in the same codex without ascription. Nagy, who in 1897 edited both versions in opposite columns and pages,⁵⁶ wrote: “Die andere Version mit dem Titel de intellectu dürfte die Arbeit eines anderen Uebersetzer sein, vielleicht des Johannes Hispalensis.”⁵⁷ And the manuscripts which he used apparently gave no indication that John of Seville was the translator.⁵⁸ Yet both Steinschneider in 1905, and Carmody in 1956, assign it to John of Seville, citing Nagy.

A word may be added concerning further manuscripts of John of Seville seen

⁵⁰ According to Schum’s *Verzeichniss*; I have not seen the MS.

⁵¹ Björnbo in *Bibliotheca mathematica*, 3 Folge, 12 (1912), 220–221.

⁵² *Histoire des sciences mathématiques en Italie*, 1 (1838), 253–289; (1865) 263–297.

⁵³ This translation has been ascribed not only, as Carmody notes, to Gerard of Cremona and William de Lunis (for the latter see fols. 80r–86r of the aforesaid Florentine MS and Bibl. math. 12, 221 but also to a Simon of Cremona: Vatican Latin MS. 5733, fols. 275r–287r. The best attested translation is that by Robert of Chester in a.d. 1145, with a different incipit.

⁵⁴ Charles H. Haskins, *Studies in Medieval Science*, p. 24. Carmody, *Arabic Astronomical and Astrological Sciences in Latin Translation* (1956), pp. 47–48.

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, 146–149; but his Zinner 10380–88 should be 80–88.

⁵⁶ *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Band II, Heft 5, pp. 1–11.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. xv.

⁵⁸ Nagy merely listed the MSS at pp. xxx–xxxii, without giving titulus, incipit, desinit, explicit, or even the fols. covered. He further committed at least four errors: cod. Amplon. 40 fol. does not contain *De intellectu* according to Schum’s *Verzeichniss*; Digby S. (for Seite) 217, should be HS. 217; Cod. Morton Coll. 228 should be Cod. Merton College 278; and instead of Venedig. Cod. Marc. 391 (Valentinelli, II, s. 27) one should understand cod. VI, 150 (X, 39 in Valentinelli, IV, 27). I have examined the fuller descriptions in the catalogues of manuscripts of six of the MSS and none of them gives evidence that John of Seville was the translator.

since the above went to press. At the British Museum I examined three of the treatise to the queen of Spain. In Additional 26770, 13–14 century, fols. 116ra–117vb, she was called Teophina; in Sloane 405, 15th century, fols. 23v–25v, Thapsia; in Sloane 420, early 14th century, fols. 180r–183v, she was unnamed. Sloane 405 gave only a brief summary, expressed in indirect discourse, of the letter of John to the queen. It contained no reference to, and the other two MSS omitted from the letter, the passage as to the writer's method of translation. At Munich, in cod. lat. 18927, fols. 68v–69v, as in Canon. Misc. 396, late 14th century, fols. 89ra–91vb, at Oxford, the *Epistola* of Messahala is said to be “translatu ab(a) Iohanne Yspalensi in Limia ex arabico in latinum.” But in Canon. Misc. 517, 15th century, fols. 21va–23rb, John is called *Ispano* and “in Limia” is omitted. In the Munich MS. at fol. 130ra, “Incipit liber Messehalle de receptione interpretatus a Iohanne Yspalensi de arabico in latinum.” At Oxford, Bodleian Digby 190, c. 1300, fol. 87va, and Corpus Christi College 224, fol. 69r, confirm the usual dating for John's translation of Alfraganus. At the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, latin MS. 6296, fol. 308va:

In dei nomine et eius auxilio incipit liber differentie inter animam et spiritum quem filius Luce medici nomine Constabulus cuidam amico suo scriptori cuiusdam regis ededit, Iohannes Yspalensis ex arabico in latinum Remundo Tolletano archiepiscopo transtulit.

Latin MS. 7306, 15th century,

64v—Isagoge Iohannis Hyspalensis. Zodiacus sive . . . (?) conclusa in 12 partes equales.

69r Explicunt ysagoge Iohannis Hyspalensis.

70r Quadripartitus Iohannis Hyspalensis. Quoniam huic arti Ysagoges. . .

87r Explicit Quadripartitus Iohannis Hyspallensis.

At Milan, Trivulz, 726, 15th century, Iohannes Ispanensis, *Astronomia*, was no longer in the library at the Castello. At the British Museum, Royal 12.C.XI, 14th century, fols. 30ra–55vb, “Explicit introductorius hyspalensis”; and Arundel 268, 13–14th century, fols. 7vb–23va,

Perfectus est introductorius abdilaziz, id est, servi gloriosissimi dei qui dicitur Alcabitius ad magisterium iudiciorum astrorum cum laude dei et eius adiutorio interpretatus a Iohanne Yspalensi. Explicit Alkabitius, Amen.

In Corpus Christi 248, 13th century, at fol. 82ra–b, John's translation of the *Introductorium maius* of Albumasar is followed by

Sequitur catalogus librorum ab Arabis scriptorum quos forsitan transtulerat Iohannes Hyspalensis in Latinum.

Albumasser de coniunctionibus. Titulus hic est liber in summa de significacionibus individuorum superiorum super accidentia que efficiuntur in mundo generacionis de presencia eorum respectu(?) ascendencium incepcionum coniunctionalium et aliorum et corrupcionis. Et sunt 8 tractatus et 63 differentie editus a Iafar astrologo qui dictus est Albumasar. Tractatus primus qualiter aspicitur ex parte coniunctionum apparicio prophetarum et eorum qui principes, et continet 60 folia.

Hunc sequitur de revolutionibus annorum (*interlinear*, id est, de experimentis) et continet 15 fol.

Sequuntur Flores Album. qui continent 10 folia. Hoc habeo et precedentem.

Sequitur quod non habeo de . . . (?) revolutione annorum ex libro Albumasar in revolutione

nativitatis extracte, Omne tempus breve est operandi, continet 8 fol. sed videtur quod Albumassar non fecit ipsum.

Sequitur liber Aomar de nativitatibus filii Alfragani de nativitatibus. Dixit Aomar ben Alfragan Tyberiadis Scito quod diffinitiones nativitatis in intencionibus sunt quatuor. Continet 14 fol.

Sequitur Albohali de nativitatibus et earum significatoribus. Dixit Albohali Iste est liber in quo exposui omnes significatores super nativitates de scientia iudiciorum stellarum. Hoc continet 14 fol.

Sequitur Alkindi de mutacione temporum, Rogatus fui quod manifestarem consilia philosophorum in quibus concordaverunt de impressionibus superioribus, et continet 8(?) fol.

Sequitur alius liber de mutacione temporum continens fol. i, Sapientes Indi de pluviis iudicant secundum lunam. . . .

Sequitur Messahalla in radicibus revolutionum. Primum capitulum est de ratione circuli et stellarum et qualiter operantur in hoc mundo. Dixit Messahalla quia dominus altissimus fecit terram ad similitudinem spere. Continet duo fol.

Sequitur Messahalla de revolutionibus annorum, Custos te deus, et continet 7 fol.

Sequitur idem de receptionibus. Habet 9 fol.

Liber introductorius Alcabici, Cingulus planetarum figuratur omni hora tali figura.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY