

Michael McVAUGH  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
*mcvagh@live.unc.edu*

## THE NACHLÄSSE OF ARNAU DE VILANOVA

*Abstract:* A variety of evidence indicates that at his death in 1311 Arnau de Vilanova left copies or drafts of his medical writings among his papers in the various centers where he had lived and worked. Many of them had never circulated in his lifetime, and are still unpublished. The detailed inventory of his possessions in Valencia (his early home) made in 1318 demonstrates this directly. There is strong indirect evidence that the same was true in Montpellier, where he had lived and taught for so long: the authenticity of unique copies of works ascribed to him and found together in a Munich manuscript is confirmed by his own citations of them in well-known works or by their thematic and verbal overlap with others of his genuine writings, which suggests that they descend from papers found in Montpellier by his executors. Evidence of another sort from a Paris manuscript indicates that some of its contents descend from Arnau's personal copies of some of his known works, discovered at Montpellier after his death and recopied by admirers. Comparable arguments are used to propose that still other texts on which he had begun to work in Sicily in 1310-1311 were inherited by his surgeon-nephew Joan Blasi in Naples and thence passed, still incomplete, into European circulation. Recognizing how chance has in this way brought about the survival of so many genuinely Arnaldian writings implies that the rarity of a text ascribed to him is by itself no good argument against its authenticity.

*Keywords:* *Nachlass*, Conesa, Montpellier, Valencia, inventory.

## THE NACHLÄSSE OF ARNAU DE VILANOVA

Most of the medical writings ascribed to Arnau de Vilanova that have been judged to be authentic fall at one end or another of a spectrum: at one end, they exist in many manuscript copies and are referred to in other members of the group (e.g., the *De intentione medicorum*); at the other, they exist in comparatively few or no manuscripts and are never mentioned in Arnau's other writings (e.g., the *Regimen Almarie*). This paper will present evidence that many of the texts in the latter group seem to be *Nachlässe*, works that had not been prepared for «dissemination», were unfinished or not polished to Arnau's satisfaction and so were not circulated by him, but were found among his papers when he died and were circulated to a limited extent by friendly editors. The evidence further suggests that this may have happened repeatedly, carried out quite independently at different places under the direction of different «editors» who all valued his work and wanted to share it with the public: I will propose that some of these materials seem to have been discov-

ered at his property in Valencia, others in his residence in Montpellier, others perhaps in Barcelona, and still others in Sicily (these last being texts on which he had been at work at the time of his death in 1311). If these conclusions are correct, they testify to the widespread admiration that was felt for Arnau the physician by his friends during his lifetime. But it also means that the present-day rarity of a text that happens to be ascribed to Arnau is no secure indication that it is unauthentic, and I will try to suggest possible ways to distinguish between texts that are likely to be from his *Nachlässe* and texts mistakenly or ambitiously ascribed to him by later figures.

### *Valencia*

Arnau de Villanova is reported to have died on 6 September 1311.<sup>1</sup> Just four months later his executors had begun the complicated process of settling his estate, recording the seventeen volumes of theological writings that he had left in the Barcelona *hospitium* of his disciple, the apothecary Pere Jutge, and partially describing their contents. The next month, in February 1312, his chief executor Ramon Conesa continued the task by drawing up a tentative inventory of the items found in Arnau's home in Valencia; chests containing a large number of his books and papers had been left with Valencian friends and were inventoried separately, and in August 1318 Conesa eventually combined the two as he summed up his work in a wonderfully detailed document that has been of inestimable value to Arnauldian scholars.<sup>2</sup> In the intervening half-dozen years Conesa had persevered in his task, travelling to Marseille and to Montpellier to arrange for inventories to be made of what Arnau had left behind in each place. Everywhere he had then to ensure that specified items went to beneficiaries designated under Arnau's will, or were sold to swell the estate. Conesa spent more than two years on his travels, and eventually wound up the estate in 1318.<sup>3</sup>

Valencia provides us with an instance of a *Nachlass* – the only one – where we can positively identify its size and contents, including the books and papers that Conesa found in Arnau's Valencian properties and inventoried. They include his personal copies of several unquestionably authentic works.

1. Fidel FITA, «Arnaldo de Vilanova. Sitio y fecha de su defunción», *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 31 (1897), 313-314.

2. The inventory of 1318, which also includes an account of the materials left in Barcelona with Pere Jutge, was published by Roque CHABÁS, «Inventario de los libros, ropas y demás efectos de Arnaldo de Vilanova», in *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 9 (1905), 189-203. I have corrected a few mistaken readings after examining the original document: Arxiu de la Catedral de València, perg. 7430 (Olmos 1410).

3. The final settlement is published in Ramon D'ALÒS, «De la marmessoria d'Arnau de Vilanova», in *Miscel·lània Prat de la Riba*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans 1923; I, 289-306.

For example, «7. Expositio primi alforismi Ypocratis». This is evidently the text of Arnau's lectures to his Montpellier students in spring 1301, in which he used the first Hippocratic aphorism – «Ars longa vita brevis» – to introduce them to some of the problems they would encounter in medical practice. It was Arnau's swan song as a teacher: only a few weeks later he would leave for Anagni to defend his theological views before Boniface VIII, and future events left him with no chance to prepare his draft for publication. No manuscript of his text survives. What has been edited in *AVOMO* 14 has been reconstructed from scattered fragments, probably dispersed from his papers when Conesa disposed of them.<sup>4</sup>

Other examples are *De intentione medicorum* (#39: the manuscript actually reads «institutione»), the *Regimen* for Jaume II (#346), and the *Speculum medicine* (#29). The first of these was written in the early 1290s, the other two probably in the period 1306-1309, and all three can be found today in many copies. But two other works in the inventory that have been also ascribed to him are much rarer today. One is «315. Item quemdam libellum in papiro qui incipit *Exercitus non debet* et est ibi parum scriptum». There is good reason to think that this is the work with that incipit that was printed in the sixteenth century as the *Regimen castra sequentium* and that has been edited from three late manuscripts in *AVOMO* 10.2, which its editors propose was prepared by Arnau for King Jaume at the siege of Almeria in 1310.<sup>5</sup> The text is only about 400 words long – «ibi est parum scriptum», indeed. One might imagine that Arnau had left a copy of the little essay at his Valencia home on his way back to Barcelona – Valencia was the staging area for the siege, and naval communications were frequent.

The other item in the Valencian inventory that has been accepted as Arnau's work is «99. Item unus quaternus qui incipit *In morbis*». This presumably corresponds to the commentary on Hippocrates' aphorism II.34, which is printed in the sixteenth-century editions of Arnau's works but of which not one manuscript is known today; the printed text begins with the first words of the aphorism, «In morbis minus», by which it was customarily referred to. Arnau does not refer to this commentary in his known writings, and we should probably imagine it to be an academic exercise that he did not go to the trouble of preparing for publication – unlike the commentary on Aph. I.1, which was vastly more ambitious.

These two examples recorded from Valencia suggest possible reasons why certain kinds of Arnaldian writings that survive were never widely distrib-

4. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Expositio super aphorismo Hippocratis «In Morbis Minus»; Repetitio super aphorismo Hippocratis «Vita brevis»*, ed. curated by Fernando SALMÓN and Michael R. McVAUGH (*Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia [AVOMO]*, 14), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona-Fundació Noguera 2015. The dating of the work is established at 266n3.

5. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Regimen Almarie*, ed. curated by Lluís CIFUENTES and Michael R. McVAUGH (*AVOMO*, 10.2), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona-Fundació Noguera 1998.

uted: either, like the *Regimen Almarie*, they were composed late in his life at a moment when he did not have the time or opportunity to prepare them for publication; or, like the commentary on Aph. II.34, they were routine academic productions that for whatever reason he did not feel were important enough to publish. In these cases, he retained copies in his Valencian home, and when they turned up his friends saw no reason not to make them known to other admirers.

If we look through the Valencian inventory more closely, we will find a considerable number of other texts that are unidentified but might also have contained his own work. To give only a few examples:

- 74. Item XIII quaterni scripti in latino papirei
- 100. Item tres quaterni in medicina in pergameno
- 143. Item volumen de operibus magistri in latino cum postibus albis

And tantalizingly, «310. Item quatuor quadernos in pergameno et videtur de philosophia» — there is simply not enough in these examples to identify them concretely. But one of these unidentified citations can take us a little further: «42. Item expositio unius antiforismi tenuis et certe diete» — those last words are the title of Aph. I.11. This therefore is a commentary on that aphorism, and the likeliest possibility is that Arnau was the author and kept a copy, as he did of his commentary on II.34, but that it has apparently not survived. If an anonymous commentary on I.11 should one day surface in some library, the possibility of Arnau's authorship should be explored.

What would ordinarily have happened to such miscellaneous items in an estate? The religious books in Arnau's library — theological, patristic — had been specifically willed to institutions or poor scholars who could make use of them, but his will said nothing about his medical texts, much less about his own loose medical papers.<sup>6</sup> Conesa would have tried to sell any of them for whatever he could get to benefit the estate, and indeed a number of medical items listed in the Valencian inventory also turn up in the separate list of items that in his final report he reported having been able to sell: Arnau's own copy of his *Speculum medicine* (inventory #29) had brought in 30 s.; Galen's *De interioribus* (#37), 15 s.; the *Chirurgia* of Teodorico Borgognoni (#70), 6 s.<sup>7</sup> But Conesa did not identify everything that he sold: for example, something he described merely as «plures pecie in papiro scripte super medicina» sold for 12 s., whatever it may have contained, and at least one collection of writings may have been given away: «alia quaternula quorum nomina ignorantur tam in pergameno quam papiro scripta que sunt parvi valoris que extimari non

6. Arnau's will of 13 kal. Aug. 1305 was published by Roque CHABÁS, «Testamento de Arnaldo de Vilanova», *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 28 (1896), 87-90.

7. D'ALÒS, «Marmessoria», 304.

possunt propter eorum precii modicitatem licet in inventario continerentur».<sup>8</sup> Thus Arnau's short medical writings and drafts, if any, would probably have ended up distributed widely among Valencian buyers who had a casual interest at best in their content, especially since Conesa appears to have been given the right to sell for himself or give away the unsold residue to make up for certain expenses of his executorship.<sup>9</sup>

### Montpellier

I began to think seriously about Arnau's *Nachlässe* as a significant genre when Fernando Salmón and I began to study the text *De parte operativa* published in Arnau's *Opera*, in preparation for a modern edition. It gradually became apparent to us that the text as printed was almost certainly not an integral work, internally coherent – it appeared to be composed of four distinguishable sections, of which the first and last bore little obvious relation to the two much longer middle ones. Yet the title in the printed editions was referred to several times in the *Speculum medicine* as forthcoming, as though it were a single work of Arnau's own composition, as indeed parallelisms between passages seemed to confirm.

Only a single manuscript of *De parte operativa* is known – Munich 7576, of the 15<sup>th</sup> century – and in this manuscript the first of the four sections just mentioned is actually separated spatially from the rest of the text, giving the appearance of being a separate work. This and other considerations finally led us to conclude that parts 2 and 3 of the printed text were drafts of material meant for a *Pars operativa* that Arnau was planning to complete, a text that would cover pathology from head to toe, but that when he left for Messina was left incomplete with his other papers at Montpellier, where in 1309 he had been simultaneously at work finishing the *Speculum*; and that parts 1 and 4 were independent elements in a Montpellier *Nachlass* that had been gathered up all together after he died, presumably by his executors. Editors later put them into circulation, jumbling them together, and subsequent copyists usually supposed that they were all part of the same work and copied them all together.<sup>10</sup>

8. *Ibid.*, 306.

9. I am following the interpretation of D'ALÒS, «Marmessoria», 295: «També declaren que En Conesa pot disposar com millor li sembli d'alguns poc objectes que no han estat venuts i que són ací inventariats». He seems to be basing this on the less explicit statement made by the court, after releasing Conesa from all further obligations as executor, that, nevertheless, «... declaramus quod dictus Raymundus remaneat in manumissoria predicta exequenda et bona predicta que fuerunt dicti magistri tenere et administrare» («Marmessoria», 303).

10. The evidence for this, and the reasoning behind these conclusions, is laid out in the introduction to ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *De parte operativa*, ed. curated by Fernando SALMÓN and

There is no need to imagine that his executors came upon the papers they collected and called the «Pars operativa» purely by accident as they were sifting through his Montpellier *Nachlass*; I suspect that they were looking specifically for a work by that specific title. Arnau had a habit of announcing what he was working on at the moment, even boasting about it, before it was complete. That was what had led Jaume II to keep pestering his physician in the summer of 1308, asking for a copy of the promised *Speculum medicine*, while it was still very much a work in progress.<sup>11</sup> That was what had also led Clement V to beg from anyone at all, just five months after his former physician had died, news of the *valde utilem librum super medicinam practicam quem nobis frequenter dare nobis promisit* but that Arnau had never sent him – and may never have completed.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, this could even have been a reference to the *Pars operativa*, as Sebastià Giralt has suggested.<sup>13</sup> For I feel sure that, at the same time that Arnau was composing the *Speculum*, he was bragging to his Montpellier acquaintances, not just about that work on medical theory, but about the parallel treatise on operative medicine that he was preparing to accompany it. The *Speculum* was already being read and studied at Montpellier by 1310, not long after Arnau's departure from the town, and readers would have found in it a number of quotations from the *Pars*, as if the latter were already a finished work;<sup>14</sup> they would certainly have told his executors to expect to find it among his papers.

It is notable that CLM 7576 is a composite manuscript. It has three constituent units, each of which contains works all attributed to Arnau, though none with great security (the *Antidotarium* and *De venenis* are there in part 3), and many of them are otherwise unknown. Realizing this, it was natural for us to wonder whether part 2, which in addition to the *Pars operativa* texts contained two other unknown scholastic *questiones*, as well as an incomplete text ostensibly on the *res naturales*, might actually all hold genuinely Arnaldian writings that have come down to us together as a whole from the original Montpellier *Nachlass*. One of those *questiones*, entitled *de generatione febris*, seemed to be a good test case, since several decades ago Luis García Ballester called attention to Montpellier's debate in the 1290s over the nature of fever and to Arnau's contribution to the debate in his *Commentum* on the Galenic

---

Michael R. McVAUGH (*AVOMO*, 8), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona-Fundació Noguera, in press.

11. Antoni RUBIÓ i LLUCH, *Documents per l'història de la cultura catalana mig-èval*, vol. 1, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1908, 45-46 (no. XXXVI, of 1 July 1308); *ibid.*, p. 49 (no. XXXVIII, of 15 August 1308).

12. RUBIÓ i LLUCH, *Documents*, vol. 1, 56-57 (no. XLIV, of 15 March 1312).

13. Sebastià GIRALT, «Cap a l'edició crítica de la *Practica summaria* d'Arnau de Vilanova», *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics*, 30 (2011-2013), 255-291, at 259-260.

14. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Speculum medicine*, ed. curated by Michael R. McVAUGH (*AVOMO*, 13), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona-Fundació Noguera 2019, 369.

work *De malicia complexionis diverse* (edited in AVOMO 15).<sup>15</sup> A transcription and study of this *questio* showed immediately that *De generatione febris* was unquestionably a genuine work of Arnau: its metaphors, its language, its conclusions, all prefigured similar ingredients in Arnau's *Commentum*, and revealed that it was a kind of first draft of the later and more ambitious commentary.

This naturally encouraged a closer study of the second *questio* in this section of the Munich manuscript, *De temporibus morbi*, which examines rules suggested by Hippocrates and Galen for deciding whether an illness was gathering strength (in *augmentum*) or had passed the crisis so that the patient was on the way to recovery (*declinatio*). There are no exact parallels with other Arnaldian works, of the sort that there are in the case of *De generatione*, but there are a number of convincing indications of his authorship of *De temporibus*: its association in the manuscript tradition with other genuinely Arnaldian texts; the likely date of its composition (in the 1290s); its verbal hints of being by an author to whom the Montpellier faculty's language and writings came naturally; and its consistency with Arnau's own known writings, traits, and interests. I myself am convinced that the *De temporibus* is also a genuinely Arnaldian work.

And recently, as is explained in another paper from this *trobada*,<sup>16</sup> Sergi Grau has identified the last work in this second section of the Munich manuscript – which seemed superficially to be a fragment concerning the *res non naturales* and is also attributed there to Arnau de Vilanova – as a portion of the *Libellus de conservacione visus* supposed to have been drawn up by Arnau for Pope Clement V about 1308. The question of its authenticity may be explored further; but what could have been more natural than that on returning to Montpellier from Avignon Arnau should have lodged his own copy of the *Libellus* with his other miscellaneous writings, before returning to the task of desperately trying to finish the *Speculum medicine* and the *Pars operativa*? The *Speculum* was eventually finished, of course, but the *Pars operativa* was not, so that its fragments were left behind in Montpellier together, perhaps, with the *Libellus*, but certainly with other uncirculated writings, when Arnau left on his final travels, for his executors to find there after his death. We know that Ramon Conesa arranged for an inventory of Arnau's Montpellier *Nachlass*, though it has never turned up;<sup>17</sup> if the actual document is ever discovered, I

15. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Commentum supra tractatum Galieni De malicia complexionis diverse*, ed. curated by Luís GARCÍA BALLESTER and Eustáquio SÁNCHEZ SALOR (AVOMO, 15), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 1985.

16. Sergi GRAU, «El *Libellus de confortacione visus secundum sex res non naturales* atribuït a Arnau de Vilanova», in this volume.

17. «Visis etiam inventariis factis per dictum Raymundum de bonis que invenit fore dicti magistri Arnaldi, quondam, in principio sue administracionis tam in civitate Valencie, Massilie, Barchinone quam in Montepesulano»; D'ALÒS, «Marmessoria», 298.

would expect the works contained in this second section of Munich 7576 to be listed there.

I have one more text to propose as a genuine work of Arnau's that was discovered – very probably also at Montpellier – after his death. For more than twenty years I have been studying his translation of Avicenna's work on cardiac medicines, which he entitled *De viribus cordis*, while planning an edition of the work that would be accompanied by a transcription of the Arabic original, and now, with the enormous help of Gerrit Bos, a comparative Arabic-Latin text is nearly complete. The Latin version was tremendously popular; I began my work with a sample collation of one chapter as it appeared just in the fourteenth-century manuscripts – and there were over twenty-five of them! It is a very constant text, with little apparent variation from one copy to the next, and eventually I narrowed my choice of witnesses to just five manuscripts; I collated them all in their entirety, and then compared them with the Arabic. And I discovered to my astonishment that one was in fact subtly different from the other four and was closer to the Arabic; in the end I concluded that it preserved Arnau's original version of the translation, one that he had subsequently revised. All the other dozens of surviving manuscripts are of the revision; the text in this manuscript (Paris, BN lat. 6949) is unique. Moreover, every other manuscript declares that the translation was made in Barcelona; the Paris manuscript is silent about where it was produced. I began to think it not unlikely that Arnau had prepared this Paris version in Valencia before he came to serve King Pere in Barcelona in 1281, and that the version that went into circulation was one that had been revised there, to then be spread across Europe; but that Arnau kept the manuscript of his original version with him, and that it was discovered, like so many other writings, after his death, probably in Montpellier, for the Paris manuscript was copied in Montpellier in the second quarter of the fourteenth century.<sup>18</sup>

This initial speculation approached conviction once I considered the contents of the Paris manuscript more closely. (Table 1 gives a tabular picture of those contents.) I had used the same manuscript in 1981 when I was preparing an edition of Arnau's translation of Galen's *De rigore*, and at that moment I had noted with surprise that it contained a partial as well as a complete text of Arnau's translation of that work. The complete text of *De rigore* occupies fols. 107r-114v in the codex. The codex also contains a copy of his translation of *De viribus cordis* that begins on fol. 88 and ends on fol. 100, but is interrupted on fols. 93-95v by the second half of *De rigore*, written in the same hand. I soon established that the text of this insertion was virtually identical with the complete text that followed a little later in the manuscript, and that they must both have been copied from the same source, so that it did not affect my edition, and I simply noted the curious fact without thinking further about

18. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Translatio libri Galieni de rigore*, ed. curated by Michael R. McVAUGH (AVOMO, 16), Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona 1981, 42-43.



it. But editing *De viribus cordis* has now made it more important to answer the obvious question: why should an extract from the end of *De rigore* have been inserted into what appears to be the unique surviving copy of Arnau's first version of *De viribus cordis*?

In the light of what we are beginning to appreciate about Arnau's scattered *Nachlässe*, a likely answer is that among the papers discovered by his executors within his possessions post-mortem at Montpellier were his personal copies both of the original *De viribus cordis* version and of *De rigore*; they would not have been bound, and would still have been in loose gatherings. The executors decided on their circulation and gave the gatherings to a scribe to be copied, one after the other, but the sets of gatherings somehow became confused, so that material from *De rigore* became inserted into the sequence of *De viribus* gatherings prepared for copying – if the originals had been written in the same hand, as is not unlikely, the mistake would have been all the easier to make. The scribe discovered the mistake only at the end of *De rigore* (where the *explicit* named the text that he had been copying), wrote *vacat* throughout from the beginning to the end of the insertion, and continued on, picking up *De viribus* where he had left it and completing it. I can see no other likely way of explaining this curious arrangement.

But there is a further twist to the story. Having completed the text of *De viribus* (now comprised on fols. 88ra-93ra, 96ra-100rb of the Paris manuscript), our scribe did not then turn back immediately to work on *De rigore*: instead, he next proceeded to copy out yet another work of Arnau's, *De humido radicali* (on fols. 100va-107ra), and only then rounded off his task with the complete text of *De rigore* (which incidentally proved to be the best of the known copies). The text of *De humido radicali* is also of considerable interest. When that work was edited for AVOMO in 2010, eight copies of the text were known, but the version in the Paris manuscript clearly stood apart, textually, from the other seven, and preserved the best readings.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, it had been annotated by someone closely familiar with the Montpellier environment in Arnau's day: a glossator's note (fol. 107ra) added to Arnau's concluding statement in the text that he knew only one intelligent professor at that school reads «scilicet magistrum Ermengaldum» – that is, Arnau's nephew Armengaud Blaise. As a text of particular excellence, copied at Montpellier and circulating among informed readers there in the first part of the fourteenth century, might it not be that this version of *De humido radicali* too, as well as the two other Arnaldian texts copied with it, *all* descend from Arnau's personal copies of those works? and were commissioned to be made from Arnau's own materials discovered in his *Nachlass* at Montpellier? While we

19. Sebastià Giralt has subsequently identified two further manuscripts of this text, Innsbruck 455 and Dresden C. 278; see Sebastià GIRALT, «Nous manuscrits de l'obra mèdica d'Arnau de Vilanova», *Asclepio* 72 (2020), p. 313.

wait, hoping to find Conesa's inventory of Arnau's Montpellier possessions, I am prepared to believe it.

As I explained above, in the case of Munich 7576 it was the perception that one of the works it contained (the *Pars operativa*) was part of Arnau's Montpellier *Nachlass* that led to the discovery that other texts found there, like the *Questio de generatione febris*, were genuinely Arnaldian and part of the same *Nachlass*. Now in Paris MS 6949 we have found three texts that again seem likely to have descended from a common *Nachlass*: could the other texts in that codex have had the same origin? There are only two of them. The codex begins with a copy of Averroes' *Colliget*, which Arnau was instrumental in introducing into Montpellier. Could this copy in the Paris manuscript derive from Arnau's own copy, found among his papers? It is at least a possibility worth considering.

Even more tantalizing is the remaining work in the codex, a very brief and almost unknown work on laxative medicines which is also attributed to Averroes, though I have not yet come upon the original version. What is particularly thought-provoking is the *explicit* at its end:

Here end the general articles useful for laxative medicines [composed] by the great ... Averroes, translated from Hebrew into Latin by master Johannes de Planis of Réalmont in the diocese of Albi near Toulouse in 1304 —translating at that time as master «Mayno» but afterwards known as «Johannes», becoming a Christian during the expulsion of the Jews from the kingdom of France.<sup>20</sup>

Under the circumstances, it is not unimaginable that, interested in Averroes as he was, Arnau came upon this text while living in Montpellier 1307-1310 and had a copy made for himself that was still among his papers when he died far away from that city in 1311.

But this is obviously a dangerous game. It is one thing to infer cautiously, as I did earlier, that unfamiliar works ascribed in manuscript to Arnau are authentic and derive from copies found among his *Nachlass* when we can use his own references to them or other independent citations, combined with their closeness of thought and language to his other works, to support our conclusions (though different scholars may accept them with varying degrees of conviction). It is quite a different matter to judge that a work by another author was part of his possessions simply because its dating and content seem appropriate to him and it has been found with other works that can be much more confidently recognized as having been among his miscellaneous papers. We have to acknowledge that whatever items eventually come to be accepted

---

20. «Expliciunt articuli generales proficientes in medicinis laxativis magni abeloys id est averoys translati ex ebreo in latinum per magistrum Iohannem de Planis de monte regali Albien. dyoc. apud Tholosam anno domini m° ccc° iiii°, interprete magistro Mayno tunc temporis iudeo et postea dicto Iohanne, converso in Christianum in expulsione iudeorum a regno francie»; MS Paris, BN lat. 6949, fol. 86vb.

as part of Arnau's *Nachlass*, their content will then inevitably be used to shape how later scholars approach their own study of his life and thought. Making a positive judgement in these cases is a responsibility not to be taken lightly, however much we would enjoy it.

### *Messina – Naples*

As we have seen, some elements in Arnau's various *Nachlässe* were finished works that he had not yet had occasion to put into circulation (for example, the *Regimen Almarie*); others were academic exercises that he seems to have held back but that were circulated by later editors (his Hippocratic commentaries, the *Questio de generatione*). Furthermore, it seems that some works that have long been accepted as genuinely Arnaldian works were also part of the *Nachlass*. They were preliminary drafts that Arnau was working on but were still unfinished when he died, like the *Pars operativa*, but in this case drafts that were discovered and were deliberately reworked or expanded by Arnau's friends so that they could be published under his name; these works have to be «deconstructed» from their present form to be appreciated for what they might have looked like at his death. I have argued elsewhere that this was the case with the works printed under the titles of *Antidotarium* and *De venenis*.<sup>21</sup> The story of their history that I have previously presented at greater length is as follows. In late 1310, in disfavor with Jaume II, Arnau moved to the Sicilian court of Frederic III at Messina, bringing with him a copy of the great *Speculum medicine* that he had completed just a year before. Here he began to work on an *Antidotarium* and to collect information for a second treatise on poisons. His Sicilian patron sent him as an ambassador to Robert of Naples across the straits in Italy, where fortuitously Arnau's nephew Joan Blasi happened to be the royal surgeon, and as a result Arnau came into repeated contact with Niccolò da Reggio, then at the beginning of his career as a translator of Greek medical writings into Latin. Here in Naples Arnau had the opportunity to see and even copy some of Niccolò's work. He introduced a portion of Niccolò's translation of the Hippocratic *De lege* into his draft of the *Antidotarium*, and he copied out portions, perhaps all, of Niccolò's translation of the last seven books of Galen's *De simplicibus medicinis*, noting some of its material for use in his *De venenis*.<sup>22</sup>

21. Michael McVAUGH, «Two Texts, One Problem: The Authorship of the *Antidotarium* and *De venenis* attributed to Arnau de Vilanova», *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics* 14 (1995), 75-94.

22. Michael McVAUGH, «Arnau de Vilanova in Naples», in *Arnaldo da Villanova e la Sicilia*, ed. Giuseppe PANTANO, Palermo, Officina di Studi Medievali 2017, 77-87. In this paper I argued (among other things) the likelihood that Arnau's quotations in 1310-1311 from Latin translations of Hippocrates' *De lege* and the later books of Galen's *De simplicibus medicinis* can be explained by his meetings with the translator Niccolò da Reggio at the court of Robert of

Arnau died in the summer of 1311, and it appears that the materials he left behind in Sicily passed to his nephew in Naples —or perhaps Arnau had left them there intending to work on them further when he returned. Not surprisingly, they must never have come to his executor's attention. Some time later Joan Blasi left Naples to return to his family home in Marseille where he became a successful merchant, dying in 1341. A ledger from 1329 records Joan's ownership of a number of medical works – the *Speculum* of Arnau, the last seven books of Galen's *De simplicibus medicina*, and other «writings on different sciences» –, which makes it seem probable that he had brought his uncle's Neapolitan *Nachlass* back from Naples with him.<sup>23</sup> Internal evidence indicates that Arnau's disciple Pere Cellerer (Petrus Cellerarius) later extended the *Antidotarium* and *De venenis* texts for circulation under Arnau's name.<sup>24</sup>

\* \* \*

In the twenty years after 1290 Bernard de Gordon and Arnau de Vilanova can both be found teaching at Montpellier, both composing a series of ambitious medical works; the two are unique among the dozen or so masters who were teaching there, and I have come to imagine a growing competitiveness between them, not perhaps an entirely friendly one, each provoking the other: Arnau writes a seminal work on medicinal degrees, and Bernard follows with

---

Naples at that time, suggesting that Niccolò may well have been the hitherto unidentified translator of those works.

In her article «Hippocrates' Law in the Middle Ages with the Edition of the Latin Translation and the Revision», *Early Science and Medicine* 23 (2018), 299-329, Stefania FORTUNA argues on purely textual grounds that the medieval translation of *De lege* was made by Bartholomeo da Messina, half a century earlier. I find it quite incomprehensible that although she actually cites the above-mentioned paper in which I argue for the likelihood of Niccolò's authorship of these Hippocratic and Galenic works on the basis of historical evidence, she astonishingly fails entirely to respond to my historical argument or even to acknowledge that I have a different opinion from hers, saying no more than that «McVaugh has demonstrated that Arnold knew about the earliest translations by Niccolò da Reggio» (p. 305), which entirely begs the question. Future scholarship will no doubt explore the question of authorship more carefully, and will need to take all available evidence into consideration.

23. ARNAU DE VILANOVA, *Speculum medicine*, 373-374, gives the passage where the inventoried items are enumerated. Sebastià Giralt has recently pointed out that one of the religious works in the Blasi inventory, a «libre que tracta del passatge e de la terra d-otramar», is probably to be identified with an anonymous «Tractatus contra passagium in partes ultramarinas» that was independently attributed to Arnau by Josep Perarnau twenty years ago, and this of course further reinforces the likelihood that Arnau's Sicilian *Nachlass* passed to his nephew; Sebastià GIRALT, «Conversione e crociata nel profetismo di Arnau de Vilanova», in *Arnaldo da Villanova e la Sicilia*, ed. Giuseppe Pantano, Palermo, Officina di Studi Medievali 2017, 49-64, at 58.

24. Michael McVAUGH, «Petrus Cellerarius discipulus Arnaldi de Villanova», in *Comprendre et maîtriser la nature au moyen âge: Mélanges d'histoire des sciences offerts à Guy Beaujouan*, Geneva, Droz 1994, 337-350. GIRALT, «Nous manuscrits», has recently discovered independent evidence supporting Pere Cellerer's role in completing the *De venenis*.

a similar one half a dozen years later; Bernard caps his literary production with the great practical *Lilium medicine* in 1305, and Arnau responds with his great theoretical overview of medicine, the *Speculum medicine*, in 1308/9.

Bernard's long series of dated medical writings comes to an end with a work of that year, 1308, and we might guess that his death followed within the decade. Was there a Bernardian *Nachlass*, works that he had begun but left unfinished? It is perfectly possible, even likely, given his long productivity. Luke Demaitre has called attention to two compositions attributed to Bernard with great probability, a *Tractatus de tiriaca* and a *Tractatus de marasmode*, neither of which has been given his characteristic dated conclusion, and both of which echo themes developed by Arnau; Demaitre has tentatively dated them to the years after 1305, since neither of them is mentioned in the *Lilium* (Bernard, like Arnau, regularly referred to earlier writings in his compositions).<sup>25</sup> Montpellier colleagues might well have found these among Bernard's papers and decided to put them into circulation, exactly as I believe they did for some of Arnau's works.

However, Bernard was bound to lose the *Nachlass* competition, if we pretend that there was one, for from 1283 to 1308 his career – and his literary accumulations – were fixed in Montpellier. Arnau of course was not just a teacher, moored to one spot: he served bishops in Valencia, kings in Barcelona and Messina, and had permanent or temporary residences in them all where he wrote and published – and accumulated papers everywhere. And if the picture I have been building up is correct, it was not just his erstwhile Montpellier colleagues who valued his work and wanted it to circulate, it was admirers from Valencia and Aragon to Naples and Marseille who felt the same way about the different collections of Arnaldian materials that were brought to their attention; it is a tribute to the European reputation for medical excellence that had evidently grown up during his lifetime.

## EPILOGUE

All of us who are scholars will leave our own *Nachlässe* to be dealt with after our deaths – xeroxed copies of manuscript leaves; typed copies of talks we gave to local audiences but never bothered to work into an article; notes for classes we taught; notes on books we read; transcriptions of manuscripts; preliminary versions of papers and texts that were eventually published in a new form; drafts of significant works that we had in hand, virtually complete, but had not yet offered to a publisher – all my readers will be familiar with the kinds of things we keep. It never occurs to us as active scholars to discard them —we might possibly need to consult them again, so if we have space for

25. Luke E. DEMAITRE, *Doctor Bernard de Gordon: Professor and Practitioner*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 1980, 73-78.

them we keep them. After retirement we do occasionally think about throwing them away, but it seems so final, and we can still imagine circumstances in which their information might be useful; so they stay on their shelves indefinitely for someone else eventually to deal with after our death, someone who almost certainly will have no idea of what each set of papers relates to, no idea of when and why they were written or of how to assess their significance. We have left their disposal too late. If we had acted earlier, we could have identified materials in our papers that might have been of some use to a library or to a younger colleague, but we will no longer be in a position to care, and everything in our archive will almost certainly be destroyed unexamined. No one will be interested in sorting it all out.

I do not think it is fanciful to imagine Arnau in just such a situation as his life drew to a close. Among his papers there were partial drafts of incomplete works, fragments of important treatises he intended to bring to completion, copies of finished works that he had not yet arranged to publish, early academic exercises that he had never thought significant enough to publish – I have already suggested something of the variety of such materials that can be found in the sources. Some were still of active interest to him, but not all; some he had probably forgotten about entirely. The bulk of his *Nachlass* was almost certainly no longer of any great importance to him. And when he died, those papers that he left scattered all across Europe became merely meaningless scraps of writing.

I find it fascinating, and enormously impressive, that in Arnau's case there were evidently people everywhere who were deeply interested in him and anything that he had written – not just the popes and kings who we know avidly sought his works, but unnamed people who tried to identify these scraps and understand them for what they were, who ended up by transforming them from being merely miscellaneous fragments among a mass of other fragments to being identified as writings of particular significance and importance. No one is likely to do that for *us*. Each text had to be recognized for what it was, and in this process of intellectual recovery (if I may put it this way) the initially disorganized *Nachlässe* turned into one discovery after another, all brought into existence by Arnau's friends and admirers, men from Barcelona to Valencia, from Montpellier to Messina – men like Ramon Conesa and Pere Cellerer and many others whose names we will never know. It was they whose discoveries ensured that so much of Arnau's work would be made available for later scholars to read and study, rather than remain unidentified and even lost.

Our modern series of *trobades*, of which this was the fourth, strikes me as being a continuation of that activity of those fourteenth-century admirers – another collective effort, this one from colleagues across two continents and many nations. In these *trobades* we are doing very much as they did, though in different ways: identifying important features of Arnau's thought and spreading a better appreciation and understanding of his theological and medical

writings. Like our predecessors, we recognize the interest of all his works, even of those that Arnau himself did not take the trouble to publish.

If Arnau had been with us in these sessions, I think he would have been amused at our interest in his early ephemeral academic exercises discovered in his *Nachlass*, and apologetic at having failed to leave copies of his much more ambitious Galenic commentaries in places where we could easily find them – like that on *De morbo*, for example. He would have been astonished that it has taken so long for us to realize that he greatly admired Hippocrates as well as Galen, but delighted to find that we have discovered more of his commentaries on his *Parabole medicacionis* – would he be wishing, I wonder, that he could tell us that there were still others to be found?<sup>26</sup> Above all, I think our painstaking attention to the details of his life in 1300 and 1301 would have brought his own vivid memories of those dramatic months flooding back. If only he were able to share them with us! I am quite sure that Arnau would not always have seen himself as we have come to see him, but I cannot imagine that he would have been offended by our attention in these *trobades*, and I am convinced that he would have welcomed us into the company of his disciples.

---

26. On these themes, see the papers in this volume by Fernando Salmón, Sebastià Giralt, and Jordi Bossoms i Costa.

TABLE 1

MS Paris, BN lat. 6949	
1ra-84vb	Liber membucius qui latine dicitur Averoy. Quando ventilata sunt ... / ... ipsius lumine nostros oculos illuminare dignetur. Explicit collectorium Averoy.
85ra-86vb	Incipiunt canones Averoy qui debent considerari in dandis medicinis laxativis. Articulus primus. Articuli seu canones necessarii medicis ... / ... a natura et cibus est similis propinquus non longincus.
87r-v	[blank]
88ra	Incipit liber Avicenne de viribus cordis ... Creavit Deus ex concavitatibus cordis ... [ <i>De viribus cordis</i> 1.1]
93ra	iunguntur. ut sua aperiendi ... simul causant [ <i>De viribus cordis</i> II.1 breaks off here]
93ra	qualiter fiat rigor ... [ <i>De rigore</i> begins here at AVOMO ed. 72 line 14]
95vb	... quemadmodum scitur ex libro ingenii sanitatis. Explicit liber G. de spasma et iecticatione
96ra	Constrictiva medicina et inviscativa medicina ... [ <i>De viribus cordis</i> II.1 picks up again here]
100rb	... dignatus est opusculum terminandi. Explicit [ <i>De viribus cordis</i> ends]
100va	Incipit libellus magistri Arnaldi de villa nova de humido radicali ...
104vb	... pristinae quantitatis sunt nec minute [ <i>De humido radicali</i> breaks off at AVOMO ed. 308 line 855 – eight blank lines end the column]
105ra	[eighteen blank lines begin the column; then <i>De humido radicali</i> resumes at AVOMO ed. 309 line 880] Restat igitur sicut primo ...
107ra	... perfecte cognoscere nisi unum. Explicit libellus de humido radicali. Incipit liber de rigore et tremore ...
114va	... quemadmodum scitur ex libro ingenii sanitatis. Explicit liber G. de rigore et spasma