

Fernando SALMÓN
Universidad de Cantabria
fernando.salmon@unican.es
ORCID: 0000-0002-6244-9554

REVISITING THE ARNALDIAN AUTHORSHIP
OF THE COMMENTARY ON THE *DE MORBO ET ACCIDENTI**

Abstract: In 1994, in collaboration with Luis García Ballester and Eustaquio Sánchez Salor at the first *Trobada Internacional d'Estudis sobre Arnau de Vilanova*, we reflected on the Arnaldian authorship of the commentary on *De morbo et accidenti*. Our analysis was based on the only extant manuscript (Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 781, ff. 131r-157v) that dates the copy to 1335 and attributes the work to Arnau de Vilanova (c. 1240-1311). After examining a number of arguments, we decided not to rule out the possibility of Arnaldian authorship *lato sensu*, either as totally genuine or as a product of a re-elaboration of genuine materials carried out by an anonymous colleague. Without closing this possibility down, the present paper invites us to move the focus of the discussion out of Montpellier and to revisit the authorship of the Kraków commentary in dialogue with the Italian tradition of commentators on *De morbo et accidenti* outlined in 1345 by Gentile da Foligno (d. 1348).

Keywords: Arnau de Vilanova, *De morbo et accidenti*, medical commentaries, authorship, medical scholasticism.

In 1994, in collaboration with Luis García Ballester and Eustaquio Sánchez Salor at the first *Trobada Internacional d'Estudis sobre Arnau de Vilanova*, we reflected on the Arnaldian authorship of the commentary on *De morbo et accidenti*. Our analysis was based on the only extant copy from the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków, Poland (Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 781, ff. 131r-157v). The manuscript has a colophon that dates the copy to 1335 and attributes the work to Arnau de Vilanova. Since Arnau referred to his commentary on *De morbo et accidenti* in two of his genuine works, we worked with the hypothesis that this singular copy attributed to him was authentically his. After examining a number of arguments in favor of and against this attribution we decided not to rule out the possibility of Arnaldian authorship *lato*

* Acknowledgments: I am grateful to the organisers of the IV *Trobada* for their invitation and to the participants for their feedback and comments. The research has been funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (PID2019-107671GB-I00 /AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033).

sensu, either as totally genuine or as a product of a re-elaboration of genuine materials carried out by an anonymous colleague.¹

This is not the only case faced by the modern critical edition of the medical works of Arnau concerning problematic attributions and the *opera dubia* or *incerta* have always been on the table. However, it was clear for the AVOMO editorial board that the bulk of editorial effort should go towards the completion of the edition of Arnau's genuine works before embarking on the exploration of *dubia* and thus the commentary was left in limbo.

With the announced publication in 2022 of the *De parte operativa* and the last volumes of genuine works underway, it seems like a good time to resume the discussion on the Arnaldian authorship of the Kraków commentary on the *De morbo et accidenti*, taking advantage of the e-convivial gathering that the IV *Trobada* offers.

Research on the topic remains today much as it stood in our 1995 paper published in *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics*; however, during these two decades I have collected a few new pieces of information that will not close the discussion but would invite us to explore the subject from a different perspective.

For those who are not familiar with the *De morbo et accidenti*, just a few lines to say that in the Latin West a collection of four works of Galen on general pathology was known under this name —the disease, its causes and its signs and symptoms— that were distributed in six books: Books 1 to 3 are respectively *De morborum differentiis*, *De morborum causis* and *De symptomatum differentiis* and books four to six are the *De symptomatum causis*.²

By the 13th and early 14th centuries, at least two Latin translations were available and read: one from the Arabic and one from the Greek. The one from the Arabic is an anonymous translation that goes under the name of *De morbo et accidenti* or *De accidenti et morbo*.³ The number of extant manuscripts (more

1. LUIS GARCÍA BALLESTER – Fernando SALMÓN – Eustaquio SÁNCHEZ SALOR, «Tradición manuscrita y autoría: sobre la posible autenticidad del comentario de Arnau de Vilanova al *De morbo et accidenti* de Galeno», *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics*, 14 (1995), 70-74.

2. Richard DURLING, «Corrigenda and addenda to Diels' Galenica», *Traditio*, 23 (1967), 467-68; *Idem*, 37 (1981), 377.

3. This is the title, for example, that can be found in the *explicit* of Bartolomeo da Varignana and Gentile da Foligno's commentaries: «Expliciunt exposiciones super libro de accidenti et morbo recollete sub probro viro magistro Bartholomeo de Varignana et cetera», BARTOLOMEO DA VARIGNANA, *Expositiones super libro Galieni de accidenti et morbo*, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 4452, f. 82v and «Hic finiunt notata super libro de accidenti et morbo facta per Gentile» GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, *Notata super libro de accidenti et morbo*, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm, 62, f. 104rb. However, the use of both names indistinctively is not uncommon, as is found, for example, in the Kraków commentary: «Quis sit libri titulus. Incipit libri de accidenti et morbo» and «Explicit scriptum m. arnaldi de villa nova et magistri in medicinis montispessulanis super de morbo et accidenti», ARNAU DE VILANOVA (attrib.), *Scriptum magistri arnaldi de villa nova super libro de morbo et accidenti*, Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 781, f. 131ra and 157va.

than 80) and the fact that it was the one usually commented upon in the universities speaks for its popularity.⁴ This was the version that, for example, the Parisian master Jean de Saint-Amand chose to summarize in the 1280s in his *Revocativum memorie*, a précis and guide of Galenic works for students,⁵ and it was also the version that constituted the basis for the extant commentaries on *De morbo et accidenti* discussed below. The Greco-Latin rendering usually went under the name of *De egritudine et symptomate* although it can also be referred to as *De accidenti et morbo*, similar to one of the denominations of the Arabic-Latin version. In the late 13th and early 14th centuries its presence and use was less evident than that of its Arabic-Latin counterpart.⁶ However, it is interesting to point out that some of the 14th century commentators on the *De morbo et accidenti* could have been familiar with this translation since on various occasions in their commentaries they mentioned readings from «alia translatio». An «alia translatio» that was referred to in a neutral way or, on particular instances, in a praising tone as the chosen reading.⁷ In 1345, Gentile da Foligno offered more information about the «alia translatio» he was using, stating that «alia translatio dicit Incipit liber de egritudine et synthomate»;⁸ a translation that he occasionally also recommended despite the difficulty of its Latin and that helped him to refine his exposition based on the most common *De morbo et accidenti*.⁹ As happens with the version of Arabic origin, the Greco-Latin translation was thought to be anonymous but recently Beate Gundert has suggested the name of Burgundio de Pisa as translator of one of its components, the *De symptomatum differentiis*.¹⁰

The *De morbo et accidenti* is a complex work which is more theoretical and harder to read than the *De interioribus* and devoid of the juicy clinical anecdotes that make the narrative of this latter so appealing. Like other medical

4. A list of manuscripts in: Stefania FORTUNA, *Galeno Latino. Catalogo della tradizione latina di Galeno: manoscritti ed edizioni*. <https://www.galenolatino.com/traduzioni.php?id=20&l=d&p=4>

5. OTTO PADERSTEIN, *Über Johannes de Sancto Amando*, XIII Jahrhundert, Berlin, L. Schumacher, 1892, 11-15.

6. Since the title of *De accidenti et morbo* can lead to confusions as to which version it names, direct research on individual extant manuscripts would be advisable to confirm their content on safe grounds. Even more, some commentators referred to various versions so it is not impossible that more than just two translations coexisted. For a list of manuscripts of the translation of the *De egritudine et synthomate*, see FORTUNA, *Galeno Latino*, <https://www.galenolatino.com/traduzioni.php?id=58>.

7. See, for example, the Kraków commentator: «igitur, alia translatio prefeccius habet sic dicens», ARNAU DE VILANOVA (attrib.), *Scriptum*, f. 144vb or Alberto da Bologna: «alia translatio melius habet hic», ALBERTO DA BOLOGNA, *Commentum supra tractatum Galieni de morbo et accidenti*, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Reg. MS lat. 2000, f. 50ra.

8. GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, *Notata*, f. 70ra.

9. Gentile da Foligno advised: «hic alia translatio clarior est, lege eam tamen habet latinum difficile», *ibid.* f. 87rb.

10. Beate GUNDELT, «The Graeco-Latin translation of Galen, *De symptomatum differentiis*», *Medicina nei Secoli*, 25/3 (2013), 889-926.

treatises of Galen which had been available in Latin since the twelfth century, it was widely used by the university medical masters of Bologna, Paris and Montpellier in the transition from the 13th to the 14th centuries. By 1309, it was one of the texts that were required reading at Montpellier according to the new academic ordinances¹¹ and it belongs to what Luis García Ballester has called the «new Galen» as the axis of the medical teaching reform of the time.¹² In 2011, Vivian Nutton added precision to García Ballester's claims concerning the role in medical teaching of the «new Galen», discarding the elaboration of a consistent syllabus around these Galenic works.¹³ In 2019, Michael McVaugh revisited the topic and reflected on the relevance of distinguishing between the availability and accessibility of the texts grouped under the «new Galen» and processes of assimilation of their contents. He proposed restricting this label to those texts of Galen that were not just available or accessible, but that shaped the medical thought and writings of the late 13th and early 14th centuries in Paris, Bologna and Montpellier. To this end, he listed Galen's *De complexionibus*, *De creticis diebus*, *De crisi*, *De ingenio sanitatis*, *De interioribus*, *De iuvamentis membrorum*, *De malicia complexionis diverse*, *De morbo et accidenti* and *De simplici medicina*.¹⁴ Whether taken in this more restrictive sense or in García Ballester's wider sense, the intellectual challenge implied by the reading of these new Galenic works alongside those of Arabic authors – Avicenna, Averroes and Razes – for the medical schools of the time and within this context is where the role of the *De morbo et accidenti* should be understood.

If compared with other works such as *De malicia complexionis* or *De interioribus*, the *De morbo et accidenti* must have been unusually popular in these *studia*. Apart from the resumé prepared by Jean de Saint-Amand in Paris, we know that at least ten commentaries on this work were made between ca. 1290 and 1345.

Three of the commentaries were produced at Montpellier by Arnau de Vilanova (ca. 1240-1311), Bernard de Gordon (ca. 1258 – ca. 1320) and Jordanus de Turre (fl. 1313-1335); four in Bologna by Bartolomeo da Varignana (ca. 1260-ca. 1321), Dino del Garbo (d. 1327), Alberto da Bologna (ca. 1280-after 1348) and Antonio da Parma (fl. 1315); and one in Padua or Perugia by

11. On the interpretation of these ordinances, see Danielle JACQUART, *La médecine médiévale dans le cadre parisien (XIV^e-XV^e siècle)*, Paris, Fayard, 1998, 161-167.

12. Luis GARCÍA BALLESTER, «Arnau de Vilanova (c. 1240-1311) y la reforma de los estudios médicos en Montpellier (1309): el Hipócrates latino y la introducción del nuevo Galeno», *Dynamis* 2 (1982), 97-158.

13. See Vivian NUTTON, «Introduction» in: GALEN, *On Problematical Movements*, Vivian NUTTON - Gerrit BOS (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, 91-100.

14. Michael MCVAUGH, «Galen in the medieval universities» in: Petros BOURAS-VALLIANATOS - Barbara ZIPSER (eds.) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Galen*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2019, 381-392 (esp. 386-387).

Gentile da Foligno (d. 1348). To these should be added two extant commentaries that remain anonymous.¹⁵

Problems and doubts about production, identification and attribution arise when dealing with almost all the extant commentaries. Each survives in only one manuscript copy with the exception of one of the anonymous commentaries and apart from book 4 of the Kraków commentary none of these has been edited critically.¹⁶ In our 1995 paper we presented a tentative chronology; however, the finding some years later of a commentary attributed to Gentile da Foligno forced me to introduce some changes into the picture, changes that I expounded in the monographic section devoted to medieval medicine that *Dynamis* published in 2000.¹⁷ I will come back to this commentary later. Let us focus first on the commentary attributed to Arnau.

As I said above, the commentary is contained in a single manuscript that has a colophon written in a larger scale by the same or a similar hand that states that it was finished on 18th March of 1335: «Explicit scriptum m. arnaldi de villa nova et magistri in medicinis montispessulanis super de morbo et accidenti scriptum anno domini millesimo trecentesimo tricesimo quarto in die veneris post Iudica hora none vel quasi».¹⁸

Arnau referred to a commentary on *De morbo et accidenti* composed by himself in his commentary on *De malicia complexionis diverse* (ca.1292-1295)¹⁹ and in his *De consideracionibus operis medicine* (ca.1298-1300).²⁰ The quotations are vague enough that their analysis and comparison with the content of the Kraków commentary did not contribute much evidence in favor of or against the Arnaldian attribution. However, the fact that it is quoted in *De malitia* and *De considerationibus* force us to think that the commentary on *De morbo* must have been produced in Arnau's first years of academic activity at

15. The same commentary that precedes Antonio da Parma's *quaestiones* in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 4450, ff. 57r-72v was copied in other two manuscripts: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 4466, ff. 157r-169v and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 13020, ff. 88v-94r (incomplete). The other anonymous commentary on the *De morbo et accidenti* exists in one copy: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 4454, ff. 33r-82r.

16. Fernando SALMÓN, *Las teorías de la visión en la medicina universitaria bajo-medieval: estudio y edición crítica del Arnaldi de Villanova commentum supra tractatum Galieni de morbo et accidenti cum texto Galieni, lib. IV* (c. 1288-1292/1295), Barcelona, Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1991 [Microfiche edition].

17. Fernando SALMÓN, «Technologies of authority in the medical classroom in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries», *Dynamis*, 20 (2000), 135-157.

18. ARNAU DE VILANOVA (attrib.), *Scriptum*, f. 157va.

19. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Commentum supra tractatum Galieni De malicia complexionis diverse*, Luis GARCÍA BALLESTER – Eustaquio SÁNCHEZ SALOR (eds.) (*Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia* = AVOMO XV), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 1985, 150.

20. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine sive de flebotomia*, Luke DEMAÎTRE – Pedro GIL SOTRES (eds.) (AVOMO IV), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 1988, 219 and 241.

Montpellier. Michael McVaugh has proposed the date of 1291 for the start of this activity although he does not preclude the possibility of an earlier teaching involvement.²¹ Up to 1301, when he composed his exposition on Hippocrates' first aphorism,²² this period is responsible for the production of Arnau's *De intentione medicorum*, his commentary on Galen's *De malitia complexionis diverse*, *De considerationibus*, *De dosi tyriacalium*, the *Aphorismi de gradibus* and the *De humido radicali*. The exact dates of their composition within this decade is difficult to establish but this is a plausible order.²³ Therefore, it seems that the commentary on *De morbo* should have been produced before, in parallel with or immediately after *De intentione*.

It is admitted that Averroes' commentary on Avicenna's *Cantica* was available in Latin from 1284, the *Colliget* from 1285 and *De teriaca* sometime around this time and that, at least from the mid-90s, Arnau was familiar with their content.²⁴ It is also known that in his *Aphorismi de gradibus*, Arnau stated that he had composed *De intentione*, *De considerationibus* and *De dosi* to denounce the errors into which Averroes had fallen in his invectives against Galen.²⁵ Irrespective of the fact that the anti-Averroistic tone of these works is very different and in the case of *De intentione* and *De considerationibus* not explicitly evident, it seems strange that a commentary on *De morbo* made by him and composed roughly at the same time as the *De intentione* opens with a reference to the subalternation of medicine to natural philosophy following the *Colliget* and mentioning Averroes by his name as happens in the Kraków commentary.²⁶

In fact, the key feature in an argument against its Arnaldian authorship has always been the use of Averroes shown in the Kraków commentary.

Michael McVaugh has argued convincingly that the anti-Averroistic arguments of *De intentione* could be related more to a response to the *Cantica* – and

21. «Whatever the course of events, we can say with some confidence that by 1291, and perhaps before, Arnau had left Valencia for Montpellier, was studying theology with its Dominicans, and was preparing to teach (if he was not already teaching) in the medical faculty there». Michael McVAUGH, «Averroes comes to Montpellier» in: Nicolas WEILL-PAROT (ed.), *De l'homme, de la nature et du monde: mélanges d'histoire des sciences médiévales offert à Danielle Jacquart*, Droz, Genève, 2019, 24.

22. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Repetitio super aphorismo Hippocratis 'Vita brevis'*, Michael McVAUGH (ed.) (AVOMO XIV), Barcelona, Fundació Noguera – Universitat de Barcelona, 2014, 265-270.

23. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Tractatus de intentione medicorum*, Michael McVAUGH (ed.) (AVOMO V.1), Barcelona, Fundació Noguera – Universitat de Barcelona, 2000, 137 n. 29.

24. McVAUGH, «Averroes», 21.

25. Juan Antonio PANIAGUA, «L'Arabisme à Montpellier dans l'oeuvre d'Arnau de Vilanova» in: *Studia Arnaldiana. Trabajos en torno a la obra médica de Arnau de Vilanova, c. 1240-1311*, Barcelona, Fundación Uriach, 1994, 319-325.

26. «Cui parti philosophie hic liber supponatur. Dicendum quod philosophie naturali, cui cum tota medicina subicitur, ut Averroes ait primo sui Colliget, secundo capitulo» ARNAU DE VILANOVA (attrib.), *Scriptum*, f. 131ra.

its position relating to the intermediate state of *neutrum* – rather than to the *Colliget* because he is sceptical about an early circulation in Montpellier of this last work.²⁷ However, there is another point that is even more striking. As I said, from the three works mentioned in the *Aphorismi* as anti-Averroistic, in neither *De intentione* nor in *De consideracionibus* do we find an explicit mention of Averroes or his works. In the *De dosi* and in *De aphorismi* he is mentioned by his name and his work, the *Colliget*, by the title of *universalia*.²⁸ If the Kraków commentary was composed around *De intentione* and thus earlier than the *De dosi* or *Aphorismi*, it is strange, not only that the work was widely used by Arnau, but also that it was referred to as *Colliget* rather than *universalia*.

It would be interesting to trace the *universalia/Colliget* denomination around those years in Montpellier, but there is not much evidence that helps us to do so. If we look at Arnau's contemporary, Bernard de Gordon, he does not shed much light on this issue. As Arnau did in *De intentione* and *De consideracionibus*, Bernard does not explicitly quote Averroes in his production from 1295-1299 (*Regimen acutorum*, *De pronosticis*, *De decem ingeniis curandorum morborum*). Bernard composed a *De gradibus* in 1303 and there he mentions Averroes by name. Later, between 1303-1305 when he composed his *Lilium* and a year later in his *De tyriaca* he did the same. Some years later, Arnau did mention Averroes when composing the *Speculum* in 1308/9 but did not name his work.²⁹

These are striking features indeed if we think of Arnau as the author of the Kraków commentary, but not so definitively strong as to resist some speculation that might explain its peculiarities within the Arnaldian production. There are not many Arnaldian commentaries left to compare them with and it is not impossible that we are facing a very early example made under the fascination for a new author that his own nephew, Armengaud Blasi, had translated few years earlier. How can we be sure that Arnau did not have access to the *Colliget* in his Arabic or Latin version by then? Or we can even speculate based on the strange formula of the colophon of the Kraków commentary (*scriptum m.arnaldi de villa nova et magistri in medicinis montispeulanis*) with a re-elaboration of genuine materials from Arnau's oral or written exposition on *De morbo* by a colleague when the *Colliget* was unproblematically used in Montpellier.³⁰

27. AVOMO V.1, 139-143; McVAUGH, «Averroes», 26 and 29.

28. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Tractatus de amore heroico. Epistola de dosi tyriacalium medicinarum*, Michael McVAUGH (ed.) (*Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia* = AVOMO III), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 1985, 82; ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Aphorismi de gradibus*, Michael McVAUGH (ed.) (*Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia* = AVOMO II), Granada-Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 1975, 160.

29. McVAUGH, «Averroes», 30-31.

30. GARCÍA BALLESTER – SÁNCHEZ SALOR, «Tradición manuscrita», 69-70. A fascinating account of the use of Averroes' *Colliget* by perhaps a young medical master at Montpellier before 1325 is given in Michael McVAUGH, «Reading Averroes» in Mark T.

There is ample room for speculation but what the reading of the commentary makes clear is that it is the work of a major author and not many candidates emerge in Montpellier as possible options. We know that before 1305, since it is mentioned in his popular *Lilium medicinae*, Bernard de Gordon produced a written commentary or an oral exposition of *De morbo et accidenti* as part of his teaching activities at Montpellier.³¹ The reference is located in the *particula* III of the *Lilium* that deals with the head and external senses. In the chapter that Bernard devotes to double vision, he opens his exposition by quoting *De morbo et accidenti* as the Galenic source on which one should base a discussion on the topic. Later, Bernard would point out that he had already explained this subject while commenting on *De morbo* and that here he will address it in an abbreviated form («Ista autem materiam tetigimus supra quartum de morbo, tamen breviter hic aliquid dicamus».)³² If we take the Kraków commentary as Bernard's his reflection seems inaccurate. The extension devoted to the topic in the Kraków commentary is somewhat similar to that in the *Lilium*, but what seems more revealing is that even if both – like most contemporaries – used Avicenna's explanation given in *De anima*, the reasoning and the sources mentioned and unmentioned in the Kraków commentary and in the *Lilium* are rather different as to conclude that they are related.³³

Some years ago, Michael generously drew my attention to two references of Valesco de Taranta (f. 1380-1418) in his *Philonium* to a commentary on *De morbo et accidenti* composed by Jordanus de Turre (f. 1313-1335). The references offered by Valesco to Jordanus' commentary on book 3 and 4 were so precise that it could have been a nice thread to ascribe the authorship of the Kraków commentary to Jordanus, but the checking with the content of the Kraków commentary shows no proper match.³⁴

With his contagious optimism, the late Luis García Ballester announced in the *I Trobada* held in 1994 that we had completed the transcription of the six books of the Kraków commentary and he also explained the difficulties it entailed that a critical edition should have no more witnesses of the work

ABATE (ed.), *Convivencia and Medieval Spain. Essays in Honor of Thomas F. Glick*, Palgrave Mac-Millan, 2019, 412-417.

31. LUKE DEMAÎTRE, *Doctor Bernard de Gordon: Professor and Practitioner*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980, 84.

32. BERNARD DE GORDON, *Lilium medicinae*, Paris, 1542, f. 147v.

33. Compare the chapter «De strabositate» in BERNARD DE GORDON, *Lilium*, f. 147v-148r with the *dubitacio* «Unde est quod unum duo visui apparet» expounded in ARNAU DE VILANOVA (attrib.), *Scriptum*, f. 142vb-143ra.

34. VALESCO DE TARANTA, *Practica Valesci de Tharanta que alias Philonium dicitur una cum domini Joannis de Tornamira introductorio*. Lyon, 1500, lib. 4, ch. 5 fol. 148vb («sicut recitat Jordanus de Turre supra 4 de morbo c. 2 de quadam muliere que fuit in alamania que stetit sex mensibus sine cibo et potu.») and lib. 7, ch. 13 fol. 322rb («aliter tamen dicit Jordanus de turre supra 3 de morbo et dicit quod salva reverentia Averrois non est ponenda 5 virtus, scilicet discretiva, et dato quod sic, non est naturaliter consideranda a medico»).

than a single manuscript with a very corrupted text. He did not mention then the uneven quality of the work done. Books 1 to 4 were not just transcribed but critically edited even if in need of a thoughtful revision. Books 5 to 6 were then and are still in need of serious work to make them legible. The transcription, however, had allowed us to discard major findings that would have made the possibility of an Arnaldian authorship impossible, such as the explicit quotation of works unavailable in his lifetime or self-references to works that were not his. It seems clear that, in order to refine the analysis that would allow us to resume the discussion about the authorship, a proper critical edition of the whole commentary is necessary. However, even if this is accomplished, my worry is that it may leave us exactly where we are now.

This is why I would like to take advantage of this *Trobada* to propose a different approach to the topic. How about if we think about moving the discussion of the authorship to Bologna?

From all the extant commentaries on *De morbo* made before the 1350s the only exposition whose authorship and date of composition is certain is that of Gentile da Foligno. As far as I know, there is only one extant copy of the work (CLM 62, fols. 70ra-104rb)³⁵ and it belongs to the Hartmann Schedel collection in the Munich Staatsbibliothek.³⁶ The *explicit* refers to the date of composition by Gentile in 1345, to the name of the copyist, Paulus Rieter, and to 22nd December 1386 as the date of finishing the copy.³⁷ The date of composition of Gentile's commentary is also confirmed by Gentile himself in the colophon that follows his commentary on book four of the *Canon*, which he said he completed in 1345, his last year in Padua.³⁸ The style and internal references to his own works leave no doubt about its authorship; however, the hurried style of the text in CLM 62 suggests that we are dealing with a *reportatio* of Gentile's teaching and maybe not necessarily with

35. For a description of the manuscript, see Karl HALM – Georg von LAUBMANN, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis. Tom. I, pars I {Cod. 1-2329}*, Munich, 1892, 13-14.

36. For an account of Schedel's Library, see Richard STAUBER, *Die Schedelsche Bibliothek: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Ausbreitung der italienischen Renaissance, des deutschen Humanismus und der medizinischen Literatur*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1908 [reprint Nieuwkoop, B. de Graaf, 1969].

37. «Hic finiunt notata super libro de accidenti et morbo facta per Gentile anno Domini 1345. Paulus Rieter scripsit 1386 22 decembris» GENTILE DA FOLIGNO *Notata*, f. 104rb.

38. «Ego Gentilis complevi hoc opus anno domini m iii xlv mense septembris et compilavi illud legendo legi autem illo anno totum quartum canonem et totum secundum canonem et librum de accidenti et morbo et librum prognosticorum Ypocratis cum commento. Et scripsi super libro de accidenti et morbo. Et scripsi questionem arduam et prolixam de gradibus et questionem de saporibus et questionem de mixtione medicine et compressive et incepti sermones de silva. Et eodem anno multis mundanis adversitatibus supervenientibus, deus gloriosus et sublimis sui bonitate michi tribuit fortitudinem, ipse igitur sit laudatus, amen. Et sic est finis huius operis» Cod. Vindob., 5391, fol. 154vb. Reference taken from Per-Gunnar OTTOSON, *Scholastic Medicine and Philosophy: A Study of Commentaries on Galen's Tegni (ca. 1300-1450)*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 1984, 50-51.

the commentary he talked about. The name that the copyist gives to the work suggests much the same direction: «Hic finiunt notata super libro de accidenti et morbo facta per Gentile».³⁹ The exact place of composition and audience is harder to determine. It could have been Padua, as Gentile himself stated, while he was serving Ubertino da Carrara although there is no evidence of any formal teaching involvement there. It could also have been Perugia where he was hired as a medical teacher with certainty from 1338 to his death in 1348.⁴⁰

Irrespective of whether what is kept in CLM 62 is a student's *reportatio* or a revised commentary approved by Gentile, whether it was produced in Padua or Perugia, the work has a feature that makes it especially interesting for exploring the authorship of the Kraków manuscript: as he did in his commentary on the *Canon*, Gentile created a genealogy of commentators on *De morbo et accidenti* and carefully quoted their opinions while expounding his.⁴¹

When we composed our paper for the 1994 Trobada, I had already had the opportunity of a first comparative approach to some commentaries on *De morbo* that were not available while preparing the revision of the critical edition of book four. The discussion on the contents with Luis García Ballester and the linguistic analysis provided by Eustaquio Sánchez Salor permitted us to conclude that there was a strong parallelism with the commentary attributed to Alberto da Bologna, and to a lesser extent with the *Quaestiones* attributed to Antonio da Parma. It was clear to us then that the Kraków commentary was the basis for Alberto da Bologna and for some reflections found in the *Questiones*. The reworking of Alberto of the Kraków text is evident and the *accessus ad auctores* helped us also to establish the precedence of the Kraków commentary.⁴² It seemed plausible to us then that the commentary of a famous Montpellier master could have had influence some 50 years after its production on the exposition of a Bolognese author such as Alberto. What the reading of Gentile's commentary changes is that now we can explore a local lineage of commentaries quoted extensively by him ascribed to Bartolomeo da Varignana, Antonio da Parma, Dino del Garbo and Alberto da Bologna and this reconstruction would allow us to revisit the Kraków commentary in dialogue with this tradition.

I said at the beginning of my presentation that the editorial board of the AVOMO collection left the *dubia* works in limbo. This year we are celebrating

39. GENTILE DA FOLIGNO *Notata*, f. 104rb.

40. OTTOSSON, *Scholastic Medicine*, 50-51; Roger K. FRENCH, *Canonical Medicine. Gentile da Foligno and Scholasticism*, Leiden, Brill, 2001, 3-7.

41. I presented a first approach to this genealogy without exploring its possibilities in discussing questions of authorship in SALMÓN, «Technologies of authority», 135-157.

42. GARCÍA BALLESTER – SALMÓN – SÁNCHEZ SALOR, «Tradición manuscrita», 37-40 and 66-67.

the 700th anniversary of Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Hell is terrifying indeed, but it must be no less painful to live in desire without hope (*che sanza speme vivemo in disio*, Canto IV ln. 42). Let's see in the coming years if the exploration of my proposal and work along these lines can instil some hope that we might solve the riddle concerning the authorship of the Kraków commentary.