

Peter of Spain's Handling of Authorities in his Commentary on the *Isagoge* of Johannitius

MIGUEL DE ASÚA (*)

SUMMARY

1.—Introductory remarks. 2.—The commentary on the *Isagoge* of Johannitius by Peter of Spain. 3.—Peter's handling of authorities. 3.1.—Doctrina. 3.2.—The authorities mentioned in the commentary. 3.3.—Use of authorities. 3.4.—Peter's scholastic technique. 3.5.—Some authorities. 4.—Final comments.

ABSTRACT

The *dicta* from medical and philosophical authorities appearing in commentaries on the *Isagoge* of Johannitius may be classified according to the different roles they play in the exposition of the text. This paper establishes that the opinions of the philosophical and medico-philosophical authorities were used more frequently as the constituent elements of inferences, whereas the *dicta* of purely medical authorities were quoted straightforwardly as *sententiae*. An exception to this is Peter of Spain who does not follow any hierarchical organization of authorities; instead, he freely quotes Aristotle in opposition to the physicians as well as in support of them. These observations are explained with specific reference to Peter's ideas on the relationship between medicine and philosophy.

BIBLID [0211-9536(2000) 20; 107-133]

Fecha de aceptación: 19 de abril de 1998

(*) Profesor. Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas-Universidad Nacional de Gral. San Martín. Estanislao del Campo 324. (1706) Haedo, Buenos Aires. Argentina.

Scholastic method dominated the education and practice of learned physicians from the middle of the thirteenth to the first half of the fifteenth centuries. Once considered as a degeneration of medicine by historians influenced by fin de siècle positivism, scholastic medicine is now better understood as an attempt to provide medicine with a sound rational basis in Aristotelian science which furthered the development of medicine as an independent profession within the early of the universities. Imported into medicine from a long process of development in theology, philosophy and perhaps law, and encountering the medical and natural philosophical tradition of the «Salernitan» questions, medical scholasticism was a device for enhancing the status of medicine by providing it with the foundations of *scientia*.

For the most part, the ultimate epistemological horizon of scholasticism was the notion of *auctoritas*. The powerful apparatus of Aristotelian logic operated on the massive amount of material provided by the recovery of the Aristotelian and Galenic corpus and their Arabic interpreters who tried to synthesize it and resolve its inconsistencies into a unified and coherent picture. Scholasticism could be understood as a linguistic, oral enterprise that not only addressed specific questions of medical theory and practice and tried to resolve them with the help of the ancient authors, but also raised objections derived from conflicting opinions, thus actualizing the potential dialogue among the *auctoritates* implicit in its texts. In the case of commentaries with *quaestiones*, the classroom became a conceptual stage in which the oral performance of the master brought to life the various voices from the past and guided them towards an articulated discourse. This was achieved through the multiplication of the *distinctiones* or points of view, by means of which the opposing *sententiae* of the authorities could be made to reveal the hidden unity beneath the apparent contradictions. What the medical student acquired in the classroom, then, was the ability to confront the particular situations of medical practice from the perspective of a *scientia* based on authority interpreted by reason—although opinion as to whether medicine was a *scientia* or an *ars* (and, if a *scientia*, whether theoretical or practical) differed widely among scholastic masters and was a favourite subject for disputation.

Peter of Spain was one of the first authors to introduce scholasticism in medical commentaries and it would be little exaggeration to consider

him a milestone in the development of medieval medical teaching. A look at his technique of commentary could perhaps provide some new insights into the situation of medical instruction around the middle of the thirteenth century. The modest aim of this contribution is to explore Peter of Spain's treatment of authorities in his commentary on the *Isagoge* of Johannitius, as a way of obtaining a more detailed picture of his teaching praxis and intellectual programme. Besides, it should stimulate discussion about the meaning, purpose and modes of use of *auctoritates* by scholastic medical commentators.

After some preliminary remarks, we shall begin by describing the structure of the commentary and proceed to discuss Peter's handling of authorities, considering his ideas on *auctoritas*, the *auctores* he used, his way of introducing them into discourse, his scholastic technique, and the particular role that some *auctores* play in the commentary.

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Recent work has provided evidence in favour of the thesis that the works ascribed so far to «Peter of Spain» were, in fact, written by a number of different authors (1). D'Ors argues that the author of the *Summule logicales* was a Dominican, not to be identified with Petrus Juliani (Pope John XXI). Meirinhos distinguishes between a Petrus Hispanus (author of the *Tractatus*), a Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis (author of the *Scientia libri de anima* and the *Liber de morte et vita*) (2) and a Petrus Hispanus medicus (author of the commentaries on *De animalibus* and the *Articella*, whose identification with the Pope John is still to be decided) (3). Paolo Nardi had already brought into question

(1) See MEIRINHOS, José Francisco. Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis? Elementos para uma diferenciação de autores. *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval*, 1996, 3, 51-76 and D'ORS, Angel. Petrus Hispanus O.P., *Auctor Summularum. Vivarium*, 1997, 35, 21-71.

(2) Also, perhaps, of commentaries on Dionysius.

(3) According to MEIRINHOS, note 1, the *Questiones libri de anima* should be attributed to an author not identifiable with any of these.

the identification of the medical commentator as Pope John XXI (4). A discussion of this problem lies far beyond the objective of this essay, but it has to be said that, despite this «multiplication of Peters», I subscribe to the view current among historians of medieval medicine that a physician called Peter of Spain commented at Siena on the *Articella*, the *De animalibus* and—as he himself says in his commentary on the *Isagoge*—also on *De sensu et sensato* and *De anima* (5).

2. THE COMMENTARY ON THE ISAGOGE OF JOHANNITIUS BY PETER OF SPAIN

This text, which has reached us in a number of manuscripts as the first of Peter's commentaries on the *Articella* (6), consists of a brief

-
- (4) NARDI, Paolo. Comune, imperio e papato alle origini dell'insegnamento universitario in Siena (1240-1275). *Bulletino senese di storia patria*, 1983, 90, 50-94.
- (5) «Circa partem istam possunt queri multa vel quesita dubitari, sed quia alibi sunt disputata et determinata sicut supra librum de sensu et sensato et supra secundum librum de anima ad presens omittantur et in partibus illis requirantur» (Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, MS 1877, fol. 32va-32vb). It is true that there are no testimonies that say that Peter commented on the *Articella* or *De animalibus* at Siena, but since his teaching there is his only known activity as a commentator, it seems to me only logical to assume—under the available evidence—that the works attributed to him were produced at the Siena *studium*.
- (6) For a list of manuscripts, see KRISTELLER, Paul Oskar. *Studi sulla Scuola medica salernitana*, Napoli, Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, 1986, p. 128. Fernando Salmón tells me that this list has some mistakes. For a complete list of manuscripts containing the *articella* and the commentaries on the *articella*, see O'BOYLE, Cornelius. *Thirteenth-and Fourteenth-Century Copies of the Ars Medicinæ. A Checklist and Contents Descriptions of the Manuscripts*, Cambridge, Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, CSIC Barcelona, Department of History of Science [Articella Studies 1], 1998. See also the comprehensive work on the teaching of the *articella* in Paris, O'BOYLE, Cornelius, *The Art of Medicine: Medical Teaching at the University of Paris, 1250-1400*, Leiden, Brill, 1998. The list of the *quaestiones* in Peter of Spain's commentaries on the *articella* has been edited in SALMÓN, Fernando, *Medical Classroom Practice. Petrus Hispanus' questions on Isagoge, Tegni, Regimen Acutorum and Prognostica (c. 1245-1250) (MS Madrid B.N. 1877), fols. 24rb-141vb*, Cambridge, Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, CSIC Barcelona, Department of History of Science [Articella Studies 4], 1998. In this study we

accessus (strongly inspired by the *accessus* in Bartholomaeus of Salerno's commentary on the *Isagoge*) and 45 chapters which follow approximately those of the introductory medical text attributed to Johannitius. The beginning of each chapter is indicated by the corresponding *lemma*. Then comes a brief *divisio textus*, which situates the chapter discussed within the context of the whole work and also divides its content. This is followed by a reading of the text of the corresponding chapter of the *Isagoge*, which usually ends with the expression «in hoc terminatur summa presentis lectionis» (7). So, we learn that each of the chapters of the commentary is the result of a *lectio*.

After that comes the *expositio*, introduced by the expression «Ad evidentiā partis huius [tria / quattuor /...] possint determinari» (8). The *expositio* occasionally consists in an elucidation of the *intentiones* of the *auctor*; more frequently, it amounts to a rather extensive gloss in which the themes of the chapter (the elements, the humours and so on) are discussed, on the basis of *auctoritates*, according to categories such as *notificatio*, *numero*, *ordo*, *divisio*, *cause* and so on. Each chapter is closed by a number of *quaestiones*, hierarchically organized as *principales* and subsidiary, and introduced by the expression: «Circa partem istam [tria / quattuor /...] possint dubitari» (9). The *quaestiones* of the commentary are fully scholastic. Questions of the *quaestiones et responsiones* type, which appear so frequently in Peter's commentary on *De animalibus*, constitute here a very rare exception.

This pattern of commentary is followed throughout the whole work, although some sections lack the *glossa*. The commentary on the *Isagoge* is far more elaborate than the rest of Peter's commentaries on the *Articella*, especially in terms of the variety of instruments applied to the teaching of the text: *divisio*, *summa*, *expositio* (which is, in fact, a gloss) and *quaestiones*. Other medical commentaries by Peter (*On Prognostics*, *On Particular Diets*) consist only of *divisiones* and *quaestiones*; the commentaries

shall use the version of the commentary on the *Isagoge* in the manuscript Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional MS 1877, fols. 24ra-47vb (henceforth cited as «Madrid»).

(7) Madrid, fol. 32vb.

(8) Madrid, fol. 24vb.

(9) Madrid, fol. 24vb.

on the *Viaticum*, *Universal Diets* and *De urinis* are just groups of *quaestiones* organized according to *lemmata* (10).

Now it has to be said that we do not know the exact origin of the text we are dealing with. But we can suppose—on the basis of Peter's references to «lectiones»—that we are reading either a *reportatio* or, more probably, a *redactio* of Peter's teaching, that is, notes taken in class that went through some editing: the redaction is careful, there are no textual *lacunae*, and the structure of each question is consistent (11). I believe that the text could be classified in the genre of a *lectio* with *quaestiones* (questions that were posed and discussed by the teacher). The questions (in particular the *quaestiones principales*) are conceptually connected with the problems discussed in the preceding *expositio* rather neatly and there is a chapter (*De virtute sensitiva*) in which Peter does not raise *quaestiones* because he says that he has discussed them in other commentaries. All this suggests that the 307 *quaestiones* were an original part of the commentary and not a further addition to it of *quaestiones disputatae* (12).

In conclusion, we could consider this commentary as a fine example of classroom medical teaching in an early stage of the process of adoption of scholastic methodology, when the *quaestiones* were not yet separated from the *lectio*.

-
- (10) The chapters of the commentary on the *Tegni* have a detailed *divisio*, which also functions as a summary of the text commented upon, and (except for the first chapters) lack the *glossa*.
- (11) See BOUGEROL, Jacques-Guy. De la *reportatio* a la *redactio*. In: *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales, définition, critique et exploitation. Actes du colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve 25-27 mai 1981*, Louvain, L'institut d'études médiévales, Université catholique de Louvain, 1982, pp. 51-65.
- (12) Cf. JACQUART, Danielle. La question disputée dans les Facultés de Médecine. In: Bernardo C. Bazán; John W. Wippel; Gérard Fransen; Danielle Jacquart, *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1985, pp. 281-315 and BAZÁN, Bernardo. Les questions disputées, principalement dans les facultés de théologie. In: *ibid.*, pp. 15-149.

3. *PETER'S HANDLING OF AUTHORITIES*

3.1. *Doctrina*

Notions such as *auctor* and *auctoritas*, which were central to scholastic methodology, were developed as instruments of interpretation and doctrinal exposition of theological, philosophical and legal texts (13). As expected, nowhere does Peter explicitly discuss his conception of *auctoritas*, but we can obtain some hints about his views on the subject by looking at his treatment of the Galenic notion of *doctrina* in his commentary on the *Tegni*.

When considering what *doctrina* means, Peter rehearses Haly's conception of the matter: «an action of the doctor in the disciple, according to which the former projects into the soul of the latter the intentions he has in his own soul» (14). This unidirectional communication between *doctor* and student can take place either through a «sermo prolatus», or through an ostensive gesture of the finger of the teacher, or through the written word: «et sic scimus res per prolotionem doctoris presentis vel per scripturam ipso absente» (15). The reading of the written word is—besides the delivery of the word and the gesture of the hand—another way of learning *doctrina*. But Peter claims that reading is an indirect way of acquiring *doctrina*, one that takes place through the intermediacy of the sense of vision (16). In fact, in one of the *questiones*,

-
- (13) For a discussion of the meaning of *auctor* and *auctoritas* in theology, see CHENU, Marie-Dominique. *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, 3rd edition, Montreal, Institut d'études médiévales, 1974, pp. 106-125; CHENU, Marie-Dominique. *Auctor, actor, autor*. *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii*, 1927, 3, 81-86; BERTELLONI, Francisco. *Fe y razón*. *Escritos de Filosofía*, 1980, 6, 53-69. For *auctoritas* in medical commentaries see AGRIMI, Jole; CRISCIANI, Chiara. *Edocere medicos: Medicina scolastica nei secoli XIII-XV*, Napoli, Guerini, 1988, pp. 128-136.
- (14) «Dicit Haly quod doctrina est actio doctoris in discipulum secundum quam doctor proicit in animam discipuli intentiones quas habet in anima sua» (Madrid, fol. 48vb).
- (15) Madrid, fol. 48vb. Peter is here reproducing Haly's commentary on the *Tegni*; see note 20.
- (16) «Via in disciplina vel medium addiscendi est duplex. Quedam non est immediate, quedam immediate procedit a doctore in discipulum et est causa doctrine in ipso

he asks why the *medium* of *doctrina* is more the utterance of the word than the vision of color (17). The answer is that «discourse that transmits the intentions of one [person] to another is mostly the medium through which the things to be taught are conveyed» (18).

But Peter—again following Haly—reminds us that Galen, in *De iuvamentis membrorum*, affirms that «through the written word we understand the discourse of Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates and the other philosophers and physicians, as we would have done had we heard their teachings» (19). This plainly means that the text is a substitute for an absent teacher; a substitute that conveys his presence to us and can, thus, be considered an indirect mode of transmission of the things to be taught (20). It

et hoc est sermo prolatus representans discipulo quod in mente doctoris est. Est autem aliud medium, ut motus digiti, ut virtus, que non sunt immediate. Hec mediata causa vel occasio doctrine est. Et huius similiter est scriptum. Hoc non immediate cognoscitur a visu. Et si ipso mediante fuerit causa scientie, erunt extra viam doctrine. Obiectum enim visus et medium est etiam in mentione [?] doctrine et non in doctrina» (Madrid, fol. 49rb).

- (17) «Queritur quid sit medium in doctrina et quare magis prolatio quam aliud et videtur quod magis habet fieri doctrina mediante obiecto visus quod est color quam mediante obiecto auditus quod est prolatio» (Madrid, fols. 49ra-rb).
- (18) «Sermo differens intentionem unius ad alterum maxime esset medium in doctrina. Quod concedemus» (Madrid, fol. 49 rb). This also refers to a usual medieval distinction between the two ways of acquiring science, *per inventionem* (through the eye) and *per doctrinam* (through the ear). See MAIERÛ, Alfonso. Gli atti scolastici. In: Luciano Gargan; Oronzo Limone (eds.), *Luoghi e metodi di insegnamento nell'Italia medioevale (secoli XII-XIV)*, Galatina, Congedo editore, 1989, pp. 249-287 (p. 249, note 1). For a discussion of the relationships between the uttered and the written work in Peter of Spain's commentary on *De animalibus*, see NAGEL, Silvia. Sensi ed organi nel commento al «De animalibus» attribuito a Pietro Hispano (to be published in *Micrologus*). I am obliged to the author for allowing me to see the manuscript of her paper.
- (19) «Unde dicit Galenus in libro de iuvamentis membrorum quod per scripturam intelligimus sermonem Platonis, Aristotelis, Hippocratis et reliquorum philosophorum et medicorum quasi nos presentes audissemus doctrinas eorum» (Madrid, fol. 48vb, citing *De usu partium* I, 2).
- (20) In his commentary on the *Tegni*, Haly claims that there is no difference between *doctrina* as taught by a teacher who is present and *doctrina* written by an absent teacher and read by another: «Et equale est sive doctrina sit prolata dictionibus aut audita, sive scripta aut inspecta, ex qua intelligantur ille eedem dictiones, aut

would seem, then, that the reading (aloud) of the *sententie* of an *auctor* by the contemporary master in the classroom was construed by Peter (after Haly) as a reenactment of the act of teaching of the former. If this conception of the reading of the text as an indirect way to the *doctrina antiquorum* holds, then what was the *quaestio* posed by the *doctor* but a dialogue between his voice and the chorus elicited by the written words of the *auctoritates* «quasi nos presentes» (as Galen says) (21)—as though the medieval classroom would have been full of «invisible presences»?

3.2. *The authorities mentioned in the commentary*

Peter mentions a fair number of medical authorities: Avicenna (including his commentary on *De anima*), *Articella* authors such as Theophilus and Philaretus, Constantine, the Salernitans Bartholomaeus and Trotula, Isaac (*De elementis*), Haly (and his commentary on Galen's *Tegni*), various books of Galen (*Tegni*, *De morbo et accidenti*, *De simplicibus medicina*, *De regimine sanitatis*, *De complexionibus*), Rasis (*Liber ad Almansorem*), Serapion and Hippocrates (the *Aphorisms*). The major philosophical authority is Aristotle, of whom Peter mentions the *Analytica priora et posteriora*, almost all of his *libri naturales* (*De generatione et corruptione*, *Physica*, *De caelo et mundo*, *Meteorologica*, *De anima*, *De animalibus*, *De sensu et sensato*, *De morte et vita*) and also the *Ethics* and the *Metaphysics*. Other authors of natural philosophy are Plato (in the Chalcidian version), the «*auctor libri de motu cordis*», the author of *De differentia spiritu et anime*, Averroes, Boethius (*De consolatione*), John Damascene, Augustine, Isidore

indicata manu aut digito aut statione ex qua intelligatur illud quod significant dictiones. Doctrina enim aut est prolata actu, aut prolata potentia, et non est differentia etiam inter illa, ubicumque doctor sit presens qui doceat discipulum aut etiam non presens, cum ipse iam firmaverit et scripserit et exemplificaverit illud ex quo intelligitur doctrina, donec aspiciens in aliquo libro antiquorum secundum semitam doctrine, addiscat ex ordine vel editione libri absque mediatione». (*Articella cum commento*, 1534, fol. 96rb).

- (21) See note 19. For a discussion of *doctrina* in Peter and other medical authors, see also AGRIMI; CRISCIANI, note 13, pp. 54-74.

and «Gregorius in suo libro quam composuit de anima» (22), that is, Nemesius' *De natura hominis*, attributed to Gregory of Nyssa.

Peter makes the usual scholastic differentiation between *auctores* and contemporary authors. In his commentary on the *Tegni*, he distinguishes clearly between Haly's «commentum supra Tegni» (which he treats as the authoritative *glossa* of Galen) and other commentators. He refers to the *expositores* that followed the translation of the *Tegni* that circulated with the *Articella*—the so-called *translatio moderna*— as «quidam» or «alii» (23). The opinions of his contemporaries are mentioned to be refuted (the refutation is always introduced by the expression «nos autem dicimus», which appears only in this function) or to expose a number of *intentiones*, among which Peter chooses the correct answer (24).

In Table 1 we can see the total number of citations for each author. Avicenna is, by far, the most cited authority in the text (234 times), followed by Aristotle (118 times), Constantine (96 times) and Galen (88 times); then come Isaac (27 times) and Haly (22 times), Rasis (15 times), Hippocrates (only 14 times) and Johannitius (5 times) (25).

3.3. Use of authorities

In attempting to approach the problem of Peter's handling of authorities, we shall now consider his use of authors in relation to [1] the subject matter discussed, [2] the part of the chapter in which the *auctor* is mentioned, and [3] the character of the authority, whether medical or philosophical.

(22) Madrid, fol. 31rb.

(23) «Haly, sequens aliam translationem...alii autem expositores, hanc translationem sequentes» (Madrid, fol. 53ra). «Quidam dicunt...alii dicunt...nos autem dicimus» (Madrid, fol. 49va). For the different translations of the *Tegni* see OTTOSSON, Per-Gunnar. *Scholastic Medicine and Philosophy: A Study of Commentaries on Galen's Tegni (ca. 1300-1450)*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 1984, pp. 24-27.

(24) For example: «Circa hanc questionem, duplex est intentio» (Madrid, fol. 52vb); «Circa hoc, triplex est intentio» (Madrid, fol. 58ra-rb).

(25) The references made to Johannitius as «iste auctor» are not included.

If we look at the number of times each author is mentioned in each chapter, we find that some of the *auctores* predominate in certain chapters (Table 1). The most cited author in most of the chapters is Avicenna («De cholera nigra» depends almost exclusively on his authority), but there are exceptions. For example, Galen predominates in the chapters «De rebus naturalibus», «De divisione signorum» and «De cyrugia»; Constantine in «De medicina», «De virtute spiritali» and «De potu»; Aristotle in «De coloribus capillorum», «De figura corporis» and «De qualitatibus corporum»; the «auctor de differentia spiritu et animae» in the chapter «De spiritibus» (11 citations); Rasis in «De coitu» (7 citations, as many as Avicenna in that chapter). This obviously means that Peter used his *auctores* selectively, according to the subject matter discussed. He, as commentator, granted each of them *auctoritas* in a particular field and decided who should be considered the authoritative interlocutor of the text in each particular *quaestio*.

Is there any difference as to the relative frequency of citations of each of the *auctores* in the two main parts of each chapter, the *expositio* or gloss and the *quaestiones*? In other words, are there authors who are used mostly in the *expositio* and authors used mostly in the *quaestiones*? The answer to this question is negative: the number of times a given authority is mentioned in the *expositio* or gloss in relation to the number of times it is mentioned in the *questiones* is a rate which is approximately the same for all the *auctores* used in the commentary (roughly, the rate varies between 1:4 and 1:3). So in this commentary the technique of interpreting the text does not seem to bear on the selection of authorities.

It has been already remarked that the mere statistical counting of the citations of an *auctor* by a commentator is misleading, and that to assess more precisely the utilization of *auctoritates* in a commentary, the type of use of the citations in the argument has to be taken into account (26). Now if we pay attention to the possible roles that the *dicta* of an *auctor*, his name or a combination of both, play in the discourse

(26) See JORDAN, Mark D. Aquinas Reading Aristotle's Ethics. In: Mark D. Jordan; Kent Emery, Jr (eds.), *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1995, pp. 229-249 and CHENU (1974), note 13, pp. 112-113.

TABLE 1

*Authorities cited in the commentary on the Isagoge of Johannitius by
Peter of Spain (MS. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 1877, fols. 24 ra-47 vb)*

	<i>Joha.</i>	<i>Avic.</i>	<i>Arist.</i>	<i>Const.</i>	<i>Haly</i>	<i>Isaac</i>	<i>Galen</i>	<i>Hippo.</i>	<i>Rasis</i>
Prol. + access.		3	2	4	1	1	7		
1. De medicina		2	1	4	2		1		
2. De rebus naturalibus			2	4	2		11	1	
3. De elementis		2	5	3		2	1		
4. De commix. sive de compl.		5	5		1				
5. De humoribus		15	1	1					
6. De modis flegmatis		9	1	1		2	6		
7. De modis cholere rubee		8	3	1		1	2		
8. De cholera nigra		20							
9. De membris		8	8	1	1				
10. De membris		7	3		2		1		
11. De virtutibus	1	2	1	2	1				
12. De virtute naturali		2	4	3					
13. De virtute spirituali		1	5	12					
14. De virtute animali			2	2					
15. De ordinat. et discretiva	1	13	6				1		
16. De virtute sensibili			2	1					
17. De operationibus	1	4	4				1		
18. De spiritibus		4	3		1		1		
19. De etatibus		13		11		8	3	6	
20. De coloribus	1	13	3	2		1	1		
21. De color. capillorum		9	13	2		2	6		
22. De tunicis oculorum	1	10	4	1		1	9		

TABLE 1

*Authorities cited in the commentary on the Isagoge of Johannitius by
Peter of Spain (MS. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 1877, fols. 24 ra-47 vb) (Continuation)*

	<i>Joha.</i>	<i>Avic.</i>	<i>Arist.</i>	<i>Const.</i>	<i>Haly</i>	<i>Isaac</i>	<i>Galen</i>	<i>Hippo.</i>	<i>Rasis</i>
23. De figura corporis		3	10	7	3	2	1	3	
24. De aere		11	6	5			2	2	
25. De ventis		5		4	1		1	1	
26. De modis terrarum		5		1				1	
27. De exercitio		5	1	3	1		1		
28. De balneo		2							
29. De cibo		7	1	2					
30. De potu		2	2	6					1
31. De sompno			2	2					
32. De coitu		7	3	2			4		7
33. De acciden. anime		4	4	1	4	2	3		1
34. De febribus		6		2		3			
35. De apostematibus						2	1		
36. De divisio egritudinum		3		2					
37. De membris officialibus			1	1			1		
38. De qualitat. corporum			7		2		4		
39. De causis sanit. et egrit.		6	1				2		
40. De causis morbor. calidor.		5	1				2		
41. De causis morbor. official.		4							
42. De superfluitate		1							2
43. De divis. signorum		1	1				6		2
44. De operat. medicine				3					2
45. De cyrugia		7					9		
TOTAL	5	234	118	96	22	27	88	14	15

of the commentary, we can distinguish a few categories. The following classification is merely instrumental to my argument: the different uses of citations spelled out in it do not correspond to the different degrees of proof-value that the mention of an *auctoritas* can grant to an argument (27).

In Peter's commentary, an author can be summoned to provide definitions or *divisiones* (in these cases their names are preceded by expressions such as «diffinitur ab»). Most frequently, the *dicta* of an author can be used either as the basis of a direct inference (for example, in a causal clause) or an indirect inference (as the premises of a syllogism or enthymeme). A *dictum* is also used as such, *simpliciter* (for example, in cases in which the «oppositum videtur quod» consists simply in the reproduction of the opinion of an authority). An *auctor* can also be invoked to distinguish his *intentio*, the particular sense in which his *dictum* should be understood (following expressions such as «intelligitur ab» or «hoc modo dicitur ab»). Finally, the names of authors are used to refer to their books and also when approving or answering to their objections (preceded by expressions such as «Et videtur quod sic auctoritate...» or «Ad auctoritatem...»).

The counting of the number of times each of the authorities is used in one of these discursive functions shows that most of the *definitiones* and *divisiones* of the commentary are taken from Avicenna (Table 2). Besides, if we compare the relative number of times the *dicta* of a given authority is mentioned as part of an inference with the number of times they are used as such (*simpliciter*), some differences become evident (28). To facilitate comparison, the rate «number of *dicta* in inferences / number of *dicta simpliciter*» for each authority was calculated: a high rate means that the *dicta* of that *auctor* are used relatively more times as forming part of inferences; a low rate, that they are used mostly *simpliciter*. In Table 2, we see that the author with the highest rate is Aristotle

(27) Jordan and Chenu (note 26) consider the different uses of citations of an *auctoritas* in a theological commentary on the basis of the various possible degrees of proof they convey, as used by the commentator.

(28) We should look at the percentages in Table 2 to assess the relative amount of *dicta* in inferences and *dicta simpliciter* for each author.

TABLE 2
Uses of auctoritates and their dicta in the commentary on the Isagoge of Johannitius by Peter of Spain (MS. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 1877, fols. 24 ra-47 vb)

	<i>Joha.</i>	<i>Avic.</i>	<i>Arist.</i>	<i>Const.</i>	<i>Haly</i>	<i>Isaac</i>	<i>Galen</i>	<i>Hippo.</i>	<i>Rasis</i>
<i>Definitiones</i> («diffinitur ab»)		17	2	4	2	3	3		
<i>Divisiones and classificationes</i>		12	1	2		2	1	2	
<i>Dicta in inferences (dir. and indirect)</i>	1 (20.0)	63 (26.9) ¹	34 (28.8)	18 (18.8)	5 (22.7)	6 (22.2)	13 (14.8)		
<i>Dicta (simpliciter)</i>	3 (60.0)	81 (34.6)	31 (26.3)	39 (40.6)	10 (45.5)	7 (25.9)	32 (36.4)	6 (42.9)	5 (33.3)
<i>Intentio</i> («sic intelligitur»)		27	25	14	4	3	18	1	4
«Videtur quod sic auctorit. __» «Ad auctor. __»	1	15	15	12		2	5	1	2
Reference to books (without <i>dicta</i>)		19	10	7	1	4	16	4	4
TOTAL	5	234	118	96	22	27	88	14	15
Rate n° <i>dicta</i> infer. / n° <i>dicta simplic.</i>	0.3	0.8	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.4	0	0

¹ Figures in parentheses refer to percentages taken over the total of the column.

(1.1); then come Isaac (0.9) and Avicenna (0.8); finally, we can distinguish a group of authors with low rates: Haly (0.5), Constantine (0.5), Galen (0.4), Rasis (0) and Hippocrates (0) (29).

Now it seems possible to suggest an interpretation of these numbers. The author with the highest rate, that is, whose *dicta* are used relatively more as forming part of inferences, is Aristotle, the philosopher. Those authors with low rates, that is, whose *dicta* were mostly used *simpliciter*, are physicians (Haly, Constantine, Galen, Rasis and Hippocrates). The

(29) Johannitius is not included here, because the references to him as «iste auctor» were not counted.

middle of this spectrum is occupied by Avicenna, physician and philosopher, and Isaac. This means that Peter tended to use the opinions of his philosophical and medico-philosophical authorities relatively more frequently as parts of inferences of some kind, while his purely medical authorities received—in relative terms—a more direct treatment, in the sense that their *dicta* were taken as *sententiae* without further ado (30).

A possible hypothesis to account for this difference in the use of philosophical, medico-philosophical and purely medical authorities in the commentary relates to the Avicennan distinction that constitutes the basis of the different solutions Peter offers—in this and other commentaries—to solve the issues of the *controversia inter medicos et philosophos*. Peter says that «if somebody subtly considers the discourse of the philosophers, [he will see that] it is truth; but [the discourse of] the physicians is more evident» (31). Would it be too farfetched to suppose that the opinions of the philosophers, which are more abstract and closer to a hidden truth, were more apt to be treated as premises of a syllogism than the sentences of the physicians, which are more concrete and apt to be considered as expressions of matters of fact? This could be the case, but even if we do not wish to accept this interpretation, what seems undeniable is that there is a difference in the way Peter treats the statements of his *auctoritates*—medical and philosophical—from the point of view of the function their *dicta* play in discourse.

3.4. *Peter's scholastic technique*

Is there any distinctiveness in Peter's dialectical handling of authorities? What calls our attention is his repeated use of expressions such as

(30) The only exception to this generalization seems to be Isaac, whom one would expect to see as forming part of the latter group. Isaac's «high» rate could be accounted for by a bias owing to the small absolute number of citations he receives in the commentary.

(31) «Si quis subtiliter inspiciat sermonem philosophorum, verus est; vero medicorum magis manifestus» (Madrid, fol. 29rb).

«auctoritate Constantini» or «per auctoritatem Avicenne». This is a well-known scholastic formula (32), but Peter uses it much more frequently in his commentary on the *Isagoge* than in his other *Articella* commentaries. Could it be that in this, the opening commentary of the series, he was more conscious of the need to legitimate his own discourse on the basis of the *auctoritates*?

When confronting the *Isagoge* with the authorities, Peter displays all the logical and dialectical resources of scholasticism (33): he compares the *Isagoge* with the texts of his authorities (34); he raises objections to the text he is commenting upon on the basis of a given *auctor* (35); he provides authoritative foundations for things said in the *Isagoge*, drawing upon his sources (36); he also objects that something that appears in the *Isagoge* is absent in another text (for example, when he asks why the fever generated from *cholera*, mentioned in the *Isagoge*, is considered neither by Avicenna nor by Isaac) (37).

Besides this interaction of text and authorities, there is the interplay of the *auctoritates* among themselves. On occasion, several authorities are confronted in one *quaestio* (38). Also, it is frequent to find the

-
- (32) In this context, *auctoritas* would make reference to the texts rather than to the authors: see CHENU (1974), note 13, p. 110, note 2.
- (33) We should remember that what scholastics took as the unit of authority was not the author, but a text or a particular *dictum* of an author (see note 32). This explains why the detailed listing of all the books in which an author expressed a given opinion is not redundant. For example, Peter reminds us that Aristotle gives his account of *scientia* in the *Analytica priora*, the *posteriora* and the *Physica*. Madrid, fol. 46vb.
- (34) When, for example, he confronts Johannitius' definition of medicine with the definitions given by Haly, Galen, Isaac, Avicenna and Constantine. Madrid, fol. 24rb.
- (35) For example, when he argues that Constantine, in the enumeration of the natural things, cites the *complexio* but not the *compositio*, contrary to Johannitius. Madrid, fol. 25ra.
- (36) For example, when he argues the reduction of a *res naturalis annexa* to a *res naturalis principalis* on the basis of Galen's argument. Madrid, fol. 25vb.
- (37) Madrid, fol. 28ra. This «hearing of the silences» of the texts commented upon is rather frequent in the commentary.
- (38) For example when he discusses why Constantine and Johannitius consider four ages in the human being, while for Hippocrates and Avicenna, the stages of life are seven. Madrid, fol. 34vb.

accumulation of different authorities to support an opinion (for example, he affirms that «solum dulce nutrit» on the authority of Avicenna, Isaac and Aristotle) (39). Finally, there are *quaestiones* in which apparently contradictory *sententiae* of the same author are confronted (40).

All this is, of course, scholastic medicine (41). But the reminder of the richness of dialectical resources that organize Peter's discourse and the maturity of his technique gains new dimensions when we recall that Peter's was one of the first attempts to apply scholastic methodology in medical instruction.

We have already remarked that Peter depends upon two different kinds of authorities: medical and philosophical. But although (as we have also seen) it is indeed possible to discern differences in the use of the *dicta* of physicians and philosophers as to their function within discourse, there is no detectable difference as to their position in the dialectical confrontation of «*dictio-oppositio*», which is characteristic of the *quaestio*. In other words, although Aristotle, the philosopher, is frequently found opposing the physicians (in general or the opinion of a particular medical author), he is also listed among them in the sequences of definitions (42). And there are 7 mentions of Aristotle preceding or following medical authorities supporting a given opinion (for example, «quia dicit Avicenna et Haly et philosophus quod...») (43). Peter's commentaries (medical and natural philosophical) do not contain anything like the hierarchical organizations of authority which are usual in theological commentaries, and there are no questions determined on

(39) Madrid, fol. 27rb.

(40) For example, in the question that discusses whether the vital spirit can be generated from the natural spirit, where contradictory solutions are attributed to Avicenna. Madrid, fol. 34vb.

(41) Cf. AGRIMI; CRISCIANI, note 13, pp. 87-96.

(42) For example, in the definition of «natura», where the order of the authors is: Aristotle, Galen, Hippocrates (Madrid, fol. 24vb), or in the definition of the elements, where the order is: Isaac, Aristotle, Galen, Avicenna, Constantine (Madrid, fol. 25rb).

(43) Madrid, fol. 27rb. Besides this case, Aristotle accompanies Avicenna three times (fols. 37va, 42va, 45vb), Constantine twice (fols. 38ra, 41rb), and Johannitius once (fol. 38vb).

the basis of the type of authority. It is doubtful whether Peter would have subscribed, without nuances, to the famous phrase of Albert the Great: «If the discussion concerns medicine, I would rather believe Galen or Hippocrates, and if it concerns things of nature, Aristotle or anyone else experienced in natural things». As far as medicine rested upon or was subordinated to natural philosophy (44), Aristotle had had as much to say in some matters of medicine as Galen had, particularly in the discussion of *res naturales*. And if we consider the significant role that medical authorities play in his commentary on *De animalibus*, we could say that the converse is also truth (45). The granting by Peter of an equivalent authoritative status to physicians and philosophers was, evidently, a condition of possibility for the development of the controversy between them (otherwise, the conflict would have been resolved by appealing to a hierarchical principle). In this commentary, Peter does not use the various «rules of authority», the dialectical instruments used by scholastic commentators to solve contradictions—except for the differentiation between the different senses (*intentiones*) of a word as used by authorities in conflict (46). His handling of authorities, then, involves neither the assumption of a hierarchy, nor the use of «rules of authority», nor the deployment of discursive formulae expressing the different shades of the authoritative argument usual in theological commentaries (47). Peter's authors, medical and philosophical, enjoy a rather homogeneous degree of authority, and his manipulation of them seems to consist in the way certain authors are used in reference to a

(44) «Secundum Bartholomaeum circa introitum istius libri septem sunt inquirenda...Supponitur autem primo medicina et per medicinam phisice sive naturali philosophia et ex consequenti philosophie» (Madrid, fol. 24ra).

(45) ASÚA, Miguel de. Medicine and Philosophy in Peter of Spain's Commentary on *De animalibus*. In: Carlos Steel, Guy Guldentops, Pieter Beullens (eds.), *Aristotle's Animals in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Leuven, Leuven University Press [Mediaevalia Lovaniensia Series I/Studia XXVII], 1999, pp. 189-211.

(46) For the «rules of use of authorities», see CHENU (1974), note 13, pp. 118-125 and note 24.

(47) Peter does not seem to utilize the subtle rhetorical devices that could reveal the different proof-value he wishes to grant each of the citations and the style of the commentary is extremely mechanical and rigid.

particular subject matter and in their use either as points of departure for an argument or in direct citations.

3.5. *Some authorities*

Peter does not characterize his medical authorities except for Hippocrates, of whom he says in the commentary on *De regimine acutorum* that he «glows gloriously among the rest of the authors as a morning star in the breaking of the day to come» (48). But Hippocrates plays a very minor role in the commentary on the *Isagoge*. Avicenna is, without doubt, Peter's main authority in this work. He is the most frequently cited *auctor*, many definitions of key concepts in the commentary are taken from him, and the material expounded in the *glossa* of each chapter is, in most cases, an exposition of Avicennan medical doctrine (particularly in the first chapters, those concerned with *res naturales*). Also, many individual solutions to particular issues of the controversy between philosophers and physicians are taken from Avicenna. It seems evident that it is Avicenna who provided the beams with which Peter raised the theoretical structure of his commentary on the *Isagoge*.

The second most cited authority is, interestingly, the Philosopher. Peter assumes the Aristotelian definition of knowledge (49), his account of the elements (50), the Aristotelian definition of life as *actus primus* (as opposed to the definition by Constantine) (51), Aristotle's account of the active and passive intellect (52), and many particular points of Aristotelian natural philosophy. The Philosopher is used by Peter mostly in the chapters concerned with *res naturales* (around 68 % of the Aristotelian references correspond to those chapters). There are 15 *quaestiones* in which the opinion of Aristotle is confronted with that of the physicians

(48) «Ypocras qui in scientia medicinali ut stella matutina qui in presagio diei preterite videtur inter auctores ceteros rutilat gloriosus» (Madrid, fol. 110ra).

(49) Madrid, fol. 24rb.

(50) Madrid, fol. 25rb.

(51) Madrid, fol. 30vb.

(52) Madrid, fol. 30vb.

(as a whole or separately) and many more in which *sententiae* of Aristotle are called upon, either as objections or to defend the thesis (53). In two *quaestiones*, the opinion of Aristotle is preferred to that of Constantine (one asks whether the spiritual power influences the members from the heart through a movement of dilatation and contraction, and the other discusses which is more necessary, eating or drinking) (54). Only in one case is the opinion of the Philosopher laid aside (in the problem of the female sperm, which Peter solves «dicendum quod mulieres spermatizant») (55).

The reading of the commentary presupposes a familiarity with Aristotle and, as we have seen, Peter refers us to his previous commentary on *De anima* and *De sensu et sensato* in the chapter *De virtute sensitiva* (56). The fact that he taught in a university where arts and medicine were associated suggests that the audience of the commentary on the *Isagoge* had already had their share of Aristotelian doctrine.

What about the other philosophers? The other author of natural philosophy who plays a significant role in the commentary is the «auctor de libro de differentia spiritus et animae» (Costa ben Luca). He is utilized only in the chapter *De spiritibus*, but is mentioned there 11 times. This chapter is divided by Peter in two *quaestiones principales*, the first related to the philosophical conception of spirit (in which the idea of spirit as a way of union between soul and body is discussed and approved), and the second to the medical conception of the three spirits (natural, vital and animal).

(53) Most of these *quaestiones* are transcribed in ASÚA, Miguel de. El comentario de Pedro Hispano sobre la *Isagoge* de Johannitius. Transcripción de las *quaestiones* sobre la controversia entre médicos y filósofos. *Patristica et Mediaevalia*, 1996, 17, 58-66.

(54) «Utrum virtus ista [spiritualis] influat a corde ad alia membra mediante motu dilatationis et constrictionis» (Madrid, fol. 30vb); «[Queritur] de hoc quod dicit Constantinus quod si aliquis esset equaliter sitiens et famelicus citius moveretur ad potum quam ad cibum» (Madrid, fol. 41ra).

(55) Madrid, fol. 42rb. Nevertheless, he tries to save Aristotle's opinion, adding that the female sperm is crude (as opposed to the male sperm, which is cooked) and that females do not emit sperm.

(56) See note 5.

The author of *De motu cordis* is mentioned to argue for the centrality of the heart as the home of life, and his definition of life as the first act of the soul is also rehearsed (57). Isidore is quoted on his definition of the soul (58). The most interesting citation of Boethius is that in which he argues for the unity of the soul and its powers, together with John Damascene (59). So most of the philosophers other than Aristotle are used almost exclusively in relation to the discussion of themes related to the soul and spirit—an exception being Augustine, who is cited for his definition of sign in the chapter *De divisione signorum* (60). And it might be recalled here that the commentary opens by quoting a philosophical *auctoritas*, Plato's *Timaeus*, or more precisely, Chalcidius' version of it (61).

To close this brief account of Peter's use of authorities, it seems necessary to add that in three questions Peter includes as *rationes* evidence obtained through the senses. When discussing whether males or females have long hair, he answers that «sensibiliter videmus» that women have longer hair than men (62). In the question that asks whether human hair could be green, he says «oppositum videmus sensibiliter» (63). And he also sees «sensibiliter» that people in Spain and other warm countries are «audatiores quam anglici» (64) (although he seems to overturn this affirmation in the solution, where he distinguishes between the «propria audacia» of the *Anglici* and the *audatia* of the *Hispani*, which is a «maniaca confidentia»). In Peter's commentary on the *Tegni*, there are also a few of these kind of «reasons», although some of them would

(57) Madrid, fol. 30va; fol. 34rb. Peter mentions him a third time, affirming that «spiritus sit finis digestionis sive effectus» (Madrid, fol. 34ra).

(58) Madrid, fol. 30ra.

(59) Madrid, fol. 30ra.

(60) Madrid, fol. 45ra. There are almost no questions on natural philosophy as such in the commentary, the exception being the four *quaestiones* devoted to investigate whether the natural and vital spirits are also present in animals and plants (Madrid, fol. 33ra-rb).

(61) Madrid, fol. 24rb.

(62) Madrid, fol. 36va.

(63) Madrid, fol. 36vb.

(64) Madrid, fol. 39va.

appear doubtful to us, such as when Peter says that «nos videmus quod ex frequenti usu veneriorum debilitantur membra et desiccantur» (65). But the fact remains that observations from everyday experience were considered on an equal footing with the *dicta* of the authorities (66). These kinds of *rationes* are absent from Peter's commentary on animals—and this perhaps could be related to his characterization of physicians as «sensibiles» and philosophers as able to proceed beyond the sense to reach the «origo et radix» of things (67).

4. FINAL COMMENTS

Some conclusions can be singled out for comment. Peter's scholastic medical commentaries deserve attention because of the early date of their composition. Michael McVaugh and Danielle Jacquart have argued that Peter probably studied medicine at Paris, where he would have acquired his mastery of scholastic methodology and a first familiarity with the *Canon* (68). His influence on the further development of the

(65) Madrid, fol. 74rb.

(66) In his commentary on Isaac's *Diets*, Peter distinguishes between the «via rationis» and the «via experimenti»: see the transcription of this text in PETER OF SPAIN. *Scientia libri de anima*, edited by Manuel Alonso, Obras filosóficas 1, 2nd edition, Barcelona, Juan Flors, 1961, xxxix-xliv. See also ASÚA, Miguel de. The Relationships between Medicine and Philosophy in Peter of Spain's Commentaries on the *Articella*. In: *Papers of the Articella Project Meeting, Cambridge, December 1995*, Cambridge, Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine [Articella Studies 3], 1998, pp. 13-27, at pp. 21-23. In the *Thesaurus pauperum*, many recipes are proposed on the authority of having been experienced: «expertum est» (I owe this remark to Professor Michael R. McVaugh), But one should be aware that the identification of Peter of Spain (who was active at Siena) with Pope John XXI (who wrote the *Thesaurus*) has been brought into question (see note 1).

(67) «Medici vero qui sunt sensibiles considerando manifestationem iiii virtutum per quas conservatur corpus in esse ad suas operationes in iiii membris possunt iiii membra principalia. Et sic non est contradictio, quia philosophus ponit tantum unum quantum ad originem et radicem, medici vero iiii quantum ad virtutum istius corporis manifestationem» (Madrid, fol. 29ra).

(68) See McVAUGH, Michael R. (ed.). *Aphorismi de gradibus, Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Omnia*, Granada-Barcelona, Seminarium Historiae Medicae Granatensis, 1975,

method in northern Italy has also been suggested and remains to be explored in detail (69).

In fact, it would be tempting to consider Peter of Spain as an intermediary between southern and northern Italian medical and philosophical learning, something between a «late Salernitan» and a «precursor» of Taddeo Alderotti and Peter of Abano. On the one hand, he possibly had links with the court of Frederick II; he cultivated the genre of *quaestiones naturales* or «Salernitan» questions (in his *Problemata* or *Quaestiones de animalibus*); and he continued the Salernitan tradition of commentary on the *Articella*, with a strong emphasis on the relationships between medicine and philosophy. But although it is true that Peter knew and occasionally used Bartholomaeus' commentary on the *Articella* and other Salernitan material, nevertheless it was Avicenna he used as a model for his own work; in fact, the early, conscious and extensive utilization of the *Canon* by Peter seems to set his commentary apart from the Salernitan tradition. Besides, if we look for an antecedent to his mature use of scholastic methodology, Paris is rather more likely than Salerno.

On the other hand, his commentary on the *Articella* foreshadowed some of the more characteristic traits of medical teaching in Bologna and Padua: the consistent scholastic approach to medical texts, the use of Aristotelian philosophy, and the central role given to the controversy between physicians and philosophers. Unfortunately, we do not know if Peter's commentary was read, and no evidence as to the diffusion of the commentary has reached us. What we do have is the testimony of a common intellectual atmosphere, a sharing of sources, methods, interests

vol. 2, p. 43, note 24; McVAUGH, Michael R. Medical Knowledge at the Time of Frederick II. *Micrologus*, 1994, 2, 3-17; and JACQUART, Danielle. La réception du Canon d'Avicenne: Comparaison entre Montpellier et Paris aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles. In: *Actes du 110^e Congrès national des sociétés savantes, Montpellier, 1985. Section d'histoire des sciences et des techniques. II. Histoire de l'école médicale de Montpellier*, Paris, 1985, pp. 69-77.

(69) SIRAISSI, Nancy G. *Taddeo Alderotti and His Pupils: Two Generations of Italian Medical Learning*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1981, p. 98; JACQUART, note 12, p. 292.

and problems between Peter's commentary and northern Italian scholastic medicine. Peter's commentary on the *Articella* distinguished itself by its early and extensive use of Avicenna and its establishment of the pattern of the *controversia inter medicos et philosophos*. Moreover, it contained much of what was going to be deployed by northern Italian commentators during the second half of the thirteenth century, reaching its fulfilment in Peter of Abano's *Conciliator*.

Peter's commentaries on the *Articella* and *De animalibus* could be viewed as an attempt to articulate medical and philosophical discourse on several grounds (70): (a) his sophisticated theoretical discussions regarding the definition of medicine and its relationship with philosophy; (b) the large number of medical issues he discussed and the broad range of medical authorities he used in his commentary on *De animalibus*; (c) the common questions shared by both commentaries; (d) his originality in being the first to establish the pattern of issues that would constitute what he called the *controversia inter medicos et philosophos*; and (e) his «canonization of the *Canon*», which was perhaps a consequence of its systematic structure (which thus lent itself to scholastic treatment), its congeniality with Aristotelian natural philosophy, and its use as a valuable resource of solutions to numerous controversial questions.

Peter's treatment of authorities in the commentary on the *Isagoge*—a work that proved to be a favourite ground for discussing the philosophical aspects of medicine—seems to point in these same directions (71). He depends on a good number of medical and philosophical *auctoritates*

(70) The following points have been discussed in ASÚA, note 66 and ASÚA, note 45.

(71) For the relationships between medicine and philosophy in the commentaries on the *Isagoge* of Johannitius, see KRISTELLER, Paul Oskar. Bartolomeo, Musandino, Mauro di Salerno e altri antichi commentatori dell'articella, con un elenco di testi e di manoscritti. *In: Studi sulla Scuola medica salernitana*, Napoli, Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, 1986, pp. 97-151; JORDAN, Mark. Medicine as Science in the Early Commentaries on 'Johannitius'. *Traditio*, 1987, 43, 121-145; and JORDAN, Mark D. The Construction of a Philosophical Medicine: Exegesis and Argument in Salernitan Teaching on the Soul. [*In: Michael R. McVaugh; Nancy G. Siraisi (eds), Renaissance Medical Learning: Evolution of a Tradition*], *Osiris*, 1990, 2nd series, 6, 42-61. See also note 74.

and builds upon them a homogeneous discourse, in the sense that his *auctoritates* are indistinctly used in the dialectical interplay of the *questiones* and that there are no differences between them on «disciplinary» grounds. But this is only one side of the problem, because we have also seen that, when it comes to the uses of the *dicta*, it is possible to discern some relative differences between the more theoretical statements of the philosophers and those more concrete statements of the physicians.

We can see Peter's efforts to reach a point of equilibrium between coherence of discourse and the necessary autonomy of medicine in a new light if we recall the institutional setting in which he taught. Siena was a small *studium*, created around 1240, where students received instruction in arts, law and medicine (72). So, Peter commented in a university where arts and medicine were closely associated, as they were in Bologna or Padua.

The late Professor Charles Schmitt, in one of his papers, said that «there is no reason to believe that the physicians wanted Aristotle for any reason other than to derive whatever utility they could from his works as an adjunct to medical studies» (73). But I dare to say that we can think of other reasons besides the problematic one of «utility». It is evident that Peter, by using Aristotle as the second main *auctor* of his medical commentary, greatly increased the authoritative basis of his work. A medical commentator able to deploy the resources of the philosophers would have advantages when compared to others not able

(72) We know that Peter stayed in Siena from 1245 to 1250. There are documents that testify that he was paid as a professor in the *studium* between 1248 and 1250. For a comprehensive presentation of the early history of the *studium* and guide to bibliography, see NARDI, note 4. Cf. also RIJK, Lambert M. de. On the Life of Peter of Spain, The Author of the *Tractatus*, called afterwards *Summule Logicales*. *Vivarium*, 1970, 8, 150-51, and MEIRINHOS, note 1, pp. 55-56. For medical teaching in Siena, see also GAROSI, Alcide. *Siena nella storia della medicina (1240-1555)*, Firenze, Leo Olschki, 1958, pp. 131-148.

(73) SCHMITT, Charles. Aristotle among the physicians. In: Andrew Wear; Roger French; Ian M. Lonie (eds), *The Medical Renaissance of the Sixteenth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 1-15 (p. 3).

to exhibit a mastery of natural philosophy (74). At the same time, Peter enthroned Avicenna as the authoritative interpreter of the *Isagoge*, but Avicenna—though a philosopher—was known first and foremost as the physician author of the *Canon* (75). What is evident is that Peter, while trying to rally the authority of the philosophers, did not lose sight of the need to underline the independent and peculiar basis of medical authority. The *auctoritates*, those «invisible presences» that haunted Peter's classroom, shared a convivial, but at the same time uneasy sociability.

-
- (74) It has been suggested that the philosophical interests of thirteenth-century physicians were not entirely alien to their need to enhance their professional dignity in universities where the liberal arts and medicine shared a common space: see SIRAISSI, Nancy G. *Arts and Sciences at Padua: The Studium of Padua Before 1350*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies [Studies and Texts 25], 1973, p. 171. See also BULLOUGH, Vern L. *The Development of Medicine as a Profession*, New York, Hafner, 1966, pp. 108-111; BYLEBYL, Jerome J. *Medicine, Philosophy and Humanism in Renaissance Italy*. In: John W. Shirley; F. David Hoeniger (eds), *Science and the Arts in the Renaissance*, Washington, DC, Folger Shakespeare Library, London, Associated University Presses, 1985, pp. 27-49; and AGRIMI; CRISCIANI, note 13, pp. 17-18.
- (75) Peter's conception of the relationships between medicine and philosophy seems to be clearly different from those of the Salernitan commentators on the *Isagoge*. The former drew upon the new Aristotle and the *Canon* as a philosophical scaffold for medicine, the latter intended to build a «medical physics», a physics «constructed retrospectively from the study of medicine» [JORDAN, note 71, p. 61]. Paul Oskar Kristeller also pointed out that the commentaries on the *Articella* by Bartholomaeus and Peter are very different: see KRISTELLER, note 71, p. 103. However, Piero Morpurgo has argued that Bartholomaeus' commentary was the source of Peter's [MORPURGO, Piero. *L'idea di natura nell'Italia normanno-sveva*, Bologna, Cooperativa libraria universitaria editrice Bologna, 1993, pp. 109-146 (p. 116)]. I owe my remark relating to this footnote to Professor Danielle Jacquart.