

SPANISH SCHOLARS IN PARIS: A NOTE ON THEIR TEACHING AND WORKS

During the many years of my work on the repertory of the masters of Arts in Paris and their readings¹, I have been supported by an important number of colleagues, from various countries. Among them, Angel d'Ors was one of the most assiduous and the most amazing. He regularly sent me not only lists of corrections, that were the fruit of his meticulous reading of my copy, but also completely new material concerning Spanish scholars whom I had not found in my usual sources (the "fichier bio-bibliographique" of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in Paris, the repertories of Lohr, Kaeppli, etc.). Thus, many a scholar from Spain entered the repertory as master (if he actually taught at the Faculty of arts in Paris) or as source (if his works were manifestly used by those masters). Others joined the "exclus", the masters not mentioned in the repertory itself, because their link with Paris could not be established, but whose works were comparable and contemporary (and who are listed in the beginning of each volume, from vol. 2 onwards).

In spite of the somewhat general title of this article, I will concentrate on those Spanish scholars who worked in the context of the Faculty of arts, leaving theology, law and medicine aside, because they are out of my competence. Of course, I will not be able to discuss all of them; I will choose some personalities who seem particularly interesting to me and try to give some details about their teaching in Paris, their works and the literary genre to which they belong². In Appendix 1, I will list all the Spanish scholars mentioned in the repertory as masters, in Appendix 2, I will mention an example of the authors who are relegated among the "exclus", and this will be at the same time an example of the commentaries of Angel d'Ors, in remembrance of his much appreciated help.

The fourteenth century

One of the earliest Spanish masters we encounter at the Faculty of arts in Paris is the Franciscan Antonius Andreas (Antonio Andrés), from Catalonia, who taught there from 1304 to 1307. He was a student of John Duns Scot and was sometimes called *Doctor dulcifluus*, not for his works on the arts, of course, but for his commentary on the *Sentences*. He wrote several treatises and commentaries on Aristotle and other basic texts, which testify to his activities in the Arts faculty, for instance the commentary on the *Perihermeneias* and the *Questiones de sex principiis*, the commentary on the *Metaphysics* and the *Questiones de tribus principiis rerum naturalium*. Since his career and writings are rather well known³, I would like to take here a different example for the beginning of the 14th century: Ferrandus de Hispania.

¹ *Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des arts de Paris : textes et maîtres (ca.1200-1500)*, 1-9, Turnhout 1994-2012.

² In spite of the celebrity of "Petrus Hispanus", this, or better those, scholar(s) will not be discussed here. The identification of the several personalities called "Petrus Hispanus" by a long tradition was one of Angel d'Ors's interests, but the discussion is not closed and the situation is much too complex to be taken into account here.

³ See for instance A. d'Ors, "Utrum nomen significet rem vel passionem in anima (Antonio Andrés y Juan Duns Escoto)", in *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 62 (1995) pp. 7-35; M. Gensler, « Catalogue of Works by or Ascribed to Antonius Andreae », in *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 31 (1992) pp. 147-155.

Ferrandus de Hispania or Hispanus was a scholar for whom we cannot determine with certitude that he taught the arts in Paris. He has often been confounded with a certain Durandus Hispanus, a Spanish scholar from the first half of the 14th century, whom some have proposed to identify with the Durandus who was *socius* of the Sorbonne in 1330 and commented on Aristotle's works according to notes in a Parisian manuscript⁴. However, today's scholars think that the commentary on the *Economics* that has sometimes been attributed to Durandus, is in fact the work of Ferrandus⁵.

Ferrandus has been identified with the Ferrandus *frater regis Aragonum* mentioned in the *Chartularium* of the University of Paris⁶. However, the only data which seem certain about him is that he has been quoted by Alphonsus Varga and that he was bishop of Calahorra. Anyway, our Ferrandus was a teacher of philosophy at the very end of the 13th and in the beginning of the 14th century, and is considered as an 'Averroist' whose works and opinions were probably known in Paris in that time. As he belongs to a period in which the Averroist current in Paris had some difficulties because of the condemnations of 1277, until its revival after 1310, Ferrandus's works have been studied by several 20th-century scholars, among whom Albert Zimmermann⁷.

The works of Ferrandus are mainly philosophical: a commentary on the *Economics*, one on the *Metaphysics*, a *Questio de specie intelligibili*, and perhaps a commentary with questions on Averroes's *De substantia orbis*. He may also have written a commentary on the *Sentences*.

The commentary on the *Metaphysics* has been preserved in two (incomplete) manuscripts, one in Cambridge, Peterhouse and one in Oxford, Merton College⁸. It is a literal explanation of the text, with only some rare questions. Ferrandus often criticizes the metaphysical doctrines of Thomas Aquinas.

The *Questio de specie intelligibili*, in which the author exposes his theory on the intellect and knowledge, has been edited by Kuksewicz⁹. Ferrandus frequently quotes the commentaries on the *De anima* of Averroes, Avicenna and Themistius. The *Questio* is composed of several parts: the main question is discussed in the beginning and at the end, but the major part deals with other problems. The text starts with "Queratur utrum forma intelligibilis differat ab actu intelligendi"; the question is discussed in two arguments for the affirmative answer and one for the opposite position; then the author states that this is a very difficult question and announces his procedure: three things have to be made clear, he says. First, as cognition is common to intellect and sense, therefore it should be explained what is cognition and (2) from that it will appear what it is that moves in the operation of the intellect. Thirdly, one has to enquire whether after the act of 'intellecting' some species remains in the intellect, through which we will later understand when we actually want to. The first article is

⁴ Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 1020-1021 and 1228.

⁵ For Durandus, see *Le travail intellectuel* 2 (C-F), pp. 53-54. For Ferrandus, see *ibid.*, pp. 87-89.

⁶ Cf. G. Díaz Díaz, *Hombres y documentos de la filosofía española*, IV, 1991, p. 71 ; *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis (CUP)* I, n° 503.

⁷ A. Zimmermann, « Ein Averroist des späten 13. Jahrhunderts : Ferrandus de Hispania », in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 50 (1968) 145-164; and other studies, see *Le travail intellectuel (op. cit.)*.

⁸ Cf. Zimmermann, *op. cit.*

⁹ Z. Kuksewicz, « Ferrandus Hispanus 'De specie intelligibili' », in: *Medioevo* 3 (1977) pp. 187-235.

of course the *expositio terminorum*, common in disputed questions of this period. The second article consists of the question “what is abstraction and how many modes of abstraction exist and how it happens”. The problem is explained in a long development (by far the longest part of the *Questio*). Then the third article treats the third point announced before: “whether after the act of understanding some species remains in the intellect”. The final opinion of the author is that no species remains. And thus, says Ferrandus, the solution of the (main) question is clear, briefly resuming the problem. Finally he declares that the answer to the arguments (i.e. the main arguments given in the beginning) is clear, “for it appears in which way the intellect is moved by the *phantasma* by the virtue of the agent intellect”. The text ends with the following colophon: “Explicit questio de specie intelligibili, utrum differat ab actu intelligendi, determinata a Ferrando de ysania”. The structure of the question does not show that it was the result of an actual oral disputation, but it is conform to a current model of treatises in the form of a disputed question, from the beginning of the 14th century onwards.

Alphonsus Varga Toletanus belongs to the same period. He was born in Toledo and entered at some time in his life the order of the Augustinian Hermits¹⁰. He was sent to Paris to study theology and apparently taught the Arts there during his studies. He “read” (i.e. taught and commented on) the *Sentences*, as a bachelor of theology at the Augustinian *studium* in Paris, in 1344-45. His commentary on the *Sentences* has survived in several manuscripts and has been printed several times¹¹. Alphonsus must have obtained his degree of master of theology shortly afterwards, for we have two occurrences of his name in the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, one dating from 1348 and the other from 1350, which strongly suggest that he was by then a regent master. The first is a letter of Pope Clement VI asking Varga to confer the degree of master of theology to a certain Clemens Vitarii, OESA in the convent of Montpellier, the second a similar letter concerning another student at Montpellier¹². In 1353 he became bishop of Badajoz and in 1354 of Osma; he was elected archbishop of Sevilla in 1366.

Varga also commented upon Aristotle’s *De anima*, one of the basic texts on the curriculum of the Faculty of arts. However, his commentary has a markedly theological character, which makes us think that he either composed it when teaching in some Augustinian *studium* before being sent to Paris, or later in his career, after his lectures on the *Sentences*, but before his appointment as bishop of Badajoz, while staying at the Augustinian *studium* of Montpellier¹³. Anyhow, his commentary was apparently appreciated in later times, at least in Augustinian circles, for, although we have only one complete manuscript and one fragment, his work was printed at least five times between 1477 (in Venice) and 1609 (in Rome). It is also very probable that it was known and appreciated by the masters of the Faculty of arts in Paris.

¹⁰ The entry in the repertory is incomplete (Angel d’Ors had not yet joined the international network who corrected my copy). However, a more up to date bibliographical note is provided by Paul Bakker and John van den Bercken in the footnotes of their article “The Commentary on Aristotle’s *De anima* by Alphonsus Vargas Toletanus, OESA”, in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 52 (2010) pp. 201-234.

¹¹ See J. Kürzinger, *Alphonsus Vargas Toletanus und seine theologische Einleitungslehre: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Scholastik im 14. Jahrhundert*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 22, 5-6, Münster i. W. 1930, pp. 18-22.

¹² *CUP* II, 1149 and 1181.

¹³ See Bakker and van den Bercken, pp. 204-205.

The main sources of Varga in his commentary on *De anima* are John Duns Scot and Giles of Rome, but he also quotes various other authors. His purpose may have been to provide an overview of opinions on central issues concerning the soul for students of his order, as Bakker and Van den Bercken suggest¹⁴. The list of ‘questions’ and ‘conclusions’, as given by these scholars, certainly suggests so.

In fact, the commentary is composed of twelve main questions, each of them consisting of three articles. Each article in its turn is a sub-question, while the first two prepare the way for the third one which deals with the main question. This very systematic form does not point to a text resulting from real teaching. Vargas adopts a current form of commentaries in his time, consisting in *questiones* and *conclusiones*, but no real discussion is apparent and the classroom seems far away. However, the commentary was probably known to the Parisian masters.

Thus, for the 14th century we have seen one example of a Spanish scholar (Antonio Andrés) who certainly taught at the Faculty of arts in Paris and two examples of Spanish authors whose works were probably known to and used by Parisian masters.

The fifteenth century

At the end of the 14th and in the beginning of the 15th century, several Spanish masters certainly taught the arts in Paris; among them, Andrés Limos, Johannes Dolz de Castellar, and Pedro Sanchez Ciruelo.

Apart from the information that can be deduced from his *Dubia in insolubilibus*, little is known about Andrés Limos¹⁵. He was born in Valencia and refers to Martin Eñyego, professor of theology and canon of Valencia Cathedral from 1485 onwards, as his master. He dedicated the treatise, which he wrote in Paris, to him. There is also an anecdote about his confrontation with John Standonck (1443-1504), in which Limos appears as a subtle dialectician who disputes with the reformer of the college of Montagu. The last accuses the philosopher of vane science (*scientia inflat*), to which Limos answers that ignorance humiliates (*ignorantia humiliat*). We also know that he obtained the degree of Master of Arts, for he is mentioned like that for instance in a colophon to the treatise (in the edition Venice 1488). He probably lived through the second half of the 15th century and perhaps the first decades of the 16th century¹⁶.

Anyway, the *Dubia in insolubilibus*, the only work that came down to us, has been printed several times and clearly influenced the work of Pardo, David Cranston and Juan Luis Vives. The treatise is lengthy. It is composed of fifteen questions concerning the examination of *insolubilia* and the questions have an analogous structure: first Limos formulates a series of sophisms related to the question, then he adds a theoretical discussion about the general ideas explained before, and finally he solves each of the sophisms thus providing the answers to the

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

¹⁵ See A. d’Ors, « ‘Dubium proponitur’. Andrés Limos and the treatise on Obligations », in *Medieval and Renaissance Logic in Spain*, ed. I. Angelelli and P. Pérez-Ilzarbe, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2000, pp. 225-249.

¹⁶ Andrés Limos should not be identified with Martin Limos, who was also Master of Arts in Paris before the arrival of Jeronimo Pardos.

question. As Angel d'Ors observed, the structure of the questions becomes increasingly difficult in the latter part of the treatise, because of the place the *Obligationes* take in his discussions of the questions, the link between *Insolubilia* and *Obligationes* being rather narrow. In any case, the treatise seems to be an original contribution to the debates of that time.

Johannes Dolz de Castellar also wrote on logic. He came from an illustrious family of Aragon and obtained his degree of Master of Arts in Paris around 1480, where he studied under Gaspar Lax au college de Montaigu, together with Luis Vives. During the last decades of the 15th century he taught the arts in Paris, as a regent master at the college of Lisieux, of which he also became rector¹⁷. His works on logic seem to be of a rather basic level, doubtlessly meant for the students of this college. They concern the explanation of the first book of Petrus Hispanus's *Summule*, and two treatises: on syllogisms ("Sillologismi magistri Johannis Dolz aragonensis del Castellar, quos edidit Parisius dum regeret in famatissimo collegio Lexoviensi") and on "Terms with their principles as well as other difficulties of dialectic". The three works were printed in Paris respectively in 1512, 1511 and 1510. Among his students at the college of Lisieux were for instance Nicolaus Truyart, who followed the entire *cursus artium* and obtained his master degree under Johannes Dolz, and a Johannes Lothon, who studied under Petrus de Alliaco and Johannes Dolz; he also obtained his degree under the last¹⁸.

Johannes Dolz's commentary on the eighth book of Aristotle's *Ethics* (*Expositio octavi ethicorum Aristotelis de amicitia*) was printed in Lyon in 1514, but we do not know if he wrote it during his time in Paris or afterwards. Anyway, it is clear that he had wider interests, as we can see from two other writings: the *Cunabula omnium fere scientiarum et praecipue phisicalium difficultatum in propositionibus et propositionalibus*, printed in Montauban, where he afterwards had a chair of physics, in 1518, and the *Elementa pictoris trium dialogorum* (W. 1530).

Pedro Sánchez Ciruelo¹⁹ lived at the very end of the 15th and during the first half of the 16th century. He was born in Daroca (Zaragoza) around 1470. Already in 1482 he went to Salamanca in order to study the arts and in 1492 he went to Paris to begin his studies in theology. In Paris he obtained the degree of Master of Arts and, while studying theology, he taught mathematics and astronomy at the college of Beauvais. Here he met for instance Jacobo Ramirez and Gaspar Lax, other well-known Spanish scholars. After this period in Paris, in 1502, he returned to Spain, where he taught philosophy in Sigüenza and Salamanca. In 1508 he was given a chair of theology in the university of Alcalá, but he also taught mathematics there. In 1510 he was elected in the Colegio de San Ildefonso de Alcalá as "professor of Liberal Arts, Philosophy and Theology". Afterwards, he was elected "Canonico magistral" of the cathedral of Segovia and of the cathedral of Salamanca, where he finally died in 1548.

¹⁷ Cf. *Le travail intellectuel*, 5 (2003), p. 56 and the bibliography quoted there; Díaz Díaz, *Hombres y documentos*, II, p. 587; J.M. Ayala, « Filósofos medievales aragonenses », in *Actas del I Congreso nacional de filosofía medieval*, Zaragoza 1992, p. 200.

¹⁸ Cf. J.K. Farge, *Students and Teachers at the University of Paris. The Generation of 1500*, Leiden/Boston 2006, pp. 528, 535.

¹⁹ The paragraph on this author comes from typewritten information sent to me by Angel d'Ors.

Ciruelo was the author of many works concerning a wide range of disciplines: arithmetic, geometry, cosmology, mathematics, logic, astrology²⁰. He also wrote some theological works, among which an *Arte de bien confesar, una Paraphrasis in Summam Divi Thomae* and even annotations on the Hebrew Bible (“*Biblia Hebraica cum interpretatione Latina interlinearia ad verbum et nonnullis in quosdam locos difficiles marginalibus annotationibus Petri Cirueli Daroconensis, scripta et punctuata ab Alphonso de Zamorra*”, 1536-1538 sqq.), preserved in two manuscripts of Salamanca. We should also mention that he wrote a treatise called *Summulae Petri Hispani*, in which he presents himself as “*Petrus Hispanus recentior*”, which contributed to the confusion around the author of the famous *Tractatus*.

What do we know about his ten years in Paris? The College of Beauvais, or College of Dormans-Beauvais, had been founded in 1370 by Jean de Dormans, bishop of Beauvais and chancellor of France, in order to offer young provincial students the possibility to complete their studies in Paris²¹. In spite of the control exercised by the members of the Dormans family, the college quickly developed an autonomous line, a tendency enforced by the protection and supervision by the Parliament. During the crisis provoked by civil war the college formed a central place for the parliamentary milieu and more and more opted for the role of institution for teaching, a development consecrated in 1458 by an important endowment. By the time Pedro Ciruelo arrived at the college, it certainly still had a political dimension, but its main function was that of teaching and that seems to have been Ciruelo’s main vocation.

Several works of Ciruelo have been printed in Paris while the author was still teaching there. His *Tractatus Arithmeticae Practicae, qui dicitur Algorismus*, first printed in 1495, apparently had some success, for it was reprinted in 1496, 1505, 1509, 1513 and 1514. The same can be said of the *Arithmetica Speculativa Thome Bravardini*, first published in 1495 by Guido Mercator, and the *Geometria Speculativa Thome Bravardini*, published in the same year by the same editor. Both were of course works meant for the students and based on the earlier treatises of Thomas Bradwardine.

Another work written by Ciruelo in Paris, his commentary on the *De Sphaera* of John of Sacrobosco, was even more successful: printed in Paris in 1498, it was reprinted no less than eight times, in Paris, Alcalá and Salamanca²². Commentaries on this basic treatise of Sacrobosco had been written from the 13th century onwards, but probably few had been printed before and Ciruelo apparently thought it useful to make a new edition with his own comments. The title page of the 1508 edition contains the following information: “*Uberrimum Sphere mundi commentum intersertis etiam quaestionibus domini Petri de alliaco. Nuper magna cum diligentia castigatum*”. The colophon is more explicit:

fº niv (vb): Et sic est finis huius egregii tractatus de sphaera mundi Iohannis de sacro busco anglici et doctoris Parisiensis. Una cum textualibus / optimisque additionibus ac

²¹ T. Kouamé, *Le collège de Dormans-Beauvais à la fin du Moyen Âge. Stratégies politiques et parcours individuels à l'Université de Paris (1370-1458)*, Leiden, 2005.

²² It has been edited by C. Flórez, P. García and R. Albares: *Pedro Ciruelo: una enciclopedia humanística del saber*, Salamanca 1990.

uberrimo commentario Petri Cirueli darocensis ex ea parte Tarraconensis Hispanie quam Aragoniam et celtiberiam dicunt oriundi. Atque insertis per subtilibus questionibus Reverendissimi domini cardinalis Petri de Aliaco ingeniosissimi doctoris quoque parisiensis. Impressum est hoc opusculum Anno dominice nativitatis .1508. in mense Augusti Parisius in Bellovisu. Impensis Iohannis Petit Commorante in vico divi Iacobi ad intersignum Leonis Argentei.

Thus, Ciruelo commented on a version of Sacrobosco's *Sphere* completed with the questions of Pierre d'Ailly on the same text, probably written in the 1370s and printed in Paris in 1498. As is the case with his commentaries on arithmetic and geometric, Ciruelo explicitly goes back to an earlier, much used, commentary in order to compose a still better and complete one. He apparently was a conscientious teacher, aiming to transmit the best possible version of the knowledge in each discipline.

The teaching of the three late 15th-century Spanish masters we have mentioned was typical for their time. The colleges had taken on much importance and the teaching of the arts mainly took place there. The kind of writings they produced also seems to follow the general scheme: treatises and questions on logic, extensive commentaries meant for students. Only the commentary of Johannes Dolz on the eighth book of the *Ethics* seems less usual²³.

Conclusion

Among the scholars mentioned above, the earlier ones, Antonio Andrés and Ferrandus Hispanus, clearly worked in a wide range of disciplines concerning the faculty of arts. Varga on the contrary was more orientated on theology. The later ones, Limos, Dolz and Ciruelo apparently specialised in logic while being in Paris, although Ciruelo also commented on the *Sphere*. This may be typical of the teaching in Paris during the late fifteenth century. The literary form of their works, commentaries and disputed questions, was also usual for the period. The Spanish scholars, while naturally inclined to choose masters of their own origin, were nonetheless part of the international academic world of which they adopted the customs and learning, and to which they offered a significant contribution. This contribution would only grow stronger in the years afterwards: the three scholars we have quoted for the late fifteenth century only just preceded a kind of Spanish invasion: from the end of the 15th century to the first decades of the 16th century “a significant group of Spaniards invaded the University of Paris”, as Angel d'Ors wrote, “Pardo, Coronel, Encinas, Lax, Celaya, Soto and many others”²⁴.

²³ His other works belong to a later period, when he occupied a chair of physics in Montauban.

²⁴ A. d'Ors, « 'Dubium proponitur', p. 229.

APPENDIX 1: SPANISH SCHOLARS MENTIONED AS M(ASTER) OR S(OURCE) IN THE REPERTORY

(D means that there is doubt about the author teaching as Master of Arts or not)

S Alphonsus Varga Toletanus, [+ 1366] OESA

M Andrés Limos, [end 15th cent.] (not listed in Repertorium 1)

D Durandus Hispanus, (confusion with Ferrandus de Hispania?)

M Antonius Andreas (Antonio Andrés),

S Fernandus de Cordoba, [*ca.* 1425-1486?]

D Ferrandus de Hispania, [end 13th – beginning 14th cent.]

S Gonsalvus Hispanus (de Vallebona), [*ca.* 1250-1315], OFM

S Guillelmus de Aragonia, [first half 14th cent.]

M Hieronymus Pardus, [+ 1502/1505]

M Johannes Dolz de Castellar, [end 15th cent.]

S Johannes Fortis Aragonensis, [beginning 14th cent.]

D Johannes Egidius Zamorrensis, [second half 13th cent.]

M Ludovicus (Luis) Coronel, [+ 1531]

M Ludovicus (Luis) Pitoys, [*ca.* 1500]

M Martín Limos, [+ *ca.* 1495]

D Nicolaus Eymerici (Eymerich), [1320-1399]

S Petrus Gallecus, [+ 1269]

S Petrus Garcia, [end 15th cent.]

M Petrus Sánchez Ciruelo, [*ca.* 1470-1548]

S Petrus Thomae, [*ca.* 1280-1337/40]

S Raimundus Lullus, [1332/3-1315/6]

APPENDIX 2: AN EXAMPLE OF COMMENTS BY ANGEL D'ORS

Some authors have received an extensive treatment in the comments of Angel d'Ors, even if, after all, they had to be excluded from the repertory and be listed only among the "exclus". A special case is that of Johannes de Montesono, who has been attributed a section in between the "exclus" and the masters (vol. 5, pp. 32-33).

Johannes de Montesono (Monzon), born in Monzon, in Aragon, entered the Dominican order, taught in Valencia and obtained the degree of master of theology in Paris in 1387. He certainly taught theology in Paris, where he participated in the polemics in favour of Thomism and against Nominalism, in which Jean Gerson and Pierre d'Ailly played a prominent role, and which led to the excommunication of Montesono in 1389. Documents related to these polemics have been printed in the *Opera Omnia* of Jean Gerson²⁵ and are there followed by a text of Pierre d'Ailly, in which he justifies the excommunication: *Apologia Facultatis Theologie Parisiensis circa damnationem Joannis de Montesono*.

A commentary on a logical text, the *Glosule super libros Peri Hermeneias*, has been attributed to him, although the colophon in the only surviving manuscript²⁶ reads: "Expliciunt Glossule magistri Johannis de Muntisol qui dicitur de Saxolo super librum Perihermeneias". This Johannes de Muntisol has been identified with Johannes de Montesono, but possibly without any foundation. The identification is rather widespread, figuring for instance in the repertory of Charles Lohr, and at the same time much criticised. Thus, we decided to give Montesono a special place, listing at least a short bibliography about this well-known master.

Angel d'Ors, who had first sent me extensive documentation about Montesono, somewhat later sent me a handwritten letter about the possible identification between this master and the so-called Johannes de Muntisol. This letter, as all his letters and messages ending with "Un cordial saludo", is reproduced here, in memory of an admirable Spanish scholar.

²⁵ *Opera omnia*, (reprint Olms 1987), col. 693-722.

²⁶ Madrid, B.N. 3092 f^o 88-131^v.

Joh. de Monteseoro / Muntisol
à garder pour corrections

Madrid 21-IV-2003

Estimada Olga Weijers:

Me alegra saber que mis observaciones a propósito de la segunda parte de Los "Johannes" te han resultado útiles.

Por lo que se refiere al problema relativo a Johannes de Monteseoro y Johannes de Muntisol (de Saxola), también a mi se me han planteado en ocasiones dudas respecto a su identidad, pero no he sido capaz de encontrar datos ni argumentos para resolver ese problema. ¿Sabes qué tipo de argumentos apoya Paul Krupa el rechazo de su identidad?

Aunque a veces se ha considerado que Johannes de Monteseoro era natural de Ronzón (Huesca), los datos biográficos que de él se conservan llevan a pensar que era natural del reino de Valencia, y que estudió y enseñó en Valencia y en Cataluña (y parece haber enseñado artes). Por su parte, por lo que se refiere a Johannes de