

Technologies of Authority in the Medical Classroom in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries

FERNANDO SALMÓN (*)

SUMMARY

Introduction. 1.—A genealogy of commentators on *De morbo et accidenti*. 2.—The creation of contemporary networks of authority. 2.1.—The division of the text. 2.2.—The *dubia*. 2.3.—The authorities. 3.—A new technology of authority in the medical classroom. 4.—Conclusion.

ABSTRACT

By 1300, university medical masters were introducing their students to a culturally distinctive reality. This reality was based on the twin pillars sustaining institutional medical knowledge: authority and a logical apparatus based on Aristotelian principles. Traditionally, attention has been paid to the relationship of the medical author with his classical authorities. This paper analyzes the strategies developed by the university medical master for establishing himself as an authority, which entailed treating his contemporaries as authorities as well. It is suggested that a tendency can be traced in the medical classroom from the 1340s onwards to turn attention away from the classical authors towards contemporary writers.

BIBLID [0211-9536(2000) 20; 135-157]

Fecha de aceptación: 26 de febrero de 1999

(*) Científico Titular. Departamento de Historia de la Ciencia. Institució Milà i Fontanals. CSIC. Egipcíacs 15, 08001 Barcelona.

INTRODUCTION

The topic I would like to discuss is a development of my research on the construction of authority in medieval medical teaching. In previous works I have explored the relationship of the medieval author —the medical master at the developing *Studia* of late thirteenth century— with the classical authorities in medical teaching. I have stressed the author-authority relationship as one of submission and control; acknowledged respect for the authorities of the past and dependence on the surviving texts, on the one hand, and on the other, a well developed strategy —making full use of the possibilities of the commentary technique— to give those authorities a voice that unequivocally has a strong medieval accent. Thus, my aim has been to underline the role of the medical master as an active mediator with the power of granting or denying authority to the classical author (1).

In this paper I would like to explore the strategies developed by the university medical master towards the recognition and establishment of authority for himself and for those contemporary authors who, like himself, worked within the medieval *Studia*. I would develop this possibility by analysing a uniquely academic product, the medical commentary. I shall focus my analysis on the commentaries on Galen's *De morbo et accidenti*. This series of commentaries makes an interesting case-study. On the one hand, they represent an example of the expositions of some of the Galenic works in Latin translation whose study was undertaken as a novelty by the academic medical communities of Montpellier, Paris and Bologna in the last quarter of the thirteenth century (2). On the

-
- (1) SALMÓN, Fernando. The Many Galens of the Medieval Commentators on Vision. *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences*, 1997, 50, 397-419. In this essay I shall use «classical author» as applicable to any of the authors sanctioned by the academy whose texts, as *auctoritates*, were objects of exposition and study within the scholastic system of textual evaluation at that time.
- (2) On the role of the «new Galen» at Montpellier and Paris see GARCÍA-BALLESTER, Luis. Arnau de Vilanova (c. 1240-1311) y la reforma de los estudios médicos en Montpellier (1309): El Hipócrates Latino y la introducción del nuevo Galeno. *Dynamis*, 1982, 2, 97-156. See also the introduction by GARCÍA-BALLESTER, Luis, to *Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia*, vol. XV: *Commentum supra*

other, they were produced within a period of less than fifty years, thus providing an interesting case for comparative analysis.

1. A GENEALOGY OF COMMENTATORS ON DE MORBO ET ACCIDENTI

The text known to the Latin West as *De morbo et accidenti*, or *De accidenti et morbo*, was a collection of Galen's works on diseases, their causes and symptoms, which had been put together in late Alexandria (3). Like other medical treatises of Galen which had been available in Latin since twelfth century, it was not commonly used by the university medical masters of Bologna, Paris and Montpellier until the last two decades of the thirteenth century. By 1309, it was one of the texts of the «new Galen» that was required to be read at Montpellier according to the new academic ordinances (4).

The *De morbo et accidenti* must have been popular in these *Studia* since we know that at least nine commentaries on this work were produced between ca. 1290 and 1345. Two of the commentaries were produced at Montpellier by two masters of that *Studium* [Arnald of Villanova (ca. 1240-1311) and Bernard of Gordon (ca. 1258-ca. 1320)], four in Bologna [by Bartholomew of Varignana (ca.1260-ca. 1321), Dino del Garbo (d. 1327), Albert of Bologna (ca. 1280-after 1348) and Anthony of Parma

tractatum Galieni de malicia complexionis diverse, edited by Luis García Ballester and E. Sánchez Salor, Barcelona, Seminarium Historiae Cantabrigense, 1985, pp. 1-137. On the new Galenic works at Bologna see SIRAISSI, Nancy G. *Taddeo Alderotti and His Pupils: Two Generations of Italian Medical Learning*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1981, pp 96-117.

- (3) GALIENUS, *De morborum differentiis*, edited by C. G. Kühn, Leipzig, 1821-33 [reprint: Hildesheim, 1966], in *Cl. Galieni Opera Omnia*, 6, pp. 836-880; *ibid. De caussis morborum; De symptomatum differentiis; De symptomatum caussis*, edited by C. G. Kühn Leipzig, 1821-33 [reprint: Hildesheim, 1966], in *Cl. Galieni Opera Omnia*, 7, pp. 1-41, 42-84 and 85-272. In the extant Latin copies the works always appear in this order, see DURLING, Richard. *Corrigenda et Addenda to Diels' Galenica. Traditio*, 1967, 23, 467-468.
- (4) *Cartulaire de l'Université de Montpellier*, Montpellier, Maison Richard Frères, 1890, vol. 1, p. 220. See GARCÍA-BALLESTER (1982), note 2, pp. 119-127.

(fl. 1315)], one in Padua [Gentile da Foligno (d. 1348)] and another two of the extant commentaries remain anonymous (5).

Problems of identification and authenticity of the authorship arise when dealing with the extant copies. Each of the commentaries survives in only one manuscript copy and none has been edited. In previous works I have presented a tentative chronology (6); however, the recent finding and analysis of Gentile's commentary on *De morbo* has forced me to introduce some changes in the picture. Thus the following chronology and attributions can be established by use of direct and indirect references [see Table 1].

Since Arnald quotes a commentary composed by himself on *De morbo et accidenti* in his commentary on *De malicia complexionis diverse* (ca.1292-1295) (7) and in his *De consideracionibus operis medicine* (ca. 1298-1300) (8), it was possibly produced in Arnald's first years of academic

TABLE 1

<i>Attribution</i>	<i>Date of Composition</i>	<i>Ms</i>
Arnald of Villanova	<i>ante</i> 1295	Krakow, Jagiell. 781
Bartholomew of Varignana	<i>circa</i> 1298	Vatican, Vat. lat. 4452
Anthony of Parma	<i>ante</i> 1323	Vatican, Vat. lat. 4450
Anonymus (Dino del Garbo?)	<i>ante</i> 1325	Vatican, Vat. lat. 4454
Albert of Bologna	<i>ante</i> 1345	Vatican, Reg.lat. 2000
Gentile of Foligno	1345	Munich, CLM 62

- (5) The same commentary that precedes Anthony of Parma's *quaestiones* in Vatican, Vat. MS lat. 4450, ff. 57r-72v was copied in other two manuscripts: Vatican, Vat. MS lat. 4466, ff. 157r-169v and München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 13020, ff. 88v-94r (incomplete). The other anonymous commentary on the *De morbo et accidenti* exists in one copy: Vatican, Vat. MS lat. 4454, ff. 33r-82r.
- (6) SALMÓN, Fernando. Sources for a Galenic Visual Theory in the Late Thirteenth Century. *Sudhoffs Archiv*, 1996, 80, 167-183 (pp. 181-182).
- (7) ARNAU DE VILANOVA, note 2, p. 150, lines 12-13.
- (8) ARNAU DE VILANOVA. *Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine sive de flebotomia*, edited by Pedro Gil Sotres and Luke Demaitre, Barcelona, Seminarium Historiae Scientiae Barchinone, 1988, p. 219, lines 1-2 and p. 241, lines 11-13.

activity at Montpellier (ca. 1288-1295). Arnald's commentary was never edited and there is only one extant copy dating from the fourteenth century (Krakow, Biblio. Jagiell. 781, ff. 131r-157v). The manuscript has a colophon that dates the copy to 1335 and attributes the work to Arnald. Having analyzed the fourth book of the Krakow commentary, I can find no evidence against Arnald's authorship; but the fact that there is only one extant copy and no presence of the commentary in Arnald's Renaissance editions advises caution, and suggests that we need to wait until the completion of the modern critical edition of the six books of the commentary in order to confirm or dismiss Arnald's authorship (9).

The other commentaries on *De morbo et accidenti* were probably later than Arnald's. The nearest in date of composition was possibly that of Bartholomew of Varignana, which was produced as the result of his academic activity at the Bolognese *Studium* ca. 1298 (10). There is only one copy of Bartholomew of Varignana's commentary on *De morbo et accidenti* (Vatican, Vat. lat. 4452, ff. 67r-82v). Thorndike suggested that the copy could have been made by Albert of Bologna (11).

Bernard of Gordon's commentary was composed before 1305, since it is mentioned in his popular *Lilium medicinae*. Apparently, the commentary does not survive. The reference to a commentary on the *De morbo et accidenti* appears in the part of the *Lilium* that deals with the external senses. In the chapter that Bernard devotes to double vision, he opens his exposition by quoting *De morbo et accidenti* as the Galenic source on which one should base a discussion on the topic. Later, Bernard would point out that he had already explained this subject while commenting on *De morbo et accidenti* («Ista autem materiam tetigimus supra quartum

(9) For a discussion on Arnald's authorship see GARCÍA-BALLESTER, Luis; SALMÓN, Fernando; SÁNCHEZ-SALOR, Eustaquio. Tradición manuscrita y autoría: sobre la posible autenticidad del comentario de Arnau de Vilanova al *De morbo et accidenti* de Galeno. *Arxiu de Textos catalans antics*, 1995, 14, 31-74. At the moment we are working in the critical edition of this commentary (*Arnaldi de Villanova Opera Medica Omnia*, vol. XIV, in progress).

(10) SIRAISSI, note 2, pp. 46-47.

(11) THORNDIKE, Lynn. Some Medieval Medical Manuscripts in the Vatican. *Journal of History of Medicine*, 1953, 8, 271.

de morbo tamen breviter hic aliquid dicamus») (12). However, it is not clear if it was a written commentary or if Bernard was referring to an oral exposition of *De morbo et accidenti* as part of the medical curriculum at Montpellier (13).

In 1953, Lynn Thorndike suggested that Dino del Garbo had produced another commentary on *De morbo et accidenti*. According to Thorndike, the opening of Dino's commentary on Galen's *De differentiis februm* refers to Galen's *De morbo et accidenti* and to *De malicia complexionis diversa* in a way that suggests that Dino might have commented upon both works. I have never given much credit to this reading of an *incipit* that reads: «Differentie februm etc. Postquam G. in libro de accidenti et morbo determinavit de egritudine in generali et in libro de malicia complexionis diverse ...» (14). However, the fact that Gentile da Foligno refers on several occasions in his own commentary to a commentary by Dino, forces me to reconsider my position and take into account a possible commentary by Dino which was produced when he was lecturing at Bologna or Siena (15). A comparison of Gentile's references with those of the anonymous commentaries suggests that Vat. lat. 4454 might contain Dino's commentary on *De morbo et accidenti*. However, this is a working hypothesis that is based only on my analysis of the references contained in book four.

There is no extant commentary by Anthony of Parma, but a collection of *quaestiones* on the text (16). The date and place of composition of the

(12) BERNARD DE GORDON. *Lilium medicinae*, Parisiis, 1542, f. 147v.

(13) DEMAITRE, Luke. *Doctor Bernard de Gordon: Professor and Practitioner*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980, p. 84.

(14) THORNDIKE, note 11, p. 269.

(15) On Dino's career, see SIRAISSI, note 2, pp. 55-64.

(16) Only a register of *quaestiones* on *De morbo et accidenti* is attributed to Anthony of Parma. This appears in only one manuscript: Vatican, Vat. MS lat. 4450, 14c., ff. 73ra-93vb. The fact that in the same manuscript there is an anonymous commentary on *De morbo et accidenti* preceding the list of *quaestiones* leads Nancy Siraisi to suggest that Anthony was also the author of the commentary: see SIRAISSI, note 2, p. 102. But, after the analysis of both the *quaestiones* and the commentary, I think that this possibility should be ruled out. In fact, the collection of *quaestiones* contains fragments of a commentary that has nothing to do with the preceding

collection remain obscure. They might have been the result of his teaching activities at Bologna, since Nancy Siraisi has suggested Anthony's attachment in 1320s to the Bolognese *Studium* (17). The evidence is not strong, but the supposition is supported further by the appearance of Anthony of Parma's name in a genealogy of Bolognese commentators on *De morbo et accidenti* which can be established from the commentary that Gentile da Foligno had composed in 1345.

Neither do we know the date of composition of Albert of Bologna's commentary (18). The fact that Albert's commentary bears a strong resemblance to the commentary in the Krakow manuscript, suggesting that Albert had used the commentary attributed to Arnald as a basis for his own, is not very helpful in dating Albert's commentary. Equally unhelpful is the fact that at the end of book three of Albert's commentary there is a reference to Bartholomew of Varignana's exposition (19). I have suggested that Albert's commentary was produced after 1345 by comparing the *accessus ad auctores* presented in various commentaries on

commentary in Vatican, Vat. MS lat. 4450. Likewise, the questions enclosed in the preceding commentary are not the same as those from the collection.

- (17) According to SIRAISSI (note 2, p. xx), Anthony of Parma could have been teaching medicine in Bologna before 1323. The fact that Anthony's *recollectiones* on the *Canon* I.1. were taken «per me Albertum Bononiensem» (see TK 759: BAV, Vat. MS lat. 4452, 14c, f. 47v; München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 13020, 14c. ff. 226r-267rb) together with the fact that Albert's career took place entirely at Bologna supports Siraisi's hypothesis. On the other hand, Zdzislaw Kuksewicz connects Anthony with the Averroistic groups of the school of arts at Paris in the first two decades of the fourteenth century: see KUKSEWICZ, Zdzislaw. *De Siger de Brabant à Jacques de Plaisance: La théorie de l'intellect chez les averroïstes latins des XIIIe et XIVe siècles*, Wrocław-Warsaw-Kraków, 1968, pp. 148-149.
- (18) The commentary survives in only one manuscript (Vatican, Vat. Reg. MS lat. 2000, ff. 28r-73r). It ends: «Et in hoc terminetur sententia libri de accidenti et morbo recollecta sub magistro Alberto Bononiensis et correpta cum scripto quod ipsemet alias scripsit propria manu. Et laudatur deus» (f. 73rb).
- (19) On at least one occasion, Albert of Bologna mentioned other commentaries on *De morbo et accidenti*. In one particular instance he disagrees with an argument developed in Arnald's commentary, although he does not explicitly mention Arnald (*Ibid.*, f. 57rb-va). The reference to Bartholomew's commentary is even more explicit when at the end of Albert's commentary on the third book, we read: «Ista lectio fuit parva propter reversionem magistri Bartholomei de Varignana» *Ibid.*, f. 48vb.

De morbo et accidenti. The different commentators presented *De morbo et accidenti* as the work in which Galen studied the *res preter naturam* generally, as opposed to other treatises where he studied these in particular. As an example of these other Galenic writings Bartholomew, the commentator of the Krakow manuscript and one of the anonymous commentators mentions Galen's *De malicia complexionis*, *De crisi*, *De differentiis febrium* and *De interioribus*. Albert, by contrast, mentions *De malicia complexionis*, *De tabe* and *De disnia*. Although the possibility of cross-reference exists, I would claim that the commentators are mentioning, as examples of special pathology, those of Galen's works which were already well-known, or they preferred to refer to works of very recent translation (20). In one way or the other, the reference to the *De disnia* is striking and suggests that Albert's commentary was written after the translation of this work by Niccolò da Reggio in 1345 (21). However, having studied Gentile's commentary, which was written in 1345, I must consider the production of Albert as prior to this date.

The only commentary whose authorship and date of composition is certain is that of Gentile da Foligno. As far as I know there is only one extant copy of the work (CLM 62, fols. 70ra-104rb) (22) and it belongs to the Hartmann Schedel collection in the München Staatsbibliothek (23). The *explicit* refers to the date of composition by Gentile in 1345, to the name of the copist, Paulus Rieter (24), and to 22 December 1386 as the

(20) SALMÓN, note 6, pp. 179-180.

(21) On Niccolò's translations see THORNDIKE, Lynn. Translations of Works of Galen from the Greek by Niccolò da Reggio (c. 1308-1345). *Byzantina Metabyzantina*, 1946, 1, 213-235.

(22) For a description of the manuscript, see *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis. Tom. I, pars I [Codic. 1-2329]*, München, 1892, pp. 13-14.

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

(24) There are at least two other manuscripts from the Schedel collection ascribed to the same hand that convey some information on Paulus Rietter. According to a note added to München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm, 365 by Hartmann Schedel, Paulus Rietter was already a medical doctor in 1377, when he had copied several commentaries by Marsilio de Santa Sofia, which are also contained

date of finishing the copy, probably at Padua (25). There is an additional note in the margin of fol. 99vb by the copyist which says that while finishing one of the *quaterni*, on 17 December there was a big earthquake in the *Studium* (26). So far I have been unable to verify this point (27). However, Padua would be confirmed as the place of the copying process following Paulus Rieter's biographical data which witnessed his presence in the city at that time (28). The date of composition of Gentile's commentary is also confirmed by Gentile himself in the colophon that follows his commentary on book four of the *Canon*, which he completed in 1345, his last year in Padua (29). That the copy in CLM 62 is the product of Gentile's academic activity leaves no doubt after an internal analysis which reveals that Gentile often quotes himself, both in his commentary on Avicenna's *Canon* and on the *De fame et siti*. However,

in this manuscript. Again, München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm, 77 is claimed to be in Rieter's hand. Inside the cover of München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm, 77 there is a note that says that the copy was made by Rieter, partly in Padua and partly in Nürnberg between 1386 and 1388. According to the same reference, he died in 1410.

- (25) «Hic finiunt notata super libro de accidenti et morbo facta per Gentile anno Domini 1345. Paulus Rieter scripsit 1386 22 decembris». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO. *Notata super libro de accidenti et morbo*, München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm, 62, f. 104rb.
- (26) «1386 17 decembris hora tertia cum d.idia novis finisti istum quaternum et eciam fuit terremotus magnus quem sumpsisti in studio tuo». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, fol. 99vb (marginalia).
- (27) I thank Tiziana Pesenti for helping me in the searching of the earthquake through various *Cronicae*.
- (28) GLORIA, Andrea. *Monumenti della Università di Padova (1318-1405)*, Padova, Tipografia del Seminario, 1888, pp. 414-15. I owe this reference to Tiziana Pesenti.
- (29) «Ego Gentilis complevi hoc opus anno domini m iii xlv mense septembris et compilavi illud legendo legi autem illo anno totum quartum canonem et totum secundum canonem et librum de accidenti et morbo et librum prognosticorum Ypocratis cum commento. Et scripsi super libro de accidenti et morbo. Et scripsi questionem arduam et prolixam de gradibus et questionem de saporibus et questionem de mixtione medicine et compressive et incepti sermones de silva. Et eodem anno multis mundanis adversitatibus supervenientibus, deus gloriosus et sublimis sui bonitate michi tribuit fortitudinem, ipse igitur sit laudatus, amen. Et sic est finis huius operis». Cod. Vindob., 5391, fol. 154vb: see OTTOSSON, Per-Gunnar. *Scholastic Medicine and Philosophy: A Study of Commentaries on Galen's Tegni (ca. 1300-1450)*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 1984, pp. 50-51.

the hurried style of the text suggests that we are dealing with a *reportatio* of Gentile's teaching and not with the commentary he talked about. Certain features of book four —such as Gentile's reference to a certain author whose name he cannot remember, although he thinks it can be Anthony of Parma— speaks in favour of lecture notes from an oral exposition without the library resources at hand (30). The name that the copyist gives to the work suggests much the same direction: «Hic finiunt notata super libro de accidenti et morbo facta per Gentile» (31).

2. THE CREATION OF CONTEMPORARY NETWORKS OF AUTHORITY

Though one must be cautious in cases where the attribution is not secure, I think that a comparative analysis of these materials is worthwhile for exploring the creation of contemporary networks of authority that conditioned not only new readings of the classical authorities, but also a real *translatio auctoritatis* from the texts towards the medical masters themselves.

In this essay I shall offer the first results of research in progress, focusing my analysis on the commentaries on book four of *De morbo et accidenti*, the work that deals with sense perception. This research has so far centred upon a comparison of the division of the text, the posing and discussion of questions and the quotation of authorities.

2.1. The division of the text

The analysis of the division of the text in book four is not the most fertile ground for exploring the existence of an accepted standard division or a contested one. There is a quite consistent division which repeats itself without much variation in all the commentaries; but this fact comes very much conditioned by the Galenic text itself, in that book

(30) «Dicitur primo a quibusdam quorum nomina non invenio. Credo tamen quod fuerit Antonius». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 85rb.

(31) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 104rb.

four is clearly separated into discussions concerning the five external senses, the common sense, and the *anima regitiva*. This fact does not imply that in all the commentaries every division and subdivision of the text was commented upon.

2.2. *The dubia*

More interesting are the *dubia* that are posed and solved within the commentaries. I have taken into account only those questions that convey at least the rudiments of the scholastic apparatus of opposing arguments, syllogistic reasoning and use of authorities, leaving aside those that are no more than brief explanations of a certain topic.

When Nancy Siraisi produced her formidable listing of questions raised among Taddeo Alderotti's group, she pointed out that «one is simultaneously struck by the prevalence of common themes and the absence of standard titles. The same broad topics are treated over and over again by different authors, but the duplication of questions titles in exactly or almost exactly the same words is relatively rare» (32). It would be pretentious on my part, with such a small sample, to contradict this statement, but it would be worthwhile conducting a wider comparison of the *dubia* in commentaries on the same work. The questions posed by the commentators on *De morbo et accidenti* have a strong resemblance at a formal level. With reference to *dubia* concerning visual perception, the following table can be constructed [see Table 2]:

The similarities among the various questions speak for an efficient scholastic apparatus which, by the first half of fourteenth century, was able to establish, in no more than fifty years, a tradition that involves a way of both dissecting a new text and outlining standard points of discussion.

Although the repetition of titles is evident, it would be misleading to infer that these are indications of permanent topics of interest. Take,

(32) SIRAIISI, note 2, p. 249.

TABLE 2¹

1/8. Sed est dubitacio de causa huius accidentis: unde est quod unum duo visui apparet (f. 142vb)	
Bartholomew of Varignana	3*/6
Anthony of Parma	1/11
Dino del Garbo	—
Albert of Bologna	1/9
Gentile of Foligno	2*/12
3* Sed tu dices que est causa quare motus cristalline est causa quare unum apparet duo cum ipsa moveri ad superius vel inferius (f. 76rb)	
2* Dubitant quare contorsio oculi versus oculi versus sursum et deorsum facit unum apparere duo sed non facit hoc contorsio ad latus ut ad dextrum vel sinistrum (f. 80rb)	

2/8. Sed hic est dubitacio: quod Galienus ponit quod non solum nervus oculi sit concavus sed etiam nervus virge sit concavus (f. 143ra)	
Bartholomew of Varignana	—
Anthony of Parma	2/11
Dino del Garbo	—
Albert of Bologna	2/9
Gentile of Foligno	3/12

3/8. Sec hic est dubitacio, cum per Galienum humor albugineus diminutus noceat visui, quia cristallina exsiccatur, utrum exsiccacio cristalline visui noceat (f. 143rb)	
Bartholomew of Varignana	2*/6
Anthony of Parma	5/11
Dino del Garbo	—
Albert of Bologna	3/9
Gentile	6/12
2* Circa primam partem est dubitacio utrum mala complexio cristalline possit esse causa nocementi in visu (f. 76ra)	

¹ The title of the question is taken from Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS 781. The first number indicates the order of the questions in the chapter. The second number indicates the total number of questions in that chapter. The asterisk (*) shows a difference at a formal level but with a similarity in the contents. The hyphen (—) indicates the absence of the question in the commentary.

TABLE 2 (Continuation)

4/8. Ipse posuerat ex passione albuginei humoris noceri, scilicet, visum, quare esset dubitatio apud aliquem utrum ex incensione vel remissione talium passionum predictum nocumentum augeatur vel diminuetur (f. 143va)	
Bartholomew of Varignana	6*/6
Anthony of Parma	4*/11
Dino del Garbo	—
Albert of Bologna	—
Gentile of Foligno	—
6* Circa primam partem est dubitatio quare Avicenna non ponit nocumentum quod contingit in visu ex subtilitate albuginei cum illius subtilitas sit egritudinem in oculo (f. 76va)	
4* Quia Galienus ponit quod grossicies humoris albuginei sit causa ut aliquis non possit videre remota neque eciam bene discernere propingua, queritur que sit causa horum duorum (f. 83vb)	

5/8. Sed hic est duplex dubitatio. Primo quia dicit, si spiritus sit paucus et clarus, quod quis bene vidit propinque (f. 143va)	
6/8. Secunda est dubitatio; quia Galienus dicit quod quando spiritus est multus, tamen grossus, quis remota bene videbit (f.143va)	
Bartholomew of Varignana	—
Anthony of Parma	9-10/11
Dino del Garbo	2/3
Albert of Bologna	4-5/9
Gentile of Foligno	—*
— * Gentile does not address the topic following the pattern of a proper question, but he comments upon the problem in a similar way as the other commentators do (f. 81va)	

7/8. Sed dubitatur quia [est] contradicchio in verbis Galieni, nam ponit primo quod apostema in coniunctiva accidentaliter seu mediate nocet visui (f. 143vb)	
Bartholomew of Varignana	—
Anthony of Parma	11/11
Dino del Garbo	3/3
Albert of Bologna	9/9
Gentile of Foligno	—

TABLE 2 (Continuation)

8/8. Queritur utrum vapor vel fumus existens in oculo possit videri secundum suam speciem et eam imprimere in cristallinam (f. 143vb)	
Batholomew of Varignana	—
Anthony of Parma	8/11
Dino del Garbo	1/3
Albert of Bologna	6/9
Gentile of Foligno	8-9*/12
8* Dubitatur utrum res stans in oculo possit videri (f. 81va)	
9* Dubitant quare iudicetur esse extra cum tamen sit intus (f. 81va)	

as an example, the question that appears as number 8 in the Krakow manuscript, which speaks about the possibility of seeing objects that are inside the eye. This question, which frequently appears in commentaries both on the Hippocratic *Prognostica* and on *De morbo*, challenged the explanatory ideas, dominant at the medical schools, on how perception took place (33). In the Krakow manuscript, the question is given a prominent place and its long discussion is reserved to the end of the chapter (34). Lengthy discussions of the matter are also given by Anthony of Parma (35) and Albert of Bologna (36). But Gentile, even though he approaches the topic, devotes a *questio* of no more than four lines to the matter, briefly naming the opposing arguments and the solution (37).

-
- (33) SALMÓN, Fernando; SÁNCHEZ-SALOR, Eustaquio. Sobre el uso de la autoridad en la medicina medieval: Aristóteles, Galeno y las moscas volantes. *Dynamis*, 1993, 13, 347-371.
- (34) SALMÓN, Fernando. *Las teorías de la visión en la medicina universitaria bajomedieval: estudio y edición crítica del Arnaldi de Villanova commentum supra tractatum Galieni de morbo et accidenti cum textu Galieni, li. IV (c. 1288-1292/1295)*, Barcelona, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1991, microfiche edition, pp. 44-47.
- (35) ANTHONY OF PARMA. *Quaestiones supra tractatum Galieni de morbo et accidenti*, Vatican, Vat. MS lat. 4450, fols. 84ra-rb. The *questio* is edited in SALMÓN; SÁNCHEZ-SALOR, note 33, pp. 367-369.
- (36) ALBERT OF BOLOGNA. *Commentum supra tractatum Galieni de morbo et accidenti*, Vatican, Vat. Reg. MS lat. 2000, fols. 50vb-51ra. The *questio* is edited in SALMÓN; SÁNCHEZ-SALOR, note 33, pp. 369-371.
- (37) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, fol. 81va.

The fact that Gentile's commentary marks the *terminus ad quem* of this series of expositions and makes free use of contemporary authors proves a valuable source for understanding the role of *dubia* in commentaries in medical education. By the time he was lecturing on *De morbo et accidenti* at Padua in 1345, an established tradition of commentaries on it had long existed. It is interesting to see how Gentile makes use of this tradition by carefully placing himself in a well-established lineage of scholars and at the same time advertises his exposition as novel and worth attending. The importation of a textual tradition from a prestigious school such as Bologna and the claim of departing further from it no doubt was an important message to be listened to in the Paduan school. Tradition and new readings are frequently contrasted by Gentile in his teaching. When, for example, he refers to a question about the wounds that could affect the crystalline humour, he speaks with dislike of a solution that up to his time has been immutable («Ista solucio licet sit usque hodie queta non tamen placet») (38). These traditional ways of answering questions arising in *De morbo et accidenti* commentaries are usually referred to by Gentile under the «solucio communis» formula (39). Some of these standard solutions go together with standard questions that can be common to commentaries on various works. For example, Gentile incorporates in his commentary a standard question about pain («Utrum dolor sentiatur aliquo sensu») (40) which does not belong exclusively to a tradition of commentaries on *De morbo* and under a similar title («Utrum dolor sentiatur») is discussed in other works (41). On other occasions, Gentile wants to indicate to his audience that a standard question is to be given a new answer, such as when he refers to the problem of double vision (42), or it is given an answer

(38) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 82ra.

(39) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 82rb and f. 87ra.

(40) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 83vb-84ra.

(41) PIETRO D'ABANO. *Conciliator controversiarum quae inter philosophos et medicos versantur*, Venice, 1565 [facsimile reproduction: Padua, 1985], f. 117rb. A similar question («Utrum in quolibet sensu sit dolor») can be found in PIETRO DE TORRIGIANO. *Plus quam commentum in parvam Galieni artem*, Venice, 1557, book II, f. 91v.

(42) «ad instancias prima est mea quia a nullo eam prius videram. Et feci eam Mundyno anothomiste et non potuit eam solvere». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 80va.

which, though original to Gentile, had been elaborated by him some time before («et hec est solucio mea antiqua») (43). His borrowing from contemporary authors is more evident when Gentile gives the title of the question and the solution proposed by previous masters. One example is when he refers to the possibility that internal humours contained in the tongue could be excited and then perceived by the movement that food or drinks provokes. After the long title «Utrum ...» he just adds «Respondet Dynus ...» (44). Sometimes the arguments laid out in the development of certain questions by other masters are overlooked. For example, when he is asking why old people are shortsighted, Gentile refers to the reading that certain commentators have given to this problem, which involves taking sides on the extramission/intramission debate (45). But this is something that Gentile prefers to avoid (46). On other occasions a whole question is lifted from another commentary on *De morbo* (47) or even from a commentary on another textual tradition and it is given an original reading by Gentile (48).

This wide use of various commentary traditions allows Gentile to decide that certain questions which appear regularly in *De morbo et accidenti* commentaries are not worthwhile mentioning («alias questiones inutiles quas obmitto») (49). Instead, sometimes Gentile prefers to offer his students original questions which were not contained in the works of the previous commentators, such as when he was trying to find out which is the auditory nerve (50).

(43) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 84vb.

(44) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 82rb.

(45) On the extra/intramission debate in academic medical circles, see SALMÓN, note 1.

(46) «Quidam inducunt oppinionem Platonis de visu quod fiat extramittendo quam oppinionem Avicenna recitat capitulo de debilitate visus et eam improbat et nos obmittimus». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 81va.

(47) «Dubitat Bartolomeus utrum ex aliis quam ex malis humoribus calidis possit causari sitis [...] Questio est rudis». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 86va.

(48) «Dubitatur a plusquamcommentatore in Tegni [...] quare in emissione urine et egestionis non causetur delectacio ita magna sicut in emissione spermatis». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 85ra.

(49) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 82va.

(50) «Sed ego dubito quis nervus est iste an ille qui est expansus in pelliculam an alius». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 82ra.

2.3. *The authorities*

Original interpretations of the Galenic text are always presented by Gentile in dynamic opposition to the readings of previous masters who had been lecturing at Bologna (51). The borrowing of the titles of questions and their solutions made it impossible for Gentile's audience to focus on Galen's text, and thus served to displace the text as the central object of the lecture. This move allowed Gentile to empower his writings within a well-established system of teaching and intellectual validation. But in order to develop a new technology of authority it was necessary for Gentile to make ample use of his contemporary medical authors. A comparison which evaluates Gentile's appeal to the authorities in his lecturing on *De morbo et accidenti* and that of previous commentators is revealing of this change. Take as an example the following table which compares the authorities quoted in the commentary attributed to Arnald in the Krakow manuscript when dealing with *De morbo et accidenti* book four and those used by Gentile in the exposition of the same book [see Table 3].

Although there is agreement in the first four authorities quoted (Galen, Avicenna, Averroes and Aristotle), differences can be found in their relative weight and works quoted. Galen appears to be the widest authority quoted in the Krakow manuscript, with a special reference to those books which matched *De morbo et accidenti*, namely *De interioribus* and *De malicia complexionis diverse*. Here the impact of the «new Galen» is clear in the medical schools at the turn of the century (52). However, Galenic works that had not been translated in Arnald's time or had scant diffusion after its translation, such as Niccolò's translation of *De usu partium*, are mentioned by Gentile. Differences can be found as well when analyzing the broad use of Avicenna's natural philosophical and medical works by Gentile and the more centred approach on the *Canon* to be found in the Krakow manuscript. However, these are not the features I would like to highlight here. The contrast that I find more significant in the comparison, is the presence of contemporary names

(51) A similar case is described by Tiziana Pesenti in her analysis of Giovanni Santasofia's commentary on the *Tegni* contained in this volume.

(52) GARCÍA-BALLESTER, note 2.

TABLE 3

A. Authorities and works quoted in Book IV by Gentile da Foligno	
Avicenna (32 times)	— <i>Canon</i> (15) — <i>Sextus de naturalibus</i> (10) — <i>De animalibus</i> (5) — <i>De viribus cordis</i> (2)
Averroes (20)	— <i>Colliget</i> (10) — <i>De anima</i> (5) — <i>De sensu</i> (2) — <i>De sompno et vigilia</i> (2) — <i>De celo et mundo</i> (1)
Galen (20)	— <i>De utilitate parcium</i> (Books IX, X and XVI) (8) — <i>De interioribus</i> (Books III and IV) (3) — <i>De malicia complexionis diverse</i> (1) — <i>De dispnia</i> (1) — <i>Terapeutice</i> (Book XI) (1) — <i>De simplici medicina</i> (1) — <i>De coitu</i> (1) — <i>De aere</i> (1) — <i>Comm. Aphorismi</i> (1) — <i>De alimentorum</i> (Book II) (1) — <i>Tyriaca</i> (1)
Aristotle (18)	— <i>Problemata</i> (6) — <i>De generatione animalium</i> (3) — <i>De anima</i> (2) — <i>De sensu</i> (2) — <i>De sompno et vigilia</i> (2) — <i>De motibus animalium</i> (1) — <i>Politica</i> (1) — <i>De partibus animalium</i> (1)
Bartolomeus [de Varignana] (14)	
Gentile [da Foligno] (12)	— <i>Comm. Canon</i> (7) — <i>De fame</i> (4) — <i>De fame et siti</i> (1)
Dynus [del Garbo] (9)	
Haly [Abbas] (6)	— <i>Theorice</i> (4) — <i>Practice</i> (1) —[no title given] (1)
Albertus [de Bologna] (6)	— <i>Conciliator</i> (3)
Antonius [de Parma] (2)	
Haly [Rodohan] (1)	— <i>Comm. Tegni</i> (1)

TABLE 3 (Continuation)

A. Authorities and works quoted in Book IV by Gentile da Foligno	
Plusquamcommentator (1)	— <i>Comm. Tegni</i> (1)
Mondino ["anathomiste"] (1)	
Serapion (1)	— <i>Practice</i> (1)
Costa Bel (sic) Luce (1)	— <i>Tractatu de visibili</i> (1)
Bachon (1)	— <i>Perspectiva</i> (1)
Rasis (1)	— <i>Continens</i> (1)
Plato (1)	—[indirect reference] (1)

B. Authorities and works quoted in Book IV by Arnald of Villanova	
Galen (41 times)	— <i>De interioribus</i> (10) — <i>De iuvamentis membrorum</i> (5) — <i>De malicia complexionis diverse</i> (5) — <i>Comm. Aphorismi</i> (3) — <i>De ingenio sanitatis</i> (2) — <i>Terapeutice</i> (2) — <i>De complexionibus</i> (2) — <i>De virtutibus naturalibus</i> (2) — <i>De utilitate pulsus</i> (2) — <i>De simplici medicina</i> (2) — <i>Comm. Prognostica</i> (1) — <i>De regimine sanitatis</i> (1) — <i>Tegni</i> (1) — <i>De motibus liquidis</i> (1) — <i>Liber alimentorum</i> (1) — <i>De intentione Ypocratis et Platonis</i> (1) [indirect quote from <i>De morbo et accidenti</i>]
Avicenna (26)	— <i>Canon</i> (23) — <i>Sextus de naturalibus</i> (3)
Averroes (18)	— <i>Colliget</i> (15) — <i>De sensu et sensato</i> (2) — <i>De anima</i> (1)
Aristotle (12)	— <i>De sompno et vigilia</i> (5) — <i>De anima</i> (5) — <i>Politica</i> (1) — <i>Problemata</i> (1)
Haly [Abbas] (3)	— <i>Theorice</i> (2) —[no title given] (1)

TABLE 3 (Continuation)

B. Authorities and works quoted in Book IV by Arnald of Villanova	
Haly [Rodohan] (1)	— <i>Tegni</i> (1)
Hippocrates (2)	— <i>Aphorismi</i> (1) — <i>Prognostica</i> (1)
Plato (2)	— <i>Timeus</i> (2) [indirect reference from <i>De morbo et accidenti</i>]
Erofilus (1) [indirect reference from <i>De morbo et accidenti</i>]	
Avenzoar (1)	— <i>Medicina</i> (1)
Mesue (1)	— <i>De consolatione medicinarum</i> (1)

C. Comparison of authorities quoted	
<i>Arnald of Villanova</i>	<i>Gentile da Foligno</i>
41. Galen	32. Avicenna
26. Avicenna	20. Averroes
18. Averroes	20. Galen
12. Aristotle	18. Aristotle
3. Haly [Abbas]	14. Bartolomeus
2. Hippocrates	12. Gentile
2. Plato	9. Dynus
1. Haly [Rodohan]	6. Haly [Abbas]
1. Erofilus	6. Albertus
1. Avenzoar	3. Conciliator
1. Mesue	2. Antonius
	1. Haly [Rodohan]
	1. Plusquamcommentator
	1. Mondino
	1. Serapion
	1. Costa Bel Luce
	1. Bachon
	1. Rasis
	1. Plato

in Gentile's commentary with a total absence of these references in Arnald's work. Gentile widely quotes masters from the Bolognese circle who had previously commented on *De morbo et accidenti*. Sometimes the reference specifically addresses Bartolomaeus, Dynus, Albertus or Antonius's expositions of *De morbo* and sometimes there is just the mentioning of the author's name, which could then be a reference to other of their works. When various of these authors are used at the same time, a certain order which reflects the historical one is established. Thus, Bartolomaeus is the first to be quoted and Albertus is usually the last one. Albert's historical proximity to Gentile is reinforced when Gentile speaks about a certain opinion held by Albert and his followers. But it is not only the Bolognese tradition on *De morbo* that is introduced by Gentile to his Paduan students. Mondino, the anatomist, is also referred to, as is Petrus Abanus' *Conciliator* and Turisanus' *Plusquamcommentum*. This approach to contemporary authors is absent from the aforementioned commentaries on the *De morbo et accidenti*. It is also absent from earlier commentaries on other textual traditions, such as Turisanus on the *Tegni* (53) or Bona Fortuna when approaching the *Viaticum* in between 1300 and 1320 (54). That Gentile's interest in giving a voice to contemporary authors permeated all his academic activities is well documented, for example, in his *Questiones de febris* (55).

3. A NEW TECHNOLOGY OF AUTHORITY IN THE MEDICAL CLASSROOM

The relationship that Gentile highlights between the contemporary author (including himself) and the classical author to be commented upon can be understood at three different levels. At one level, previous commentators are referred to as the people who have established a certain reading of the classical author. This reading may be accepted or rejected by Gentile. For example, Gentile declares, «Hic Bartolomeus et

(53) OTTOSSON, note 29, p. 116.

(54) WACK, Mary. *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages: The Viaticum and its Commentaries*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990, p. 129.

(55) BAZAN, Bernardo C. et al. *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1985, pp. 307-308.

Antonius dicunt tria. Primum est quod ex dictis Galieni apparet quod...» (56). In this case, Gentile does not accept this reading and instead promises a different one: «quid vero Galienus de hoc voluerit infra dicetur» (57). This is not a novelty in the classroom as it is not in the commentaries on *De morbo*: the earlier commentators, when referring to previous interpretations of Galen's text, would never mention a contemporary by name. At a second level, Gentile locates within the same hierarchy Galen's voice and those of his interpreters. Here Gentile forces a dialogue that implies sometimes collaboration and sometimes confrontation of opposing opinions, which are not always solved in Galen's favour. For example, in the question dealing with the consequences for motion that would entail the loss of the sense of touch, Gentile offers opposing reasons based upon a syllogism by Bartholomew. It follows: «In contrarium Galienus. Respondent Bartolomeus et Albertus peditans post ipsum quod ...» (58). Or when discussing the consequences of the changes of the albugineous humour where he prefers to follow the causality drawn by Dynus in open opposition to that of Galen (59). Galen is not the only authority that Gentile brings in to this dialectic relationship with his own contemporaries. For example, when asking if the dryness of the crystalline humour could damage sight, the authority of a certain «quidam», which is in fact Galen's opinion, is counted among the affirmative arguments attributed to Bartholomew, Albert, and Gentile himself together with Avicenna's opinion (60).

Most interesting, however, is the third way in which Gentile validates contemporary intellectual opinions. In this case, there is an inversion of roles in which previous commentaries take the place of Galen's text as the object of discussion. Here, Gentile applies the interpretative apparatus of medical scholasticism to clarify and fix the opinion of contemporary

(56) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 83rb.

(57) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 83rb.

(58) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 82vb.

(59) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 81rb.

(60) «Dicunt quidam quod est morbus quia [...] Bartolomeus redarguit quia [...] aliter respondet quod [...] Tercio Albertus dicit quod [...] Etiam Avicenna distinctos ponit hos morbos [...] Nos autem in dictis nostris super fen 3a 3ii capitulo de debilitate visus». GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 80vb.

medical masters who had lectured on *De morbo*. This approach occurs many times in Gentile's commentary where brief statements such as «... considerandum quod Bartolomeus vult quod ...» or «... et intelligit Bartolomeus ...» are used (61). This displacement of classical authorities is particularly significant in the question concerning double vision. In the first place, Gentile expounds upon the causes of double vision that are set forth in Avicenna's *Liber de anima* (62) and Avicenna's *Canon* (63), as well as other texts. Later, Gentile tells his audience about Dino's dissatisfaction with these arguments. But Gentile goes further in explaining the causes adduced by Dino and he analyses them with the same detail and critical apparatus that he devotes to the original problem contained in Galen's text (64).

4. CONCLUSION

Even though my analysis is based only on commentaries on book four of *De morbo et accidenti*, I think that it is possible to trace a tendency in medical commentaries from the 1340s to turn attention away from the classical authors towards contemporary writers. Analysis of the commentaries on the *Tegni* produced in Italy in the second half of the fourteenth century, for example, appears to give further evidence of this process (65), a process which could be the reflection among medical masters of a more dramatic change which took place for vernacular literary production at this time (66).

(61) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 81ra.

(62) AVICENNA. *Liber de anima seu Sextus de naturalibus*, edited by S. van Riet, Louvaine-Leiden, 1972, pp. 272-278.

(63) AVICENNA. *Liber canonis totius medicinae*, book III, f. 3, t. 2, c. 28, Venice, 1527 [reprint: Brussels, 1971], fol. 167va.

(64) GENTILE DA FOLIGNO, note 25, f. 80rb-va.

(65) PESENTI, note 51. Tiziana Pesenti's essay nicely illustrates this point, but her reading is rather different.

(66) MINNIS, Alastair J. The Author's Two Bodies? Authority and Fallibility in Late-Medieval Textual Theory. In: P. R. Robinson; R. Zim (eds.), *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers. Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, Aldershot, Scolar Press, 1997, p. 278.