

## TRANSLATING AT THE COURT



---

MEDIAEVALIA LOVANIENSIA  
SERIES I / STUDIA XLV

*Editorial Board*

Geert Claassens (Leuven)  
Pieter De Leemans (Leuven)  
Jeroen Deploige (Gent)  
Baudouin Van den Abeele (Louvain-la-Neuve)

*Scientific Committee*

Rita Beyers (Antwerpen)  
Luca Bianchi (Vercelli)  
Francesco Bruni (Milano)  
Charles Burnett (London)  
Keith Busby (Wisconsin – Madison)  
Joëlle Ducos (Paris)  
Régine Le Jan (Paris)  
Brian Patrick McGuire (Roskilde)  
Alastair Minnis (Yale)  
Adriano Oliva (Paris)  
Loris Sturlese (Lecce)  
Werner Verbeke (Leuven, honorary member)

KU LEUVEN  
INSTITUTE FOR MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES  
LEUVEN (BELGIUM)

# TRANSLATING AT THE COURT

BARTHOLOMEW OF MESSINA

AND CULTURAL LIFE

AT THE COURT OF MANFRED, KING OF SICILY

Edited by

Pieter DE LEEMANS

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 2014 Leuven University Press / Presses Universitaires de Louvain / Universitaire Pers Leuven, Minderbroedersstraat 4, B-3000 Leuven/Louvain (Belgium)

All rights reserved. Except in those cases expressly determined by law, no part of this publication may be multiplied, saved in an automated data file or made public in any way whatsoever without the express prior written consent of the publishers.

ISBN 978 90 5867 986 4

D / 2014 / 1869 / 29

NUR: 684-694

Layout and cover: Friedemann BVBA

Cover illustration: Vaticano, BAV, Pal. lat. 1071, fol. 5v: Manfred of Sicily.

Reproduced by permission of the library.



## CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Notes about the contributors   | VII |
| Pieter DE LEEMANS<br><i>Bartholomew of Messina, Translator at the Court of Manfred,<br/>King of Sicily</i>   | XI  |
| Steven J. WILLIAMS<br><i>Like Father, Like Son? The Life and Reign of Manfred, King of Sicily</i>  | 1   |
| Fulvio DELLE DONNE<br><i>The Sapientia of Manfred and the Studium of Naples</i>  | 31  |
| Michael W. DUNNE<br><i>Dubitavit Rex Manfredus ... King Manfred and the Determinatio<br/>Magistralis of Peter of Ireland</i>   | 49  |
| Paraskevi KOTZIA<br><i>De Hebraea lingua transtulimus in Latinam: Manfred of Sicily and the<br/>pseudo-Aristotelian Liber de pomo</i>  | 65  |
| Alessandra PERRICCIOLI SAGGESE<br><i>Fra la corte e l'università: manoscritti miniati di età manfrediana</i>   | 91  |
| Mauro ZONTA<br><i>Jewish Philosophy and Translations of Philosophical Texts into<br/>Hebrew in 13<sup>th</sup>-Century Southern Italy, Including Sicily:<br/>Some Observations</i>   | 113 |
| Giacinta SPINOSA<br><i>Barthélemy de Messine, traducteur du Ps.-Aristote, De mundo:<br/>la diffusion de néologismes métaphysiques, astrologiques et<br/>cosmologiques (influentia, inalterabilis) du XII<sup>e</sup> au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle</i> | 123 |
| Charles BURNETT<br><i>Stephen of Messina and the Translation of Astrological Texts<br/>from Greek in the Time of Manfred</i>   | 155 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Pieter BEULLENS  |     |
| <i>True Colours: the Medieval Latin Translations of De Coloribus</i>   | 165 |
| Gudrun VUILLEMIN-DIEM  |     |
| <i>Revision der Translatio Bartholomaei oder Neuübersetzung?</i>       |     |
| <i>Zu dem Fragment von De coloribus des Wilhelm von Moerbeke</i>       | 203 |
| Élisabeth DÉVIÈRE  |     |
| <i>Le vocabulaire médical de Barthélemy de Messine et sa réception</i> |     |
| <i>par Pietro d'Abano</i>  | 249 |
| Charles BURNETT  |     |
| <i>The Latin Versions of Pseudo-Aristotle's De signis</i>              | 285 |
| Pieter BEULLENS  |     |
| <i>Facilius sit Nili Caput Invenire: Towards an Attribution and</i>    |     |
| <i>Reconstruction of the Aristotelian Treatise De inundatione Nili</i> | 303 |
| Dimitri GUTAS  |     |
| <i>The Translation of De Principiis (Theophrastus) by Bartholomew</i>  |     |
| <i>of Messina</i>  | 331 |
| Valérie CORDONIER  |     |
| <i>La version latine des Magna moralia par Barthélemy de Messine</i>   |     |
| <i>et son modèle grec: le ms. Wien, ÖNB, phil. gr. 315 (V)</i>         | 337 |
| Index codicum manu scriptorum  | 383 |
| Index nominum  | 387 |

## NOTES ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

The academic work of Pieter BEULLENS focuses on the transmission of the Aristotelian corpus in the Latin West. He published the first volume of *De historia animalium* (tr. Guillemi) with F. Bossier (2000) and studied the reception of Aristotelian zoology in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. He contributed a chapter to *A Cultural History of Animals* (ed. B. Resl, Oxford, 2007) and co-authored an article about the printing history of Theodore Gaza's translation of *De animalibus* with A. Gotthelf (*Greek, Roman and Byzantine studies* 47 [2007]). Together with P. De Leemans he explored the transmission of the Aristotelian treatises at the medieval University of Paris (*Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 75 [2008]).

Charles BURNETT has been Professor of the History of Islamic Influences in Europe at the Warburg Institute, University of London, since 1999. His work has centred on the transmission of Arabic science and philosophy to Western Europe. He has documented this transmission by editing and translating several texts which were first translated from Arabic into Latin, and also by describing the historical and cultural context of these translations.

Valérie CORDONIER is a researcher at the CNRS, in the Centre d'Histoire des Sciences et des Philosophies Arabes et Médiévales (Paris). She also collaborates with the De Wulf-Mansion Centre (KU Leuven, Belgium). Her publications examine developments in and critiques of the Peripatetic tradition up to the late medieval period, with a focus on natural philosophy (from the imperial period to Averroes), and also on systems of providence and *ad extra* divine action in Latin Scholasticism (from Thomas Aquinas to John Duns Scotus). In collaboration with Ahmed Hasnaoui, she is currently responsible for the CNRS research project entitled 'Models of physical transmission in the Aristotelian tradition'.

Pieter DE LEEMANS is professor at the De Wulf-Mansion Centre for Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance Philosophy of KU Leuven (Belgium) and the academic secretary of *Aristoteles Latinus*. His research primarily focuses on the reception of Aristotelian (natural) philosophy in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, with special emphasis on the *Parva Naturalia* and the *Problemata Physica*. For the series *Aristoteles Latinus* he edited

the medieval translations of *De motu animalium* and *De progressu animalium* (Turnhout, 2011).

Fulvio DELLE DONNE teaches medieval Latin literature and medieval history at the Università della Basilicata (Italy). His research, which ranges from the early Middle Ages to Humanism, combines philological and historical methods. His recent book publications include *Dall' Ars dictaminis al Preumanesimo? Per un profilo letterario del XIII secolo* (Florence, 2013), *Federico II: la condanna della memoria. Metamorfosi di un mito* (Rome, 2012), *Le scritture della storia* (Rome, 2012), and the critical editions of Andreas Ungarus, *Descriptio victorie Beneventi* (Rome, 2013) and Gaspar Pelegrí, *Historiarum Alphonsi regis libri X* (Rome, 2012).

Élisabeth DÉVIÈRE is a research fellow at KU Leuven (Belgium). She studied classics and linguistics at the Université catholique de Louvain (Belgium) and holds a PhD in linguistics from KU Leuven. Her major research interest concerns the methods used to translate Greek scientific texts into Latin from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. She focuses on the role that translations played in the development of Latin medical vocabulary during the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, particularly in the medieval and neo-Latin translations of Aristotle's *Problemata Physica*.

Michael DUNNE is a senior lecturer and the Head of the Philosophy Department at the National University of Ireland Maynooth. His research interests span a wide variety of topics such as ancient and medieval philosophy, the philosophy of God, the philosophy of science, and Ireland's medieval philosophical heritage. He has published a number of books on medieval philosophy, most recently on Boncompagno of Signa (Leuven, 2012). He is currently working on a translation of Peter of Ireland's commentary on the *De longitudine et brevitae vitae* for the *Dallas Medieval Texts and Translation Series*.

Dimitri GUTAS is Professor of Arabic and Graeco-Arabic Studies at Yale University. He has published extensively on the medieval Graeco-Arabic translation movement and its lexicography, on the transmission of Greek philosophical texts into Arabic, and on Arabic philosophy. Most recently he published the Greek text and medieval Arabic translation of

Theophrastus, *On First Principles* (2010), the commented *editio maior* of Aristotle's *Poetics* (with Leonardo Taran, 2012), and the second edition of his foundational work, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition*, enlarged with an inventory of the philosopher's works (2014).

Paraskevi KOTZIA (†) was associate professor in the Department of Classics of Aristotle at the University of Thessaloniki. Her research interests included the philosophy of Aristotle and of Aristotelian commentators. She is the author of the book *Peri tou melou e peri tes Aristotelous teleutes*, Thessaloniki: Thurathen 2007. Her latest work is a critical edition of Galen's newly discovered text *Peri alupias* (with P. Sotiroudis; *Hellenica* 60 [2010], p. 63-150). She passed away on 14 July 2013.

Alessandra PERRICCIOLI SAGGESE is Professor of History of Medieval Art at the Department of Literature and Cultural Heritage (DILBEC) at the Seconda Università di Napoli (SUN). Her research focuses on the history of illuminated manuscripts from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance. She has published extensively on illuminated manuscripts from Southern Italy and has edited a history of manuscript painting in Italy, as well as collective works on specific topics in the history of illumination.

Giacinta SPINOSA is Associate Professor of the History of Philosophy at the Università di Cassino. She investigates both medieval and early modern philosophy with special attention to the development of philosophical terminology from classical Greek and Latin to 17th-century neo-Latin. She has written essays on *phantasia/imaginatio*, *idea*, *ratio*, *sensus*, *visio*, *experientia*, *ecclesia*, *natura*, *ornatus*, *demonstrabilis*, *cognitivus*, on the notion of *translatio studiorum* as well as on Hugo of Saint Victor, Bartholomew of Messina, Marie-Dominique Chenu, Henry de Lubac, and Jean Daniélou. Recently, she published *La lingua che vela. Boezio teologo traduttore* (Rome, 2012) and *Le scuole di Le Saulchoir e Lyon-Fourvière. Teologia cattolica e rinnovamento storiografico* (Roma, 2012).

Gudrun VUILLEMIN-DIEM has been a research fellow at the Thomas-Institut (Universität zu Köln). Her research focuses on the Greek-Latin translations of the *Corpus Aristotelicum* and their reception in the Middle Ages. In the series *Aristoteles Latinus*, she published the translations of the *Metaphysica* (*Translatio Iacobi*, *Translatio Vetus/Composita* [1970],

*Translatio anonyma* (1976), and *Recensio Translatio Guillelmi* [1990]), and of Moerbeke's translation of the *Meteorologica* (2008). She currently prepares, in collaboration with C. Steel, the edition of Ptolemaeus's *Iudicialia ad Syrum*, transl. Guillelmi.

Steven J. WILLIAMS is Professor of History at New Mexico Highlands University (U.S.A.). His research interests, which focus primarily on the thirteenth century, include the reception of the Aristotelian corpus and attendant spuria, in particular the *Secretum secretorum*, education at the new universities, the papal and imperial courts as centers of intellectual activity, Roger Bacon and the tradition of medieval science. In 2003, the University of Michigan Press published his *The Secret of Secrets. The Scholarly Career of a Pseudo-Aristotelian Text in the Latin Middle Ages*.

Mauro ZONTA is Associate Professor of History of Jewish Philosophy and Lecturer on the History of Arabic Philosophy at Sapienza Università di Roma, Italy. His main field of study is the medieval translations of philosophical and scientific works from Arabic and Latin into Hebrew. He published a number of books, such as *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico* (Brescia, 1996), *La filosofia ebraica medievale: storia e testi* (Roma – Bari, 2002), *Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century. A History and Source Book* (Dordrecht, 2006), and *Maimonide* (Rome, 2011).

Pieter DE LEEMANS

**BARTHOLOMEW OF MESSINA,  
TRANSLATOR AT THE COURT OF MANFRED,  
KING OF SICILY**

The rediscovery of Aristotle in the Middle Ages is one of the most important events in the history of (late) medieval philosophy. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw Latin translations of major parts of the *Corpus Aristotelicum* both from the Greek and the Arabic. Through these translations, Aristotle, who until then had mainly been known – via Boethius’s translations – as a teacher of logic, became the authority in several other domains such as metaphysics, ethics, and natural philosophy. This rapid appropriation of Aristotelian thought was stimulated by the rise of Universities in the same period. The translated *Corpus Aristotelicum* eventually formed the backbone of teaching in the *Artes* faculty. Masters of universities commented on Aristotle’s writings and used them as a foundation for developing their own theories. The immense intellectual and cultural impact of this phenomenon can still be seen in the thousands of extant manuscripts that contain medieval translations, commentaries, paraphrases, florilegia, ... of Aristotelian philosophy.

Not surprisingly, then, the bibliography on medieval Aristotelianism, and on medieval translations of Aristotle in particular, is quite impressive.<sup>1</sup> There has been considerable scientific progress since the publication of A. Jourdain’s pioneering 1819 study.<sup>2</sup> The founding of *Aristoteles Latinus* by the International Union of Academies in 1930 has helped to

1. For recent realisations in this field, see the quinquennial reports of Commission II of the *Société Internationale pour l’Etude de la Philosophie Médiévale* (SIEPM), published in the *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, most recently P. DE LEEMANS – C. TRIFOGLI, ‘Commission II: The Latin Aristotle and Medieval Latin Commentaries on Aristotle (2007-2012)’, *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54 (2012), p. 3-21. The best (and relatively up-to-date) survey of the rediscovery of the Latin Aristotle in the Middle Ages (with special emphasis on Greek-Latin translators) is J. BRAMS, *La riscoperta di Aristotele in Occidente*, Milano: Jaca Books, 2003. (An updated version of this book [in French] is in preparation.) See also B. G. DOD, ‘Aristoteles Latinus’, in: N. KRETZMANN e.a. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, p. 45-79.

2. A. JOURDAIN, *Recherches critiques sur l’âge et l’origine des traductions latines d’Aristote et sur des commentaires grecs ou arabes employés par les docteurs scolastiques*, Paris: Fantin – Delaunay, 1819; nouvelle éd. rev. et augm. par Ch. JOURDAIN, Paris: Joubert, 1843 (reprint New York: Burt Franklin, 1960).

h̄ q̄ret utiq̄ ip̄m ē h̄ m̄dub̄nabi  
 le nō h̄re rōnē q̄ h̄ talis ū fari  
 entib; q̄ honorabiliorib; quā n̄rō  
 h̄re aliqd̄ credibile ut q̄ acūsi  
 h̄ q̄ cōlatione totū anq̄t aliquā  
 yllas aut aduincē diffiāc; h̄ aut  
 nō h̄ cā hui; q̄ ioptimū lūmōy  
 q̄ada t̄mōy; q̄ nō iōdy; h̄iāp̄;  
 p̄mend; q̄m q̄ h̄i h̄re aliq̄ d̄vina  
 tate q̄ ulc; d̄ca h̄nglarit; ulc; q̄d;  
 q̄ h̄ iōdy; aggetit optimū q̄ iōdy;  
 q̄tiāgit; t̄ada; id; q̄ sep; q̄ ordina  
 tā ut h̄ aut; q̄ iālah; s̄h; ubi  
 etiā possibile ē medi; h̄ neq̄ q̄d;  
 fiet; ut antiuc; gurrur; ylofago  
 honorabil; aut; q̄ i medio n̄rō  
 candis; op̄sionē optimā q̄m medi;  
 ū honorabilissimū s̄h; at; q̄ q̄mōy;  
 q̄nat; grā si ē appar; ita; h̄ illd;  
 at; manifestat; p̄ h̄ q̄ ml̄tū q̄  
 nō obedit; n̄ recipiens; b̄i aut; ml̄  
 to mag; pauci; at; q̄ animatūy  
 iñitū at; iñitū; q̄ ip̄oy; aiātoy;  
 modicū q̄ meli; ēe; ulc; at; carū a  
 h̄q; q̄ i paucis; tonū; ml̄ta aut; ml̄  
 titudo; ē malū nō at; iñitū; q̄  
 ūi; q̄ sic; marie; sp̄e; sic; nate; i di  
 sciphinē si ē q̄ d̄ unū; s̄ba; di  
 cet; sic; sp̄e; q̄p̄us; variū q̄d; he  
 noratū; fac; q̄ c̄a; medi; regionē  
 extrema; at; q̄ utiq; q̄ q̄d; q̄ en  
 tā b̄i existit; entia; plato; id; et  
 pythagorū; lōgiquā; distātiā; in  
 mutū at; uolūt; oīa; q̄ adū; q̄ p̄i  
 tione; q̄d; facit; iñfinite; d̄vina  
 tic; q̄ unū; i quo; q̄ iñitū; q̄ i ordina  
 tā; q̄ oīe; ut; d̄cē; infortūtas; fm̄  
 se; ip̄a; ulc; at; nō ē; p̄; ab; h̄ar  
 totū; nam; q̄ ut; q̄ p̄cipare; aut;  
 et; sup; excellē; aiām; aut; q̄ p̄t;  
 offra; p̄; q̄; n̄; deū; q̄d; q̄; do; cā;  
 at; tribuit; posse; ē; ioptimū; d̄cē;  
 h̄; in; q̄; q̄; ḡngit; forte; at; n̄; ut;  
 q̄; eliget; si; q̄d; in; q̄; ḡngit;  
 unū; s̄bam; s̄b; q̄; at; q̄; i; q̄;  
 existē; ut; at; q̄; in; q̄; in; q̄; ml̄  
 tā; q̄; ut; ḡngit; ut; q̄; c̄a; t̄a; d̄a

*mirabilib; auditiōib;*

In cōp; h̄b; xv; *mirabilib; auditiōib;*  
 inslat; d̄ḡo; i latinū; amagis; b̄tho  
 lomeo; d̄mē; i; c̄a; illust; r̄ssim;  
 mayn; t̄edi; serenissimū; regis; sicilie  
 sic; amato; d̄m̄; d̄a; d̄o; s̄io.

**H**ic c̄a; nana; aquā; ē; iōnic; qui  
 respiciat; factam; a; votant; at; ita;  
 meam; ubi; fons; s̄git; nald; frigi  
 d; elevat; at; ap̄llac; sic; lebetes; ebul  
 lentes; ita; at; at; b̄i; uratib; q̄d; d̄le  
 mbil; q̄; in; fricōy; peruris; at; ip̄m;  
 ē; unidita; c̄c̄it; at; q̄; i; o; calos; ma  
 nus; q̄; p̄d; d̄c̄p̄at; n̄q; yd̄o; p̄e;  
 p̄h; q̄; n̄; ē; p̄; at; distēt; q̄; ubi; retine  
 t; q̄; plāgit; ulc; aquā; q̄; h̄re; eas; q̄;  
 p̄uauerū.

**I**unt; athens; factū; i; iuno; die; ḡmināe;  
 olua; q̄; si; magnā; ar; at; r̄m; enanē;  
 h̄atē; qui; methna; h̄re; s̄itū; erupit;  
 q̄; sup; etiā; latic; h̄re; q̄; in; modū; t̄ōtic;  
 diuinū; emanit; gen; p̄oy; occupat;  
 areumare; ip̄a; q̄; ferebat; pare; t̄e; se  
 nec; sup; spatulic; q̄; aluabat; R̄uma;  
 si; igne; f̄m; p̄e; ip̄o; d̄m̄; ē; q̄; di  
 ūit; h̄; q̄d; flāmo; h̄re; q̄; si; illuc; et  
 sic; suavit; inuenē; siml; cū; parē; q̄;  
 ille; ē;

**I**unt; c̄a; q̄; h̄re; p̄lladē; q̄; i; ai  
 lade; d̄c̄tō; q̄; i; medio; clipei; q̄; faciem  
 s̄it; figurat; ita; colligare; ita; q̄;  
 ahq; i; unū; artificū; q̄; c̄c̄itate;  
 si; aliq; uellet; ip̄a; anferē; solueret;  
 siml; q̄; ḡminē; totū; h̄atūam.

Padova, Bibl. Antoniana, Scaff. XVII, 370, fol. 64r: Bartholomew's translations of *De principiis* (end) and of *De mirabilibus auscultationibus*. Reproduced by permission of the library.

contribute to this progress significantly. Initially, this project ambitiously aimed to edit Latin translations of Aristotle that had been made both from Greek and from Arabic. In 1971, the project was redefined and limited to the editing of Greek-Latin translations only; editing the Arabic-Latin translations has then become one of the purposes of a new project, the *Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*, which was founded by Joan Drossaart Lulofs. The editions published in these series as well as the many studies by *Aristoteles Latinus* and other scholars allow for a more accurate understanding of which texts were translated at what time, the circumstances in which the translators worked, the translation methods they used, and the impact that these translations had on medieval philosophy and science.

Still, it would be a mistake to think that everything has been said on the Latin Aristotle. So far, ample attention has been paid to translations of Aristotle's works on metaphysics, ethics, and logic. His works on natural philosophy, however, have not received as much attention. The situation is still relatively favorable for the earliest, twelfth-century translations, several of which have been edited. Yet, even in this case, James of Venice's translation of *De anima*, a work whose influence cannot be overestimated, remains unedited. There is still more work left to be done on thirteenth-century translations. The most prominent examples here are probably William of Moerbeke's (*Guillelmus de Morbeka*) translations of the nucleus of Aristotelian natural philosophy: *Physica*, *De caelo*, and *De generatione et corruptione*. But there is also the almost entire oeuvre of one of William's colleagues that is still left to be explored in detail: Bartholomew of Messina (*Bartholomaeus de Messana*).<sup>3</sup>

Bartholomew of Messina is, perhaps, a victim of, what Steven J. Williams describes in his introductory essay to this volume as, historians' tendency to be attracted – at least initially – to 'larger caches of documents and larger-than-life characters'.<sup>4</sup> Active, at least for a while, in the same time period as Moerbeke, Bartholomew received only a fraction of the attention as the famous Flemish Dominican. Admittedly, Moerbeke is rightly considered to be a leading intellectual of his time. His life is relatively well-documented (at least from the middle of the thirteenth century on-

3. For a bibliography (up-to-date up to 2006) on Bartholomew, see G. COUCKE, 'A Selected Bibliography: 5. Bartholomew of Messina', in: P. DE LEEEMANS – M. GOYENS, *Aristotle's Problemata in Different Times and Tongues* (Mediaevalia Lovaniensia Studia 39), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006, p. 305-307. See also BRAMS, *Riscoperta*, p. 89-96 (= 'Capitolo settimo. Bartolomeo di Messina').

4. See WILLIAMS, 'Like father, Like son?', p. 1.

wards); he ran in the upper circles of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; he was acquainted with some important intellectuals of his time (for example, the Polish scientist Witelo and Henry Bate of Malines); there is even the myth – and according to some, the reality – of his personal relationship with Thomas Aquinas.<sup>5</sup> He was also a prolific translator, who almost translated the entire *Corpus Aristotelicum* – which is, in itself, unparalleled in the *Aristoteles Latinus* – as well as multiple works by Simplicius, Philoponus, Proclus, Archimedes, and others. Beyond sheer volume, Moerbeke showed excellent linguistic skill in his translations; his overall method can be studied in detail on the basis of the extant source materials (such as one of the Greek manuscripts he owned, Wien, ÖNB, Phil. gr. 100).<sup>6</sup> A good and nowadays still highly relevant survey of Moerbeke's importance can be found in the collection of articles that was published on the 700<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his death.<sup>7</sup>

The comparison with such a personality is, without a doubt, at the expense of Bartholomew of Messina, whose death we cannot commemorate because we do not know when he died – in fact, very little is known about his life at all – and whose oeuvre is considerably smaller than Moerbeke's. In fact, this is the only thing we do know: Bartholomew was a Master who worked as a translator, rendering works from Greek into Latin at the court of Manfred, King of Sicily, on his command. In any case, this is what some manuscripts state by a standard formula at the beginning of most of his translations:

5. Two authoritative voices in this debate are René-Antoine Gauthier, who considers Thomas to be only one of the many readers of Moerbeke, and Carlos Steel, who argues that collaboration between both scholars is likely. See, e.g., R.-A. GAUTHIER, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme contre les Gentils. Introduction* (Collection Philosophie Européenne), s.l.: Editions universitaires, 1993 and C. STEEL, 'Guillaume de Moerbeke et saint Thomas', in: J. BRAMS – W. VANHAMEL (ed.), *Guillaume de Moerbeke. Receuil d'études à l'occasion du 700<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de sa mort (1286)* (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy De Wulf-Mansion Centre Series 1 VII), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989, p. 57-82; see also his study in collaboration with V. Cordonier, quoted in n. 30. For a survey of the discussion, see P. DE LEEMANS, 'B.III.5. Wilhelm von Moerbeke', in: V. LEPPIN (ed.), *Thomas von Aquin Handbuch*, Tübingen: Mohr Verlag, in press.

6. Probably the most up-to-date and in-depth analyses of Moerbeke's translation method are found in G. Vuillemin-Diem's editions of the *Metaphysica* and *Meteorologica: Metaphysica Lib. I-XIV. Recensio et Translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka*, ed. G. VUILLEMIN-DIEM (Aristoteles Latinus XXV 3.1-2), Leiden – New York – Köln, 1995; *Meteorologica. Translatio Guillelmi de Morbeka* (Aristoteles Latinus X 2.1-2), Turnhout: Brepols, 2008. See also the article by VUILLEMIN (p. 203-247) in this volume.

7. BRAMS – VANHAMEL (ed.), *Guillaume de Moerbeke*. For a survey of the sources on his life and his output, see the very useful study of W. VANHAMEL, 'Biobibliographie de Guillaume de Moerbeke', *ibid.*, p. 301-383. See also, more recently, the chapter on William of Moerbeke in BRAMS, *Riscoperta*, p. 105-130.

Incipit liber ... translatus de Greco in Latinum a magistro Bartholomeo de Messana in curia illustrissimi Maynfredi serenissimi regis Sicilie scientie amatoris mandato suo.<sup>8</sup>

The mention of Manfred, bastard son of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, allows us to date Bartholomew's translation activity – at least those translations that contain the formula – precisely: that is, between 1258, when Manfred was invested with the office of king, and 1266, when he was defeated by Charles d'Anjou. Did Bartholomew continue his activities before or after this period (which one could suppose given that some of his translations do not contain the reference to King Manfred)? We do not know.<sup>9</sup>

At the court, Bartholomew must have had the company of other translators. In a famous letter that Manfred sent to the Masters of the University of Paris, he mentions the fact that he had several translators in

8. Several of these incipits are found in what is probably the most important witness of Bartholomew's translation activity, ms. Padova, Bibl. Antoniana, Scaff. XVII, 370: fol. 62r (*De principiis*), fol. 64r (*De mirabilibus auscultationibus* – called here 'De mirabilibus auditionibus'), fol. 72r (*Physiognomonica*), fol. 77r (*De signis*). In turn, the incipit is missing in the case of *De mundo* (fol. 81v): 'Incipit liber Aristotilis De mundo'. It is also missing at the beginning of the *Problemata Physica* ([fol. 1r] 'Incipit liber Problematum Aristotilis secundum speciem compilationis'); however, one reads at the end of the text the following verses (fol. 61v): 'Rex Manfrede, mei scriptum lege Bartholomei. // Portus et ala Dei sis michi causa spei'. (Cf. also ms. Erfurt, Universitätsbibl., Ampl. Fol. 16, fol. 48v: 'Expliciunt Problematum Aristotelis amen. Hunc librum transferri fecit Manfredus princeps filius Friderici imperatoris de greco in latinum ...' [quoted by R. SELIGSOHN, *Die Übersetzung der ps.-aristotelischen Problemata durch Bartholomaeus von Messina. Text und textkritische Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch*, Berlin: Ebering, p. 11]). – The same formula, *mutatis mutandis*, is also found in translations that are absent in the Padova manuscript: the *Magna Moralia* (formula found in two mss.; cf. the article by Valérie CORDONIER in this volume, p. 340), Hippocrates's *De natura puerorum* (formula in at least two mss.: Hippocrate, *La nature de l'homme*, ed. J. JOUANNA [Corpus Medicorum Graecorum I 1,3], Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975, p. 129, n. 2), and Hierocles's *Hippiatrica* (formula 'in several of the [nine] manuscripts'; cf. A. McCABE, *A Byzantine Encyclopaedia of Horse Medicine. The Sources, Compilation, and Transmission of the Hippiatrica* [Oxford Studies in Byzantium], Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 239). Apart from *De mundo*, the only translations that are not accompanied by the formula are the *De coloribus* and Hippocrates's *De natura hominis*; these are ascribed to Bartholomew on stylistic grounds. For the *De mundo*, see L. MINIO-PALUELLO, 'Note sull'Aristotele Latino Medievale', in: Id., *Opuscula. The Latin Aristotle*, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1972, p. 108-113; *De mundo. Translationes Bartholomaei et Nicholai*, ed. W. L. LORIMER, rev. L. MINIO-PALUELLO (Aristoteles Latinus XI 1-2 ed. altera), Bruges – Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1965, esp. p. XVI-XIX; on the *De coloribus*, see P. BEULLENS, 'True Colours' in this volume, esp. p. 176-180; for the *De natura hominis*, see Hippocrate, *La nature de l'homme*, ed. JOUANNA, p. 127-130.

9. In his article 'True Colours' in this volume (p. 176), Pieter BEULLENS suggests that the further study of Bartholomew's translation method might shed some light on the internal chronological evolution of the author's methodology.

his service.<sup>10</sup> Who were these translators? One name we know for sure is Stephen of Messina, who translated some astrological texts for Manfred.<sup>11</sup> Other translations sometimes associated with his court are the astrological treatises translated by Joannes de Dumpno<sup>12</sup> and the translation of Ibn Butlān's *Taqwīm as-Şihħa*, known as the *Tacuinum Sanitatis*.<sup>13</sup> Finally,

10. There are diverging views on the question as to which translations Manfred refers to in his letter, which I will not discuss in detail. On this topic, see, e.g., R. A. GAUTHIER, 'Notes sur les débuts (1225-1240) du premier Averroïsme', *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 66 (1982), p. 321-374 (322-330); F. DELLE DONNE, 'Un'inedita epistola sulla morte di Guglielmo de Luna, maestro presso lo *Studium* di Napoli, e le traduzioni prodotte alla corte di Manfredi di Svevia', *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 74 (2007), p. 225-245. – Whatever the answer to this question may be, the fact remains that several of Bartholomew's translations (*Problemata Physica*, *Physiognomonica*, *De coloribus*, *Magna Moralia*) circulated at the University of Paris (and were disseminated by *exemplar* and *pecia*); if not a part of the books referred to in Manfred's 1263 letter, they must have reached Paris (via Manfred or via another channel) at a different time.

11. The initial letters of the 100 aphorisms of the *Centiloquium Hermetis* spell out a sentence that reminds us of the incipits of Bartholomew's translations: 'Domino Manfrido inclito Regi Sicilie Stefanus de Messana hos flores de secretis astrologie divi Hermetis transtulit.' On the translation of this and other texts by Stephen, see the article by Charles BURNETT in this volume (p. 123-132; quotation on p. 123).

12. The connection of Joannes de Dumpno's translations with Manfred's court was first suggested by Ch. HASKINS, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924, p. 269-270, who refers to ms. Madrid, Bibl. Nacional, 10023; his suggestion was taken over by several other scholars, such as GAUTHIER, 'Notes', p. 328 and E. ACAMPORA-MICHEL, *Liber de pomo / Buch vom Apfel*, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2001, p. 13. The first two items in the Madrid ms. are Latin translations of Arabic astrological texts, the explicit of which informs us about the author, date, and place of the translation: (fol. 18r) 'Et perfecta fuit translatio et interpretatio istarum portarum in Panormitana civitate per Iohannem de Dumpno filium quondam Philippi de Dumpno, die veneris 27 mensis augusti 4 indicione ab annis Domini Salvatoris nostri Ihesu Christi 1260 ...'; (fol. 23r) 'Perfecta est interpretatio et translatio istarum portarum de arabico in latinum per Iohannem de Dumpno filium Philippi de Dumpno in civitate panormitana, anno a nativitate Domini nostri Ihesu Christi, 1262...' (cited in *Inventario General de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional XIV (9501-10200)*, Madrid: Bibl. Nacional, 2000, p. 297). It is noteworthy that these explicits – in contrast to the standard formula in Bartholomew's translations – do not state that these translations were made on the command of Manfred. Therefore, the only conclusion that can be drawn with certainty is that these texts were rendered *during the reign of Manfred in Palermo*. – About the Madrid ms., see also J. CHABÁS – B. R. GOLDSTEIN, 'Andalusian Astronomy: al-Zīj al-Muqtabis of Ibn al-Kammād', *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 48.1 (1994), p. 1-41. (I am grateful to Charles BURNETT for bibliographical advice on this matter.)

13. Iolanda VENTURA, who is preparing an article on this text ('I Tacuina di Ibn Butlan ed Ibn Jazla e la loro tradizione manoscritta: per una mise au point') informs me (e-mail 31 October 2013) that two manuscripts link the *Tacuinum* to the court of Manfred: Uppsala, Universitetsbibl., C 587, fol. 41r: 'Explicit liber de conservacione sanitatis quem composuit albuchasis [sic!] extrennus medicus pro Rege Manfredo'; Venezia, Bibl. Marciana, lat. Z. 315, fol. 1r: 'Liber Tacuini, translatus de arabico in latinum in curia illustrissimi regis Manfredi, scientie amatoris.' In spite of the resemblance of the latter formula to the formula which accompanies Bartholomew's translation, she thinks that there are no firm arguments

F. Delle Donne has recently argued that William of Luna must be situated in the same period and milieu as well.<sup>14</sup>

Did Bartholomew have a special position among these translators? S. Impellizzeri suggested that Bartholomew would have been their headmaster ('caposcuola').<sup>15</sup> This qualification is not based on any evidence but probably results from the intuition that Bartholomew is the most prominent translator to be related to Manfred's court. The same train of thought is hidden behind the identification of Bartholomew with the translator *Meinfredi nuper a domino rege Carolo devicti* ('the translator of Manfred, recently defeated by King Charles [of Anjou]') mentioned by Roger Bacon.<sup>16</sup> Evidently, this identification is possible – one could say even 'probable' – yet, it is as such not conclusive.<sup>17</sup>

Since then almost nothing can be said with certainty about Bartholomew of Messina's life, other ways must be explored to unveil his role as a transmitter of Aristotelian thought to the Latin Middle Ages. The fifteen essays in this volume intend to do so in a twofold way. First of all, Bartholomew will be put in context by sketching cultural and intellectual life under the reign of Manfred. This is done in the essays by (in an alphabetical order) Ch. Burnett, F. Delle Donne, M. Dunne, P. Kotzia, A. Perriccioli Saggese, S. J. Williams, and M. Zonta. Secondly – and quite evidently – we will have a closer look at some of Bartholomew's translations from different points of view. This is an approach that the reader will be confronted with in the essays by P. Beullens, Ch. Burnett, V. Cordonier, E. Dévière, D. Gutas, G. Spinosa, and G. Vuillemin-Diem.<sup>18</sup> In what follows, I will

to prove a connection of the translation with Manfred. For the more traditional view, see C. HOENIGER, 'The Illuminated Tacuinum sanitatis Manuscripts from Northern Italy ca. 1380-1400: Sources, Patrons, and the Creation of a New Pictorial Genre', in: J. A. GIVENS – K. REEDS – A. TOUWAIDE (ed.), *Visualizing Medieval Medicine and Natural History, 1200-1550* (AVISTA Studies in the History of Medieval Technology, Science and Art 5), Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, p. 51-82 (54).

14. Cf. DELLE DONNE, 'Un' inedita epistola', esp. p. 232-234, 243. See also his essay in this volume. – Still other thirteenth-century translators or anonymous translations are sometimes associated with Manfred; see, e.g., below n. 17 and n. 23.

15. S. IMPELLIZZERI, 'Bartolomeo da Messina', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* VI (1964), p. 729-730 (729b).

16. *Rogeri Bacon Opus Tertium*, ed. J. S. BREWER, London: Longmans, 1859, p. 91 (cap. 25).

17. J. FERREIRO ALEIMPARTE, 'Hermann el Alemán, traductor del siglo XIII en Toledo', *Hispania Sacra* 35 (1983), p. 9-56 (28, 35-37, 43-50) proposes to interpret Bacon's words as pointing to Hermann the German (*Hermannus Alemannus*) and suggests on this basis that Hermann also worked at Manfred's court. This view is criticized by P. LINEHAN, *Spain, 1157-1300: A Partible Inheritance*, Malden, MA, 2008: Blackwell, p. 136, n. 11.

18. The order of the essays on Bartholomew in this volume is that of the editorial program of the *Aristoteles Latinus*, published in *Aristoteles Latinus Codices. Pars Pos-*

sketch the main lines of thought found in these contributions and enrich them with some personal considerations.

(1) It is no accident that S. J. Williams, as mentioned earlier, referred to the negative impact that larger-than-life historical figures have on the study of, allegedly, ‘lesser gods’. To some extent, in fact, Manfred has always been in the shadow of his famous father, Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen. The panorama of Manfred’s life and politics offered by Williams in his introductory essay shows that Manfred, himself, was well-aware of his father’s exceptional personality. Probably in an attempt to justify his own reign and his being the embodiment of Hohenstaufen traditions, he cultivated the similarities between them. On the other hand, Williams stresses that Manfred was not the epigone of his father but an independent political actor with his own irrefutable merits. Thus, one should not only ask what the resemblances are between father and son but also the differences.

This tension between similarity and difference is a consistent theme throughout the essays that follow. Three of them focus on Manfred himself and more concretely on his relation with philosophy. F. Delle Donne examines the image of Manfred sketched in pseudo-Nicolaus de Jamsilla’s *Historia de rebus gestis Frederici II imperatoris eiusque filiorum Conradi et Manfredi Apuliae et Siciliae regum*. In this text, Manfred’s *sapientia* and his interest in philosophy is contrasted with those of his father. Unlike Frederick II, whose philosophical background led him to heresy, Manfred is praised for his *sapientia* as being useful in government. It is the same image that is cultivated in Manfred’s official documents on the reopening of the *Studium* of Naples and in the aforementioned letter that he sent to the University of Paris.

What form did Manfred’s interest in philosophy take then? Two documents shed particular light on this question. First of all, there is the *Determinatio Magistralis* by Peter of Ireland (*Petrus de Ybernia*). This text contains Peter’s final answer (‘determinatio’) on the question of the origin of the design of an animal’s body which had been debated by various professors of the *Studium* of Naples in the presence of King Manfred. Since Manfred appears to have raised this question and since the work is addressed to him, it is reasonable to presume, Michael Dunne argues – in line with Ruedi Imbach –, that the work is adapted, matches, or fits

*terior*, descr. †G. LACOMBE e.a., supplementis indicibusque instruxit L. MINIO-PALUELLO, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955, p. 783-786.

in with his interests. In this context, Dunne points to the references that Peter makes to birds of prey. These are likely to reflect the King's interest in the matter which is also clear in his editing of his father's *De arte venandi cum avibus*. One could add that other aspects of Peter's answer must have appealed to Manfred as well. The idea that every being has its own specific state or function (illustrated by the examples of the leader of an army or the ruler of a city) confirms Delle Donne's point that Manfred had a specific interest in philosophy that was useful in government.

The second text that tells us something about the nature of Manfred's interest in philosophy is the *Liber de pomo*, discussed by Paraskevi Kotzia. This text is a Latin translation of a Hebrew original (which is, itself, a translation) and reports Aristotle's last conversation with certain philosophers as well as his death – to some extent, it is the Aristotelian counterpart of Plato's *Phaedo*.<sup>19</sup> The author of the translation might be Manfred himself. The text is preceded by a preface written by Manfred in which he appears to claim the authorship of the translation ('ad erudicionem multorum de Hebrea lingua transtulimus in Latinam ...'). However, not all scholars agree on the interpretation of this 'transtulimus'. Rather than taking a position in this debate, Kotzia focuses on the reasons why Manfred is so eager to stress his personal involvement in the enterprise of translating the *De pomo*. She argues that Manfred wants to emphasize the fact that his interest in Aristotelian philosophy is not in conflict with, and even confirms, Christian faith and that, by doing so, he attempts to defend both his father Frederick II and himself against the accusation of being 'Epicureans'.<sup>20</sup>

In the next essay, the relation between Manfred's court and the *Studium* of Naples is highlighted from a different, art-historical perspective. A. Perricoli Saggese sheds light on what is an exceptionally qualitative production of illuminated manuscripts during the reign of Manfred. Part of these manuscripts, such as the Vatican manuscript Pal. lat. 1071 (which contains Manfred's revision of his father's *De arte venandi cum avibus*) were produced at the court in what appears to have been a 'scriptorium without scriptorium'; other manuscripts were made in a well-organized scriptorium in Naples. The link between both places is manifest in the scribe Johensis who first worked in Naples and then moved to the court.

19. For the correspondences between the *Liber de pomo* and the *Phaedo*, see ACAMPORA-MICHEL, *Liber de pomo*, p. 31-43

20. On the meaning of this accusation, see p. 85.

The two final essays of this section make the transition to the second section by their focus on translations and, thus, on what was a typical multicultural and multilingual setting of that time period and place. In the first of these, Mauro Zonta gives a survey of the Jewish translators active in Southern Italy and Sicily in the period 1230-1290 (thus including the reigns of Frederick II and Manfred). It becomes clear that these translators produced not only Arabic-into-Hebrew but also Arabic-into-Latin translations. They are thus illustrative of the connection between these three cultures (Jewish, Arabo-Islamic, Latin Christian) that was common to that particular place and time. Only one translation from Hebrew into Latin can be associated with Manfred: the aforementioned translation of the *Liber de pomo*.

To this multicultural panorama, Charles Burnett adds another component. He focuses on Stephen of Messina, Bartholomew's colleague-translator at the court of Manfred, giving a survey of the astrological texts that he translated (or might have translated) from Greek into Latin. Southern Italy and Sicily were, indeed, characterized not only by Jewish, Arabo-Islamic and Latin Christian but also by Greek culture. Apart from the Greek-speaking communities in Southern Italy or the polyglot society of Palermo, this Greek influence was probably manifest in libraries and scriptoria – such as the monastery library of San Salvatore in Messina or of San Nicola di Casole at Otranto in Apulia – and, perhaps, also strengthened by Manfred's contacts with Greece and, more concretely, by his marriage with Helena, the daughter of Michael II Angelos, despot of Epirus.<sup>21</sup> It is in this context, then, that the translation activity of Bartholomew of Messina must be situated.

21. Information on Greek book production, scriptoria and libraries in Southern Italy and Sicily was provided by N. WILSON in his unpublished essay 'Greek Book Production in the Time of Manfred of Sicily' (Leuven, Institute for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 9 January 2009). Cf. also K.-D. FISCHER, 'A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse! Versions of Greek Horse Medicine in Medieval Italy', *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 34.2 (1999), p. 123-138 (131-132), who refers to the same factors to explain why Bartholomew was able to translate (ps.-)Hierocles's *Hippiatrika*. About the strategic reasons behind the marriage of Manfred with Helena, see the essay by WILLIAMS, p. 18. – Note that there appears to be an (indirect) link of the Greek ms. Firenze, Bibl. Laurenziana, 87.21, which belonged to the library of San Nicola, with two thirteenth-century translations (*De lineis insecabilibus*, *De motu animalium*); see D. HARLFINGER, *Die Textgeschichte der Pseudo-Aristotelischen Schrift ΠΕΡΙ ΑΤΟΜΩΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΩΝ. Ein kodikologisch-kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Klärung der Überlieferungsverhältnisse im Corpus Aristotelicum*, Amsterdam: Hakert, 1971, esp. p. 153-157, and *De motu animalium. Fragmenta Translationis Anonymae*, ed. P. DE LEEMANS (Aristoteles Latinus XVII I.III), Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, p. LVIII-LXXXII.

(2) Although smaller than Moerbeke's, Bartholomew of Messina's output as a translator is still considerable. It is thanks to his efforts that medieval readership was able to become acquainted with quite a few (pseudo-) Aristotelian treatises that, for the most part, had not yet been translated before him and would not be translated after him either.<sup>22</sup> These works include the *Problemata Physica*, an encyclopedic work, large parts of which deal with medicine and natural philosophy, *De mirabilibus auscultationibus* (*On marvellous things heard*), a collection of anecdotes, dealing mainly with the natural world, the *Physiognomonica*, *De mundo*, *De signis* (*On weather signs*), *De coloribus* (*On Colours*), the *Magna Moralia*, and *De principiis* (that is, Theophrastus's metaphysical essay).<sup>23</sup> Moreover, he translated two texts by Hippocrates (*De natura hominis*, *De natura puerorum*)<sup>24</sup> and (pseudo-)Hierocles's treatise (*Hippiatrica*) on horse medicine.<sup>25</sup>

Generally speaking, one could argue that Bartholomew – and his patron as well – appears to have had a particular interest in 'scientific' and natural philosophical works. In fact, only two works appear to not fit this

22. *De coloribus* was also (partly) translated by William of Moerbeke, independently from Bartholomew's translation; see the article by Gudrun VUILLEMIN-DIEM in this volume. *De mundo* was also translated by Nicolaus Siculus, who is commonly identified with Nicolaus Graecus, the assistant of Robert Grosseteste; the chronological relation between the translations of *De mundo* is uncertain. Note that David Bloch recently questioned the identification of Nicolaus Siculus with Nicolaus Graecus: D. BLOCH, 'Nicolaus Graecus and the *Translatio Vetus* of Aristotle's *De Sensu*', *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 50 (2008), p. 83-104.

23. Since Leonhard Spengel's 1867 edition, it is sometimes stated that Bartholomew is (or might be) the author of the *translatio vetus* of the *Rhetorica Vetus* (cf. *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*, ed. L. Spengel, Leipzig: Teubner, vol. I, p. 177, n. 2). See, for example, R. SELIGSOHN, *Die Übersetzung*, p. 17; Aristoteles, *Problemata physica*, tr. H. FLASHAR (Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung 19), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962, p. 373 (with reference to Seligsohn); A. PYM, 'Attempt at a chronology of Hispanic translation history', on <http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/chronology/13.html> (accessed 4 March 2014). This thesis has been convincingly refuted by B. SCHNEIDER, *Die mittelalterlichen griechisch-lateinischen Übersetzungen der aristotelischen Rhetorik* (Peripatoi 2), Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971, p. 3-4. Cf. *Rhetorica. Translatio Anonyma sive Vetus et Translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeke*, ed. B. SCHNEIDER (Aristoteles Latinus XXXI 1-2), Leiden: Brill, 1978, p. XIII.

24. See Hippocrate, *La nature*, ed. JOUANNA, p. 127-130. In his review of Hippocrates, *On Head Wounds*, ed. M. HANSON (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum I.4.1), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999 (published in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.07.03) C. R. GALVÃO-SOBRINHO mentions (n. 3) that Hanson states (on p. 18) that the *De capitis vulneribus* might also have figured among the Hippocratic treatises translated into Latin by Bartholomew of Messina at the court of Manfred. Unfortunately, I have not been able to check this edition.

25. On this text, see FISCHER, 'A horse', p. 131-134; McCABE, *A Byzantine Encyclopaedia*, p. 210 and p. 239-244. A transcription of one 18th-century manuscript of this translation (Paris, BnF, fr. 20167) is provided by M. GÜNSTER, *Studien zu der vom Magister Bartholomäus de Messina durchgeführten lateinischen Übertragung der griechischen Hippiatrica-Kapitel des Hierocles*, Inaugural-Dissertation, Hannover, Tierärztliche Hochschule, 1974.

description: the *Magna Moralia* and the *De principiis*.<sup>26</sup> Although it probably leads us too far to assume that Bartholomew had training in medicine – just as the fourteenth-century translator of the *Problemata Physica* into (Middle) French, Evrart de Conty, physician of Charles V<sup>27</sup> –, it is remarkable that his medical vocabulary is in quite close agreement with the medical vocabulary of his time.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, as is shown by Giacinta Spinosa, Bartholomew was familiar with some important technical terms pertaining to the domain of metaphysics, astrology, and cosmology.<sup>29</sup>

When describing Bartholomew's output, one should also note that two more (pseudo-)Aristotelian works, which both occur in the abovementioned Padova manuscript and, therefore, sometimes have been associated with Bartholomew, must now (most likely) be added to the catalogue of Moerbeke's translations. The first of these is the treatise *De inundatione Nili* (= *De Nilo*) which Pieter Beullens focuses on in the second of his essays in this volume (pleading, *en passant*, for its Aristotelian authenticity). The second text is the treatise known as *De bona fortuna* which consists of a fragment of the *Magna Moralia* and of the *Eudemian Ethics*. Recently, Valérie Cordonier and Carlos Steel have argued that not only were these fragments translated by Moerbeke but also that Thomas Aquinas might have oriented Moerbeke towards translating the fragment of the *Magna Moralia*.<sup>30</sup>

26. Giacinta SPINOSA argues that all texts translated by Bartholomew belong together as they can all be characterized as being useful for instructing the King and all contribute to good government by giving insight in human nature: see p. 148-149 of this volume.

27. For a survey of studies on Evrart (up to 2006), see C. BOUCHER – M. GOYENS, 'A Selected Bibliography: Evrart de Conty', in: DE LEEMANS – GOYENS (ed.), *Aristotle's Problemata*, p. 310-315. An edition of his *Problemata* is being prepared by, among others, Françoise GUICHARD-TESSON and Michèle GOYENS for the series *Classiques français du Moyen Âge* (Champion). See also, more recently, M. GOYENS – J. DUCOS (ed.), *Traduire au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Evrart de Conty et la vie intellectuelle à la cour de Charles V*, Paris: Champion, in press.

28. On this topic, see E. DÉVIÈRE, *Langue spécialisée et traduction au 13<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le vocabulaire médical dans la version latine des problèmes d'Aristote par Barthélémy de Messine*, thèse de doctorat, KU Leuven, 2009, as well as her essay in this volume (p. 249-283).

29. On this topic, see G. SPINOSA's article in this volume (p. 133-164).

30. V. CORDONIER – C. STEEL, 'Guillaume de Moerbeke traducteur du *Liber de bona fortuna* et de l'*Ethique à Eudème*', in: A. M. I. VAN OPPENRAAY (ed.), *The Letter before the Spirit: The Importance of Text Editions for the Study of the Reception of Aristotle* (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus 23), Leiden: Brill, 2012, p. 401-446 and V. CORDONIER, 'Sauver le Dieu du Philosophe : Albert le Grand, Thomas d'Aquin, Guillaume de Moerbeke et l'invention du 'Liber de bona fortuna' comme alternative autorisée à l'interprétation averroïste de la doctrine aristotélicienne de la providence divine', in: L. BIANCHI (ed.), *Christian Readings of Aristotle from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance* (Studia Artistarum 29), Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, p. 65-114 (107-108). V. Cordonier is currently preparing the edition of this text for the series *Aristoteles Latinus*.

Mentioning Moerbeke leads us to the question of the connection, if any, between Bartholomew and his more famous contemporary. In favour of such a connection, scholars have drawn attention to the fact that their translation methods were quite similar and also that there is almost no overlap in their output.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, two more concrete arguments have been put forth. First of all, both Bartholomew and Moerbeke used the same Greek Hippocrates manuscript (Vaticano, BAV, Vat. gr. 276), the former as the model for his translations of *De natura puerorum* and *De natura hominis*, the latter as the model for his list of Hippocrates's writings in ms. Wien, ÖNB, Phil. gr. 100 (J). Secondly, it was considered striking that Moerbeke translated only the beginning of *De coloribus*: did Moerbeke stop translating this text because he knew Bartholomew had already translated it, as was suggested by Ezio Franceschini?<sup>32</sup>

It is clear that none of these arguments offers *direct* evidence that Bartholomew and Moerbeke were in contact with one another. The two most seducing arguments are not as univocal as they may first appear. One can easily imagine a scenario in which both translators used the Vatican manuscript independently of one another – Moerbeke, for example, might have consulted it in the papal library.<sup>33</sup> Also, the dossier of

31. There are two known exceptions; in both cases, Moerbeke rendered (or appears to have rendered) only a part of the work translated by Bartholomew. On the one hand, there is *De coloribus*; for the relation between both translations, see below. On the other hand, as said above, Moerbeke translated a section of the *Magna Moralia*, which later became a part of the *Liber de bona fortuna*: see CORDONIER – STEEL, 'Guillaume de Moerbeke'. In this study, Cordonier and Steel argue on firm grounds that, in translating this text, both translators worked independently from one another (p. 420-436); they also suggest that Moerbeke's translation postdates Bartholomew's and that Moerbeke might well have had some knowledge of the latter (see esp. p. 437).

32. E. FRANCESCHINI, 'Sulle versioni latine medievali del Περί χρωμάτων', in: *Autour d'Aristote. Recueil d'études de philosophie ancienne et médiévale offert à Monseigneur A. Mansion* (Bibliothèque philosophique de Louvain 16), Louvain: Publications universitaires de Louvain, 1955, p. 451-469 (467-468).

33. That this manuscript belonged to the papal library is suggested by the presence of the mysterious abbreviation 'And' in it. This abbreviation, sometimes accompanied by Latin titles, was also present in several other Greek manuscripts (some of them extant) that are mentioned in the library's inventories of 1295 ('Recensio Bonifatiana') and 1311 ('Recensio Perusina'); however, the Hippocrates ms. does not occur in either of these lists. – The interpretation of the abbreviation 'And' is complicated. Some scholars – of whom Franz Pelster was the first – consider it to be an abbreviation of *Andegavensis*: according to this, at first, seductive interpretation, Charles d'Anjou (= *Andegavensis*) would have given the Greek manuscripts that belonged to Manfred, after the defeat of the latter, to Pope Clemens IV; 'And' would then refer to this gift. In this scenario, the fact that Bartholomew and Moerbeke both used the Hippocrates ms. would become meaningless; it would indeed be logical to assume that Bartholomew consulted the manuscript at Manfred's court and Moerbeke in the papal library. However, this interpretation has been questioned on the basis of solid argu-

*De coloribus* is more complex. During the preparation of this volume, it became clear that it was necessary to re-evaluate the relation between the two translations of *De coloribus*. The question was the following: were these translations made independently of one another – this is Franceschini's position – or did Moerbeke revise Bartholomew's translation – this seems to be Minio-Paluello's position in his 1974 article on Moerbeke in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*?<sup>34</sup> Arguing against a suggestion initially made by Pieter Beullens, Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem shows through a detailed comparison of both texts that Moerbeke made an entirely new translation. Evidently, this conclusion alone does not help us to solve the question about an alleged collaboration which remains possible. In turn, Pieter Beullens advances another argument against Franceschini's hypothesis. He suggests that it is possible that Moerbeke originally translated the entire text but that the last part of it got lost. In this case, one could no longer hold the idea that Moerbeke stopped translating because Bartholomew had already translated the text.<sup>35</sup>

As for Bartholomew's translations, a few points should be noted (which, at the same time, allows us to make the comparison with Moerbeke). First of all, there is the question of Bartholomew's Greek models. From Moerbeke, we know that he often used excellent Greek manuscripts

ments by A. PARAVICINI BAGLIANI; he argues that the Latin titles and the abbreviation 'and' have something to do with the preparatory work for the inventory of 1295 but admits that the exact meaning of 'And' (Andreas?) remains unclear. See, for a recent *status quaestionis*, A. PARAVICINI BAGLIANI, 'La biblioteca papale nel duecento e nel trecento', in: A. MANFREDI (ed.), *Storia della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana I. Le origini della Biblioteca Vaticana tra Umanesimo e Rinascimento*, Vaticano, 2010, p. 73-108, esp. p. 95-99; see also his 'La provenienza 'angioina' dei codici greci della Biblioteca di Bonifacio VIII. Una revisione 'critica'', *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 26 (1983), p. 27-69. Note that ms. Firenze, Bibl. Laurenziana, 87.25 does not only contain the abbreviation 'And' in the middle of the final guard leave of this codex, as is stated by E. B. FRYDE, 'The Paraphrase by Themistios of Aristotle's *De anima*, and St Thomas Aquinas', *The English Historical Review* 109 (1994), p. 952-959 (954) (cf. also PARAVICINI BAGLIANI, 'La biblioteca', p. 97, on the authority of Fryde). An autopsy of the manuscript (in December 2008) has also revealed in the very upper margin of fol. 283v a Latin title, followed by 'And': 'liber de anima ar(istotilis) et (pe)rafras themistii super eum. and', which is exactly the title that occurs in the *Recensio Perusina* (item 618).

34. L. MINIO-PALUELLO, 'Moerbeke, William of', in: CH. C. GILLISPIE (ed.), *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* IX, New York: Ch. Scribner's Sons, 1974, p. 434-440 (437). In earlier publications, Minio-Paluello held the same opinion as Franceschini. Did his thoughts on this topic change or does the 1974 article contain a lapsus (a possibility left open by G. VUILLEMIN-DIEM in her essay, p. 245).

35. Cf. BEULLENS, 'True Colours', p. 185. It is in this context perhaps noteworthy that at the end of Moerbeke's translation one does not find any remark of the translator on his Greek model being incomplete. In turn, such a remark is found in his translation of the *Politica Imperfecta* (cf. VANHAMEL, 'Biobibliographie', p. 339) and of the *Eudemean Ethics* (CORDONIER – STEEL, 'Guillaume de Moerbeke', p. 407-410).

some of which are preserved, and also that he left traces of scholarly activity (such as paragraph signs, exclamation marks and conjectures, ...) in them. Of Bartholomew, no Greek models were believed to be extant apart from the Vatican Hippocrates manuscript.<sup>36</sup> In her essay, Valérie Cordonier argues that the thirteenth-century ms. Wien, ÖNB, phil. gr. 315 (V) was Bartholomew's unique model for his version of the *Magna Moralia*.<sup>37</sup> Cordonier leaves the possibility open that the translator left a few traces in V but admits that further research is still necessary. In turn, Dimitri Gutas argues that Bartholomew used a Greek, unfortunately lost, manuscript for his translation of Theophrastus's *De principiis*, a manuscript that was significant for at least two reasons: contrary to the mss. Wien, ÖNB, phil. gr. 100 and Paris, BnF, gr. 1853, it must have attributed this text to Aristotle (and not to Theophrastus) and contained its original title Περί ἀρχῶν.

Next, one could ask what Bartholomew's translating skills were. Certainly, Bartholomew was a child of his time who used the prevailing criteria for rendering authoritative texts into Latin and therefore rendered the Greek *verbum de verbo*. (In this respect, the criticism that humanist scholars leveled against his – and others' – translations as 'barbaric' are unfair. Perhaps even more unfair is the fact that modern scholars repeat this criticism from time to time.<sup>38</sup>) The 'medieval' character of Bartholomew's translations is strikingly illustrated by Pieter Beullens's essay on the *De coloribus*. In this article, he successfully uses a methodology, not unfamiliar to *Aristoteles Latinus* scholars, of studying the rendering of Greek particles and some frequent Greek terms into Latin as a means to explore the chronology of Bartholomew's works and to ascribe the two translations of the *De coloribus* to Bartholomew and Moerbeke, respectively.

Was Bartholomew, within the constraints set by medieval translation practices, a 'good' translator? Did he proceed in an intelligent way? Did he find (or try to find) a suitable equivalent for the Greek words that he

36. For a survey of the relation between Bartholomew's translations and their Greek models, see Valérie CORDONIER's essay, p. 340-346.

37. An exception is evidently made for those folia that were lost and replaced by another text in the 15th century.

38. An example both for the Renaissance and contemporary evaluation is Flashar's statement that 'die Übersetzung des Bartholomaeus ist ohne literarische Wert, wörtlich „barbari magis quam Latini effecti“ (Lionardo Bruni aus Arezzo in der Vorrede zu seiner Übersetzung der NE1418). Diese Übersetzung e verbo ist jedoch wichtig für den griechischen Text, da in ihr griech. Handschriften benutzt sind, die uns verloren sind.' (Aristoteles, *Problemata*, tr. FLASHAR, p. 373)

translated? The answer is not univocal. Admittedly, on more than one occasion, Bartholomew's translations appear to be rather straightforward: an example is his translation of *De signis*.<sup>39</sup> In turn, Bartholomew's medical, astrological, and cosmological vocabulary appears to be up-to-date (as shown in the essays of Elisabeth Dévière and Giacinta Spinosa). Moreover, Dévière draws attention to the fact that his translation of Book I of the *Problemata* contains several *variae lectiones*,<sup>40</sup> hinting to the translator's effort to provide suitable equivalents (a striking contrast with his translation of Book IV and XXVIII).<sup>41</sup> Similarly striking is Charles Burnett's observation that, within the text tradition of the *De signis*, there is an alternative version which is also characterized by double readings but some of which presuppose a different Greek reading. If these readings all go back to Bartholomew, this would give us a situation that parallels that of Moerbeke who revised quite a few of his own translations on the basis of new Greek manuscripts. However, should one also consider the possibility that Bartholomew's *De signis* was not revised by himself but by another translator?

A last point concerns the reception – or the relative lack thereof – of Bartholomew's translations of Aristotle. From the eight texts that he translated, two (*De mirabilibus auscultationibus*, *De principiis*) appear to be preserved in one manuscript (Padova, Bibl. Antoniana, Scaff. XVII, 370) only. The *De mundo* – which suffered from the rivalry of Nicolaus Siculus's translation – is extant in four, the *De signis* – according to the updated list provided by Charles Burnett in this volume – in fifteen manuscripts. In contrast, the *Physiognomonica*, *De coloribus*, *Problemata Physica*, and *Magna Moralia* were more widely circulated. They are preserved in some 120, 80, 60 and 56 manuscripts respectively due to the fact that these were disseminated via *exemplar* and *pecia* at the University of Paris.<sup>42</sup> Although these numbers seem high at first sight, they are still

39. On the obscurity of the *De signis*, see BURNETT, 'The Latin Versions', p. 287-288 in this volume. See also CORDONIER, 'La version latine', p. 339, who argues that 'la relative médiocrité de la version latine des *Magna moralia* s'avère tenir moins à la technique de traduction qu'à la qualité du texte grec qu'elle reflète'.

40. DÉVIÈRE, 'Le vocabulaire médical', p. 270, n. 80.

41. For Book IV of the *Problemata Physica*, see G. COUCKE, *Philosophy between Text and Tradition. The Reception of Aristotle's Problemata in the Middle Ages: Peter of Abano's Expositio Problematum*. Vol I: *Edition of ps.-Aristotle, Probl. IV, translated by Bartholomew of Messina*, unpublished PhD thesis KU Leuven, 2008. In my own research on Book XXVIII, I was unable to detect any *variae lectiones* so far.

42. On the *Problemata Physica*, see COUCKE, *Philosophy*, Vol. I, esp. p. xlviii-lx; signs of *pecia* marks in ms. Venezia, Bibl. Marciana, Lat. VI, 43 were first noticed by P. DE LEEMANS – M. GOYENS, 'La transmission des savoirs en passant par trois langues: le cas

moderate in comparison with those of the most popular translations of Moerbeke that circulated in Paris. The reason for this might be that the texts translated by Bartholomew did not find a permanent place in the regular university curriculum and that they were difficult to fit into the traditional divisions of natural science.<sup>43</sup> It comes as no surprise, then, that the repertorium of Latin Aristotle commentaries by Charles H. Lohr mentions few commentaries on them.<sup>44</sup> The *Physiognomonica*, which received attention up to the fifteenth century, was the most popular.<sup>45</sup> The *Problemata Physica* also enjoyed some success. In this case, however, one sees that extant commentaries are deeply influenced by Pietro d'Abano's *Expositio Problematum Aristotelis* (1310), a situation which has been rightfully labeled as the 'succès d'un hapax'.<sup>46</sup> This commentary

des *Problemata* d'Aristote traduits en latin et en moyen français', in: P. NOBEL (ed.), *La transmission des savoirs au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance. Vol. 1: du XIIIe au XVe siècle*, Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, p. 231-257 (237). On the inclusion of the *Physiognomonica* and the *De coloribus* in an *exemplar* labelled in a 1304 university charter as 'Item de motibus animalium et aliorum parvorum', see *De progressu animalium. De motu animalium. Translatio Guillelmi de Morbeka*, ed. P. DE LEEMANS (Aristoteles Latinus XVII 2.II-III), Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, p. LXII-LXXXIX; G. MURANO, *Opere diffuse per exemplar e pecia* (Textes et études du moyen âge 29), Turnhout: Brepols, 2005, p. 258. The university tradition of the *Magna Moralia* is described by C. PANNIER, 'La traduction latine médiévale des *Magna moralia*. Une étude critique de la tradition manuscrite', in: L. J. BATAILLON – B. G. GUYOT – R. H. ROUSE (ed.), *La production du livre universitaire au moyen âge. Exemplar et pecia*, Paris: CNRS, p. 164-204.

43. An exception, in this respect, is Jean de Jandun († 1328) who, at the end of a traditional *divisio scientie*, offers some treatises that are associated with natural science: in this context he refers to, among other texts, *De coloribus*, the *Physiognomonica*, and the *Problemata Physica* (Joannes de Janduno, *Quaestiones super 8 libros physicorum Aristotelis*, Praefatio [ed. Venice, 1551; anast. repr. Frankfurt:Minerva, 1969]).

44. Lohr's repertorium was originally published in a set of articles in the journal *Traditio* (1967-1972); see now CH. L. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries. I. Medieval Authors* (Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi. Subsidia 17-18), Firenze: SISMEL, 2010-2013.

45. On the reception of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*, see J. ZIEGLER, 'Philosophers and Physicians on the Scientific Validity of Latin Physiognomy, 1200-1500', *Early Science and Medicine* 12 (2007), p. 285-312; J. AGRIMI, 'La fisiognomica e l'insegnamento universitario: La ricezione del testo pseudoaristotelico nella facoltà delle arti', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 64 (1997), p. 127-188 (reprinted in: J. AGRIMI, *Ingeniosa scientia nature: Studi sulla fisiognomica medievale*, Firenze: SISMEL, 2002, p. 101-166).

46. Cf. M. VAN DER LUGT, 'Genèse et postérité du commentaire de Pietro d'Abano sur les Problèmes d'Aristote. Le succès d'un hapax', in: J.-P. BOUDET – F. COLLARD – N. WEILL-PAROT (ed.), *Médecine, astrologie et magie au Moyen Âge: autour de Pietro d'Abano* (Micrologus' Library 50), Firenze: SISMEL, 2013, p. 155-182. On the commentary tradition on the *Problemata*, see M. VAN DER LUGT, 'Aristotle's Problems in the West: A Contribution to the Study of the Medieval Latin Tradition', in: DE LEEMANS – GOYENS (ed.), *Aristotle's Problemata*, p. 71-111. A volume of essays on the *Expositio Problematum*, edited by P. DE LEEMANS and M. HOENEN, is in preparation.

plays a prominent role in the essay of E. Dévière who examines Pietro's treatment of the medical vocabulary used by Bartholomew as a means to assess its adequacy.

From the above survey, the reader will immediately see that this volume does not shed light on every aspect of cultural life at Manfred's court or of Bartholomew of Messina. The volume does provide some account of Greek and Hebrew culture under the reign of Manfred but Islamic culture remains largely unexploited in spite of the fact that Manfred had diplomatic relations with the Moslem world and also had some Moslems at his court.<sup>47</sup> Attention is paid to Manfred's interest in philosophy, perhaps even as a translator, but his work as a reviser of his father's *De arte venandi cum avibus* is not treated in depth.<sup>48</sup> The link (if any) of the work of Joannes de Dumpno and of the *Tacuinum Sanitatis* with Manfred's court is also not explored. Several translations of Bartholomew's translations of pseudo-Aristotle are being explored from one angle or another but these insights will need to be confronted and completed with information about his Hierocles and Hippocrates translations. More systematic study of the impact of Bartholomew's translations on medieval thought also remains to be done. Therefore, this volume is an open invitation to other scholars to further explore the topics discussed in it and to complete them with new information. Doing so may give Manfred and Bartholomew the rightful place in cultural and intellectual history that they deserve.

\*\*\*

Several persons and institutions have contributed to the realization of this volume. It has been conceived within the framework of the research project 'Science in Text and Context. The Medieval Translations of Aristotle's *Problemata* and the Development and Positioning of Medical Vocabulary', directed by Michèle Goyens and myself and financed by

47. See Williams, 'Like father', p. 6.

48. Manfred's revision of his father's works is preserved in two manuscripts, among which the famous ms. Vaticano, BAV, Pal. lat. 1071; on this ms., see also A. PERRICCIOLI's essay in this volume and the reproductions on p. 24-25, 99, 102-103. On Manfred's revision, see: Frédéric II de Hohenstaufen, *L'art de chasser avec les oiseaux. Le Traité de fauconnerie De arte venandi cum avibus*, traduit, introduit et annoté par A. PAULUS – B. VAN DEN ABEELE (Bibliotheca Cynegetica 1), Nogent-le-Roi: Laget, 2001, esp. p. 15, 24-26 (with references to further literature). More generally, see B. VAN DEN ABEELE, *La fauconnerie au Moyen Âge. Connaissance, affaitage et médecine des oiseaux de chasse d'après les traités latins*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1994; B. VAN DEN ABEELE, *Texte et image dans les manuscrits de chasse médiévaux* (Conférences Léopold Delisle), Paris: BnF, 2013.

the Research Council of KU Leuven (Belgium). First drafts of a selection of the papers in this volume were presented at a meeting organized by the *Institute for Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (KU Leuven) and the *Aristoteles Latinus* (KU Leuven – International Union of Academies) in January 2009 which was generously supported by the Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders. Precious help in preparing this meeting and this volume was given by Gijs Coucke, Michèle Goyens, Serena Masolini, Céline Szeceł, Ildiko Van Tricht (all KU Leuven) and, last but certainly not least, Baudouin Van den Abeele (U.C.L. – Belgium). The scholars who accepted, at one stage or another, to peer-review the contributions in this volume have contributed considerably to its improvement. I am also grateful to Marike Schipper of Leuven University Press for her professional guidance while preparing the manuscript for the press.

This book is wholeheartedly dedicated to em. prof. Werner Verbeke who, for so many years, has been the driving force behind the *Institute for Medieval and Renaissance Studies* and the *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia*. We also commemorate Paraskevi Kotzia, who contributed to this volume but unfortunately passed away on 14 July 2013.

KU Leuven



Steven J. WILLIAMS

**LIKE FATHER, LIKE SON?  
THE LIFE AND REIGN OF MANFRED, KING OF SICILY**

*Les objectifs de cet article sont doubles: nous souhaitons tout d'abord évoquer la vie de Manfred, fils de l'empereur Frédéric II, aussi bien en tant qu'homme qu'en tant que roi, et cela, pour interpréter par la suite sa carrière politique afin de mieux comprendre en quoi consistait la vie culturelle au sein de sa cour. À bien des égards, Manfred a poursuivi l'héritage de l'empereur, tout en suivant fréquemment sa propre voie. En s'adaptant aux circonstances nouvelles de l'Italie d'alors et en essayant de compenser ce qui manquait à sa légitimité mise en question, Manfred a façonné un royaume avec une physionomie assez différente de celle du Regno de Frédéric. Comme l'a souligné Enrico Pispisa, Manfred ne fut pas l'épigone de son père, même s'il était conscient de ses liens avec ce dernier, liens dont il était fier et qu'il a cultivés. En même temps, Manfred fut un acteur politique indépendant, dont les mérites peuvent être jugés impressionnants.*

In modern scholarship, Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (1194-1250) gets a lot of attention; his descendants, rather less. There are certainly good reasons why this is so. For one thing, historians are – initially, at least – more attracted to the larger caches of documents and larger-than-life characters. Second, Frederick's reign was unusually long; his sons' and grandson's, tragically short. Third, Frederick's 56-year life is dramatic, epic even, with great novelistic twists and turns, so the three brief dynastic episodes that follow (1250-1268) necessarily have the feel of epilogues. Fourth and finally, by all accounts Frederick was an extraordinary individual, but personal qualities are not necessarily heritable, and whatever of Frederick's qualities were possessed by his heirs were not allowed sufficient time to grow and develop. The consequence of all this has been that, while a megalopolis of scholarly writing has been built around the historical figure of Frederick, there are much smaller constructions for the remainder of his line, including Manfred, the son who continued the Hohenstaufen dynasty in Frederick's Italian territories from 1254 until 1266.

With that said, the bibliography on Manfred is not insubstantial, as can be seen in the more than two columns of densely packed references printed in a tiny font that are found at the end of the entry on him in the recent-

ly published folio-size *Enciclopedia Fridericiana*.<sup>1</sup> Cultural life under Manfred, however, constitutes only a small percentage of this literature, and the articles in the present volume constitute a much-needed effort at a corrective. Manfred's political career has been much more amply treated, and the goal of this introductory essay is to sketch out that history as well as to suggest links between it and the cultural story that will, it is hoped, prompt a fresh appreciation of Manfred's life and reign. In many ways, Manfred continued the legacy of his father; in others, however, he struck out on a path of his own.

### 1. Birth and Early Life

Manfred was born in 1232; the best guess as to location is Venosa or a castle just to the north between Melfi and the Murge. His mother was Bianca Lancia d'Agliano, one of Frederick's many mistresses. While scholars continue to debate her origins, the consensus view is that she was a member of the Piedmontese nobility – specifically, the niece of Manfred II Lancia, a *familiaris* of Frederick's who was often in Frederick's company.<sup>2</sup> Bianca had two and possibly three children by Frederick: Constance, ca. 1230, who was married to Emperor John III Vatatzes of Nicaea in 1244; Manfred; and (maybe) Violante, ca. 1234?, who became the wife of Count Richard of Caserta in 1249, a trusted lieutenant of Frederick's.

Bianca is the best known of Frederick's mistresses. Partly this is because she is the only one of them whom Frederick would marry. While the fact of the marriage was never made public in any kind of an official way – perhaps because, for an emperor, Bianca did not have the requisite royal pedigree – the arguments mounted by historians in its favor are extremely persuasive.<sup>3</sup> Several contemporary writers mention the

1. *Federico II. Enciclopedia Fridericiana*, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2005, vol. 2, p. 265-274. Cf. the similarly large bibliography accompanying the article on Manfred in the *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* vol. 68, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 2007, p. 633-641.

2. R. BORDONE (ed.), *Bianca Lancia D'Agliano fra il Piemonte e il Regno di Sicilia*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'orso, 1992; *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* vol. 63 (2004), p. 320-322; *Enciclopedia Fridericiana*, vol. 1, p. 174-176.

3. J.-L.-A. HULLARD-BRÉHOLLES (ed.), *Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi*, Paris: Plon Fratres, 1852-1861, vol. 1 pt. 1, p. CLXXXIV-CLXXXIX; J. F. BÖHMER, *Regesta imperii*, 2d ed. by J. FICKER, vol. 2, Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner'shen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1882, no. 4632b, p. 849-851; P. F. PALUMBO, *Contributi alla storia dell'età di Manfredi*, Roma: Edizioni del Lavoro, 1959, p. 48-50; E. PISPISA, *Nicolò di Jamsilla: Un intellettuale alla corte di Manfredi*, Rubbettino: Soveria Mannelli, 1984, p. 82-86; Id., *Il regno di Manfredi: proposte di interpretazione*, Messina: Sicania, 1991, p. 13-14.

marriage.<sup>4</sup> Central here is the testimony of the chronicler known as ‘Nicolas [of] Jamsilla’ (henceforth Pseudo-Jamsilla), who served as a kind of court biographer for the first half of Manfred’s political career.<sup>5</sup> According to him, the fiefdom Honor Mont Sant’Angelo (northeast of Siponto) was given to Bianca by Frederick ‘as a gift of betrothal at the time of the marriage’.<sup>6</sup> The crucial, corroborating detail here is the ‘gift’: Honor Mont Sant’Angelo had been the dowry of previous Sicilian queens, including Frederick’s mother Constance and his previous three wives.<sup>7</sup> Apparently the marriage took place some time in the 1240s, when Bianca was on her deathbed.<sup>8</sup> Clearly it was not a state marriage, as Bianca brought Frederick no political advantage. Indeed, given the duration of their relationship – a good ten, perhaps even twenty years – theirs would seem to have been a relationship of love.

All of this has some bearing on our discussion not only because, with Frederick’s marriage to Bianca, his children by her thereby became legitimate.<sup>9</sup> There is the added fact that Frederick’s affection for the mother was also very clearly directed toward the son, Manfred. As Pseudo-Jamsilla

4. To this list, now add Johannes Ruffus: see A. SOMMERLECHNER, ‘Eine stadtrömische Kaiser-Papst-Geschichte zu Ehren von König Manfred: Der *Liber de istoriis* des Frater Johannes Ruffus’, *Römische historische Mitteilungen* 42 (2000), p. 245-306 (286).

5. He has been tentatively identified as one of Manfred’s notaries, Geoffrey of Cosenza. On Pseudo-Jamsilla/Geoffrey of Cosenza, see Nicolò Jamsilla, *Le gesta di Federico II imperatore e dei suoi figli Corrado e Manfredi re di Puglia e di Sicilia*, tr., introd., and notes by F. DE ROSA, Cassino: Ciolfi, 2007, p. 17-30; PISPISA, *Nicolò di Jamsilla*, p. 5-15; M. BRANTL, ‘Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen Manfreds von Sizilien 1250-1266’, *Archiv für Diplomatik* 51 (2005), p. 127-252 (142-143). On the nature of Pseudo-Jamsilla’s work, see PISPISA, *Nicolò di Jamsilla*, *passim*, and M. THUMSER, ‘Der König und sein Chronist. Manfred von Sizilien in der Chronik des sogenannten Nikolaus von Jamsilla’, in: *Die Reichskleinodien: Herrschaftszeichen des Heiligen Römischen Reiches*, Göppingen: Gesellschaft für Stauffische Geschichte, 1997, p. 222-243.

6. ‘... Honorem monti Sancti Angeli, quem Imperator ipsius Principis Matri sponsalium tempore nuptialium donatione ...’ (In this case I follow the reading found in Nicolas Jamsilla, *Historia de rebus gestis Friderici II Imperatoris ejusque filiorum*, in L. A. MURATORI, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, vol. 8, Milano: Ex typographia Societatis Palatinae in regia curia, 1726, col. 497 n. 28; cf. the discussion by PISPISA, *Nicolò di Jamsilla*, p. 83-84. The sentence as it appears in Jamsilla, *Le gesta*, p. 78, is defective in this instance.)

7. On this, see J.-M. MARTIN, ‘L’organisation administrative et militaire du territoire’, in: *Potere, società e popolo nell’età sveva (1210-1266)*, Bari: Dedalo, 1985, p. 71-121 (90-91).

8. Frederick married his third (and previous) wife Isabella of England, in 1235; she died in 1241. At various times later in the decade, Frederick explored the diplomatic possibility of remarrying, but nothing ever came of it.

9. In Frederick’s eyes, at least, though not as far as the Church was concerned. On the issue of Manfred’s legitimacy and the complications involved, see HUIILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, *Historia diplomatica*, vol. 1 pt. 1, p. CLXXXVII-CLXXXIX, CCVIII-CCIX; BÖHMER, *Regesta imperii*, no. 4632b, p. 849-851, and no. 4632h, p. 852.

puts it, among all Frederick's sons, Manfred was 'the most beloved'.<sup>10</sup> We will see below substantial evidence to support this assertion.

To the degree that any medieval male ruler raised his children, it could be said that Frederick raised Manfred, unlike his other sons. Of all of his male progeny, only Manfred spent (almost) the entirety of his childhood and adolescence (up to the age of 18, when Frederick died) close to Frederick. Consequently, he is the son who bears the deepest and most lasting imprint of his father.

Of Manfred's upbringing and education, the evidence at our disposal consists of what Manfred tells us; what is related by Pseudo-Jamsilla; and what we can infer from our knowledge of Frederick's *Magna Curia*. While it might be the case that Manfred spent a brief time at university, it is clear that the overwhelming bulk of his education took place at court.<sup>11</sup> This was a learned, cosmopolitan, polyglot world, where there was always in attendance some combination of poets and philosophers, knights and diplomats, scientists and mathematicians, ecclesiastics and jurists, artists and falconers, minstrels and dancers, architects and engineers.<sup>12</sup> According to Pseudo-Jamsilla, Manfred was 'raised in [Frederick's] palace and instructed in his teachings'.<sup>13</sup> Manfred himself describes being taught 'at the imperial court of ... our lord and father' by 'a group of venerable doctors [who] presented theological-philosophical instruction

10. '... dicto Manfredo, quem Imperator prae ceteris filiis dilectissimum' (Jamsilla, *Le gesta*, p. 78). This was a view shared by contemporaries: see H. ARNDT, *Studien zur inneren Regierungsgeschichte Manfreds*, Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1911, p. 145 n. 5.

11. Speculation on this issue starts with K. HAMPE, 'Zum Manifest Manfreds an die Römer vom 24. Mail 1265', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 36 (1911), p. 226-238 (230-232), basing himself on a line of Manfred's ('... Parisius seu Bononie scolis parvo tempore studendo didicimus ...'). See also ARNDT, *Studien*, p. 57, 146-148, and n. 58 below. There are several difficulties with the supposition of Manfred's university study beyond trying to fit it in what we know of the chronology of his life. If Manfred had indeed been to the University of Paris, one would have assumed that he would have mentioned it in his letter to the school (see GAUTHIER, 'Notes sur les débuts', as in n. 15 below), but he does not. Pseudo-Jamsilla does not mention any university study whatsoever for Manfred either. Study at the University of Bologna seems rather unlikely, given the enmity between Frederick and Bologna generally, and its law school specifically. And wouldn't Frederick favor sending his son to his own University of Naples? Finally, a claim that Manfred attended *both* schools seems rather farfetched, given the very small time-frame when all of this is supposed to have taken place 1245-1246. It is also worth mentioning that the text of Manfred's letter is extant in only one (early fourteenth-century) manuscript: perhaps 'seu Bononie' is an interpolation.

12. A good starting point for an appreciation of Frederick's court are W. TRONZO (ed.), *Intellectual Life at the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen*, Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1994, and *Micrologus. Natura, scienze e società medievali* 2 (1994), *Le scienze alla corte di Federico II*.

13. 'in aula sua nutritum, suisque documentis instructum' (Jamsilla, *Le gesta*, p. 78).

about the nature of the world, the changes of bodies, the creation of souls, their eternity and perfection, and the instability of material things and the stability of forms, which are not affected by disaster or deficiency in their matter'.<sup>14</sup> This, coupled with his own inclination to learn – 'indefatigably we have sought knowledge from our youth' – must have made for a precocious boy who, as he grew older, brought increasing delight to Frederick as a companion and interlocutor.<sup>15</sup>

That Frederick had a lasting and profound impact on Manfred is seen in Manfred's having shared with his father a number of the latter's interests and intellectual predilections – for knowledge (*scientia*) generally;<sup>16</sup> for reading (Manfred recounts how 'whatever time we snatch from the occupation of familiar things ... we spend totally and pleasurably in the gratuitous exercise of reading');<sup>17</sup> for learned debate and discussion (Manfred attended a *quaestio disputata* that was held at the University of Naples);<sup>18</sup> for higher education (he restored and confirmed the University

14. 'Set theologica philosophica documenta, que imperiali aula diui augusti serenissimi imperatoris domini patris nostri uenerabilium doctorum nos turba docuerat et de natura mundi, fluxu corporum, animarum creacione, eternitate ac perfeccione ipsarum, de infirmitate materialium firmitateque formarum, que naufragium uel defectum sue materie non secuntur ...' (M. PLEZIA [ed.], *Aristotelis qui ferebatur Liber de pomo versio latina Manfredi*, Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960, p. 40-41).

15. '... [scienciam] a iuuentute nostra quesiuimus indefessi' (R.-A. GAUTHIER, 'Notes sur les débuts (1225-1240) du premier "Averroïsme"', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 66 (1982), p. 321-374 [323]).

16. 'In extollendis regie prefecture fastigiis, quibus congruenter officia, leges et arma communicant, necessaria fore credimus sciencie condimenta ...' (GAUTHIER, 'Notes sur les débuts', p. 323); see also Manfred's own words in the notes just preceding and following this one. Other testimony: Ibn Wāṣil: 'Ebbi più volte a trovarmi con lui, e mi apparve un uomo distinto, amante delle scienze speculative' (F. GABRIELI, 'Le ambascerie di Baibars a Manfredi', in his *Saggi Orientali*, Caltanissetta: S. Sciascia, 1960, p. 97-106 [98-99]). Saba Malaspina: 'Manfredus ... sciencia decorare studuit animum ...' (W. KOLLER – A. NITSCHKE [ed.], *Die Chronik des Saba Malaspina* [= MGH SS, vol. 35], Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1999, p. 110). Bartholomew of Messina: see n. 22 below.

17. 'Post regni uero curas assumptas, quamquam operosa frequenter negotiorum turba nos distrahat et ciuilis sibi ratio uendicet sollicitudinis nostre partes, quidquid tamen temporis de rerum familiarium occupatione decerpimus, transire non patimur otiosum, sed totum in lectionis exercitatione gratuita libenter expendimus, totum, intelligencie ut clarius uigeat instrumentum, in acquisitione sciencie, sine qua mortalium uita non regitur, liberaliter erogamus. Dum librorum ergo uolumina, quorum 'multifarie multisque modis' distincta cyrographa diuiciarum nostrarum armaria locupletant, sedula meditatione reuoluimus ...' (Gauthier, 'Notes sur les débuts', p. 323). For specific books read by Manfred, see n. 21, 23, 24, 31 below.

18. C. BÆUMKER, 'Petrus de Hibernia der Jugendlehrer des Thomas von Aquino und seine Disputation vor König Manfred', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophische-Philologische und Historische Klasse*, 1920, 8 Abhandlung. The question came from Manfred himself (*ibid.*, p. 41). See also the article by M. DUNNE later in this volume.

of Naples, expressed his approval of the medical school in Salerno, and sent a passel of translations to the University of Paris);<sup>19</sup> for Moslem culture (Manfred, we are told, had Moslems at his court and supported a ‘House of Science’ in the Moslem stronghold of Lucera);<sup>20</sup> for doing translations himself (Manfred translated the pseudo-Aristotelian *De pomo* from Hebrew into Latin, perhaps with the assistance of an amanuensis);<sup>21</sup> for sponsoring translations (Manfred had something like a dozen works translated into Latin);<sup>22</sup> for Aristotle (beyond the Aristotelian translations done at Manfred’s instigation, Manfred knew the *Metaphysics* and *De caelo* well enough to quote them);<sup>23</sup> for philosophy (Manfred sang its praises on two different occasions);<sup>24</sup> for mathematics (a Moslem ambassador who came to be well-acquainted with Manfred described him as someone who ‘knew the ten books of Euclid by heart’);<sup>25</sup> for logic (that

19. F. W. SCHIRRMACHER, *Die letzten Hohenstaufen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck-Ruprecht, 1871, p. 620-622; E. WINKELMANN (ed.), *Acta imperii inedita*, vol. 1, Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner’shen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1880, no. 496, p. 413-414. The documents concerning Naples and Salerno are all conveniently found together in G. M. MONTI, *Per la storia dell’Università di Napoli*, Napoli: Società Anonima Editrice Francesco Perrella, 1924, p. 55-59, but this is a rather rare item. See also BÖHMER, *Regesta imperii*, no. 4677-4680, p. 865, and n. 53 below. On the University of Naples, see also the article by F. DELLE DONNE later in this volume. For the University of Paris, see GAUTHIER, ‘Notes sur les débuts’ (as in n. 15 above).

20. GABRIELLI, ‘Le ambascerie di Baibar’s’, p. 99, 102-103.

21. PLEZIA (ed.), *Liber de pomo*. See also the article by P. KOTZIA later in this volume.

22. The following pseudo-Aristotelian texts were translated by Bartholomew of Messina ‘in curia illustrissimi Maynfridi serenissimi regis Sicilie sciencie amatoris de mandato suo’): *Magna moralia*; *Physionomia*; *De mirabilibus auscultationibus*; *De principiis*; *De signis aquarum* (G. LACOMBE, et al., *Aristoteles latinus: Codices*, Pars prior, Roma: La Libreria dello stato, 1939, p. 71-72, 87-88). Bartholomew likewise translated the *Problemata Physica*, almost certainly under similar conditions (*ibid.*, p. 86-87). For other translations see n. 27, 30, 32 below plus the articles by P. BEULLENS, C. BURNETT, V. CORDONIER, and G. SPINOSA later in this volume.

23. Manfred quotes the *Metaphysics* in his letter to the University of Paris (GAUTHIER, ‘Notes sur les débuts’, p. 323) and *De caelo* in an addition he made to *De arte venandi cum avibus* (A. L. TROMBETTI BUDRIESI [ed.], *De arte venandi cum avibus: L’arte di cacciare con gli uccelli*, Roma: Editori Laterza, 2000, p. 1136). Manfred refers to Aristotle as *princeps philosophorum* (PLEZIA [ed.], *Liber de pomo*, p. 41).

24. In a letter to the University of Paris (GAUTHIER, ‘Notes sur les débuts’, p. 323-324, 329-330); in a letter concerning the University of Naples (MONTI, *Per la storia*, p. 57-58). Cf. the observations of Pseudo-Jamsilla: ‘a pueritia enim paternae Philosophiae inhaerens’; ‘iste Princeps Philosophiae filius et alumnus’ (Jamsilla, *Le gesta*, p. 80, 84). Besides the work of Aristotle, Manfred knew Alan of Lille’s *De planctu nature* and Arnold of Provence’s *Divisio scienciarum* (GAUTHIER, ‘Notes sur les débuts’, p. 324, 329-330). As Gauthier points out, in Manfred’s missive to Paris he is able ‘to speak to the Parisian masters in their language’ (*ibid.*, p. 327, 329). For Manfred’s familiarity with philosophical issues, see n. 14 and 18 above.

25. GABRIELLI, ‘Le ambascerie di Baibars’, p. 99, 101 n. 14, 102; also M. AMARI, *Bibli-*

same envoy composed a tract on logic for him);<sup>26</sup> for astrology (Stephen of Messina translated the *Centiloquium Hermetis* for Manfred, and John de Dumpno's Latin version of a set of astronomical/astrological tables might have been done for him as well);<sup>27</sup> for theology (having been introduced to theological questions at Frederick's court as a youth, Manfred pursued such queries on his own later in life);<sup>28</sup> for poetry (Manfred patronized poets, composed poems himself, and cultivated poetry at his court);<sup>29</sup> for medicine (one and possibly several Hippocratic works were translated for Manfred along with, apparently, the *Tacuinum sanitatis*);<sup>30</sup> for falconry (Manfred 'read and reread' his father's *De arte venandi cum avibus*, prepared a new edition of the work, added comments and corrections based on his own knowledge and experience, and kept on in his service a *magister venationum imperatoris* for his own continued enjoyment of the sport);<sup>31</sup> for hippology (Bartholomew of Messina translated Hierocles' *De curatione equorum* for Manfred).<sup>32</sup> Like his father, then, Manfred had a number of interests outside of politics; as Manfred once

*oteka Arabo-Sicula*, vol. 2, Torino: Ermanno Loescher, 1881, p. 107. Relevant too is the fact that in 1265 the leader of the Assassins began a letter to Manfred working an idea from Euclid's *Elements*: see H. M. SCHALLER, 'König Manfred und die Assassinen', in his *Stauferzeit: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1993, p. 535-556 (548-549, 555).

26. GABRIELLI, 'Le ambascerie di Baibars', p. 101 n. 14, 102; also AMARI, *Biblioteca*, p. 106.

27. C. H. HASKINS, 'Science at the Court of Frederick II', in his *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927, p. 270. The connection between John de Dumpno and Manfred is uncertain: see the article by P. DE LEEMANS earlier in this volume (p. XVI). That Manfred had astrologers at court, see HUILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, *Historia Diplomatica*, vol. 1 pt. 1, p. DXXXII.

28. PLEZIA (ed.), *Liber de pomo*, p. 37-42; MONTI, *Per la storia*, p. 58.

29. O. CARTELLIERI, 'König Manfred', in: *Centenario della nascita di Michele Amari*, vol. 1, Palermo: Stabilimento Tipografico Virzi, 1910, p. 116-138 (128); R. RUSSO, *Federico II. Cronaca della vita di un imperatore e della sua discendenza*, Barletta: Edictrice Rotas, 1994, p. 140.

30. *De natura foetus* and, possibly, *De aere, aquis, locis* and *De natura hominis*: see P. KIBRE, *Hippocrates Latinus*, New York: Fordham University Press, 1985, p. 189-191, 25-27, 192-193 respectively. *Tacuinum sanitatis*: see L. COGLIATI ARANO (ed.), *The Medieval Health Handbook: Tacuinum sanitatis*, New York: George Braziller, 1976, p. 11.

31. 'Cum sepe legeremus et relegeremus hunc librum, ut fructum scientie caperemus ...' (TROMBETTI BUDRIESI [ed.], *De arte venandi cum avibus*, p. 1138); 'Erat autem inter eos quidam miles nomine Adenulphus Pardus, qui fuerat Magister venationum Imperatoris Frederici, qui ex nimia venationum assuetudine magnam illarum partium notitiam habebat ...' (Jamsilla, *Le gesta*, p. 166). It is also worth mentioning that Frederick and Manfred were out hawking on the disastrous morning of 18 February 1248 when the imperial camp close to the besieged city of Parma was plundered by the Parmese (SCHIRRMACHER, *Die letzten Hohenstaufen*, p. 641). See also n. 64 below.

32. HASKINS, 'Science at the Court of Frederick II', p. 269.

explained his disposition to a friend, 'it was pleasing to mix entertainments with serious things'.<sup>33</sup>

Adult responsibility in the medieval world began early, and noble sons and daughters were often called upon to play a political role as adolescents: such was the case with Manfred, who was betrothed on 21 April 1247 and then married sometime in December of the following year to Beatrice, the twenty-something year-old daughter of Count Amadeus IV of Savoy and widow of the marquis of Saluzzo. This was a natural marriage alliance between two potent houses. To Manfred as a fief came a kingdom that stretched from Pavia to the Rhône and from the Alps to the Mediterranean. Given that Amadeus' lands included the western Alpine passes, this presented an advantage to Frederick with his enemy Innocent IV residing in Lyon but wanting to return to Rome. Moreover, Amadeus' friendship potentially brought with it the good will of his brother Count Thomas II of Savoy along with other important nobles. In 1249 Manfred had his first and only child by Beatrice (Constance); it seems likely that she died during childbirth or soon after.

Manfred accompanied Frederick on his political travels and must have been privy to a great many political discussions and witness to all sorts of political events. In 1247 Manfred was with his father in northern Italy. Manfred participated in the siege of Parma in early 1248. In the spring of 1250 Frederick and Manfred were together in Foggia as the former directed military operations throughout Italy that resulted in an imperial resurgence. Manfred was responsible for the conquest of Faenza that same summer. 18 October 1250 Frederick had Manfred take care of a diplomatic chore in Barletta<sup>34</sup>. But the apprenticeship was to be short-lived.

## 2. Frederick's Death & Testament

In the autumn of 1250, Frederick's health faltered, but he continued his normal round of activities, including hawking, with Manfred as a companion when circumstances permitted. At some point Frederick contracted dysentery, and it was this that did him in. On 13 December 1250, in Castelfiorentino near Foggia, Frederick breathed his last. In his final days he was surrounded by a group of close friends and advisors. The only

33. 'ut jocis seria mixta complaceant' (SCHIRRMACHER, *Die letzten Hohenstaufen*, p. 630).

34. For the details here, see W. STÜRNER, *Friedrich II.*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992-2000, vol. 2, p. 563; SCHIRRMACHER, *Die letzten Hohenstaufen*, p. 641; RUSSO, *Federico II*, p. 208-210.

member of his immediate family there with him was Manfred and (possibly) his younger son Henry (Carlotto).

Two days later, Manfred, as *divi augusti imperatoris filius*, dutifully wrote to the citizens of Palermo with the sad news.

We are not able to restrain the sighs coming from [our] breast and the river of tears coming from our eyes, since the sun, reddening, which hitherto shone radiant, has undergone an eclipse ... Know that the most excellent divine Caesar, our progenitor, accepting human circumstances, as is pleasing to God, has discharged the debt of fatality ...<sup>35</sup>

He also sent a missive to his oldest (half-)brother Conrad (IV) informing him of the death of 'our father and lord' in words that similarly reveal Manfred's love and admiration for Frederick:

We take up the cup of the storm with what has befallen our lord and father, having drunk it not less with the mind as with the eyes ... The sun of the world, which shone on the peoples, is extinguished. The sun of Justice has set. The initiator of peace is at an end ...<sup>36</sup>

Shortly before his decease, Frederick dictated his last will and testament to his notary.<sup>37</sup> His instructions were detailed and specific. First in line for the succession to the Empire and the *Regno* (i.e., the Kingdom of Sicily) – he intended them to stay together – was Conrad (b. 1228), his oldest surviving son whom he had had by his second wife, Yolanda of Brienne. Should Conrad not have any (male) heirs, next came Henry (b. 1238), Frederick's son by his third wife, Isabella of England. Should

35. 'Manfredus divi Augusti imp[erator] Frid[erici] filius Panormitanis civibus ... suspiria tamen ab alto prodeuntia pectore, ac emanantem ex oculis nostris fluvium lacrymarum comprescere non valemus; cum sol ille rutilans sit passus ecclipsim, qui nobis hactenus radiosus illuxit ... Noveritis igitur quod excellentissimus divus Cesar genitor noster rebus humanis assumptus, sicuti Deo placuit, debitum fatalitatis exsolvit' (B. CAPASSO, *Historia diplomatica Regni Siciliae inde ab anno 1250 ad annum 1266*, Napoli: ex typographia regiae universitatis, 1874, p. 5).

36. 'Turbinis calicem quem nuper de patris et domini nostri casu non minus mentis quam oculorum infusione transumpsimus ... Cecidit quidem sol mundi qui lucebat in genibus, cecidit sol justitiae, cecidit auctor pacis ...' (HULLARD-BRÉHOLLES, *Historia Diplomatica*, vol. 6 pt. 2, p. 811). See also n. 66 below.

37. For the text of the *Testament*, see G. WOLF, 'Die Testamente Kaiser Friedrichs II. Eine Erwiderung', in: G. WOLF (ed.), *Stupor mundi: Zur Geschichte Friedrichs II. von Hohenstaufen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 19966, p. 693-749, 792-800 (698-710).

Henry not have any heirs, the throne would go to Manfred. In addition, Manfred was entrusted with the government *in Italia et specialiter in regno Sicilie* until such time as Conrad returned from Germany, and as regent (*balius*) Manfred had full and binding decision-making power: whatever Manfred did, it was through the person of Frederick, ‘as if we [Frederick] were still alive’.<sup>38</sup>

But that’s not all. Frederick bestowed on Manfred an extensive *apannage*: the principality of Taranto (given to him several months before, it was reaffirmed here); the counties of Tricarico, Montescaglioso, and Gravina; plus the fiefdom Honor Mont Sant’Angelo that had belonged to his mother. What this did was to make Manfred the greatest feudatory in the *Regno* by far and to give him a large, solid block of territory on which to anchor his rule. Frederick was doing all he could in order to ensure his son’s success.

The *Testament* gives us a very good sense of Manfred’s standing with his father. That Frederick entrusted Manfred with the government of Italy during Conrad’s absence, for however long it lasted, and that he enjoined obedience to all Manfred’s decisions, whatever they might be, tells us that Frederick had great confidence in Manfred’s abilities. Frederick was also singling out Manfred as someone special with his bequest. Frederick once described himself proudly as a ‘man of Apulia’, and of all his territories, Apulia was his favorite, with its mixed landscape of broad plains and forested hillsides; its many birds and endless possibilities for hawking; its network of castles, palaces, and hunting-lodges: all this was now, at least in the short term, Manfred’s.<sup>39</sup>

Following Frederick’s wishes, his body was sent to Palermo for interment. It was accompanied by Manfred on its long, slow journey. Frederick

38. ‘... Quo defuncto [i.e., Henry] sine liberis, succedat ei Manfredus filius noster. Conrado vero morante in Alemannia vel alibi extra Regnum, statuimus predictum Manfredum balium dicti Conradi in Italia et specialiter in regno Sicilie, dantes ei plenariam potestatem omnia faciendi que persona nostra facere posset, si viveremus; videlicet in concedendis terris, castris, villis, parentelis et dignitatibus, beneficiis et omnibus aliis, iuxta dispositionem suam, preter antiqua demania regni Sicilie; et quod Conradus et Henricus predicti filii nostri et eorum heredes omnia que ipse fecerit firma et rata teneant et observent’ (WOLF, ‘Testamente’, p. 700-701). In two other instances in the *Testament* Frederick enjoins obedience to Manfred’s decisions.

39. ‘We have chosen our domain of Sicily for our own amongst all other lands, and taken the whole kingdom as the place of our abiding, for we – radiant with the glory of the title of the Caesars – yet feel it no ignoble thing to be called “a man of Apulia”’ (I use the translation provided in E. H. KANTOROWICZ, *Frederick the Second 1194-1250*, New York: Frederick Ungar, 1967, p. 221). See also *ibid.*, p. 321. The original can be found in E. WINKELMANN, *Acta imperii inedita*, vol. 1, Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner’schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1880, no. 811 p. 630.

was buried 25 February 1251 in a porphyry sarcophagus next to his father Emperor Henry VI, his mother Queen Constance, and his Norman ancestor, King Roger II (his mother's father) in the city's magnificent cathedral.

### 3. Politics 1250-1254

From the moment of Frederick's death, Manfred was the person responsible for administering Italy and protecting Hohenstaufen interests there. The *Regno* was Manfred's priority, and indeed it consumed all of his energy and attention. The situation he faced as ruler was an exceedingly difficult and dangerous one. The death of a monarch was often the pretext for unrest and revolt, and such was the case in 1251. With the young king far away (Conrad, 23, was in Germany), with an even younger regent in his place (Manfred was but 19), and the second in line for the throne a minor (Henry was 12), a number of barons and cities took advantage of the situation to assert (or to reassert) their independence and to win for themselves a respite, however brief, from taxation.

There were yet other problems with which Manfred had to deal. Peter Ruffo, mareschal of the *Regno* under Frederick and now, at Manfred's direction, vicar-general in Calabria and Sicily, was increasingly resistant to Manfred's authority. And then there was the pope. 'Let the heavens and earth rejoice', Innocent had trumpeted upon learning of Frederick's death.<sup>40</sup> But the pope didn't leave it at that. He put the potent machinery of the Church to work against what he called the 'poisonous brood of vipers': it was not just Frederick himself who must be eliminated, but the entire Hohenstaufen line, 'heirs of the father's wickedness'.<sup>41</sup> To that end, Innocent gave away or promised communal rights; had his agents encourage rebels and preach resistance to Hohenstaufen rule; excommunicated Conrad and called forth a crusade against him; and even granted away Manfred's own principality of Taranto to a member of the powerful Frangipani family of Rome. For a time he even considered taking over the *Regno* himself and integrating it into the Papal States. Given what Manfred had already seen of the Church's behavior as he was grow-

40. 'Letentur celi et exultet terra' begins Innocent's letter on 25 January 1251 (C. RODENBERG [ed.], *Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificorum selectae*, vol. 3, Berlin: Apud Weidmannos, 1894, p. 24).

41. '... illius pestilentis reliquie, ipsius videlicet filii, paterne malitie successores, eadem inferre regno more patrio utpote genimina viperarum venenosa ...' (a papal bull of 13 December 1251; see RODENBERG [ed.], *Epistolae*, Vol. 3, p. 105). Innocent spoke similarly earlier that same year (31 March 1251; *ibid.*, p. 81).

ing up at his father's side during the 1240s, and what his father had told him about his peculiar crusade experience of 1227-1230, this must have seemed just more of the same.

Trying to bring under his control an unsettled, even anarchic realm was not unlike what Frederick himself faced during his minority: it can be stated unequivocally that Manfred met his father's high expectations of him and that he performed impressively; as one historian has put it, Manfred acted 'with a rapidity and resolution [worthy] of an expert *condottiero*'.<sup>42</sup> In this he was aided by his mother's family and their friends, in particular his uncle Galvano Lancia, who served as his principal advisor. By the time that Conrad had made his way south to Italy in order to take over the *Regno* from Manfred, a lot had already been done and a lot of rebel territory taken back in hand.

But even early on, it seems that Manfred was, to put it politely, ambitious. Some seven months into his regency, Manfred sounded out Innocent as to the possibility of being invested by him with the Sicilian crown. Conrad was in Germany and struggling to hold on to this part of his father's inheritance, but what if he were successful and then made a play for Italy? This was precisely Innocent's worry. For decades now, the political bottom line for the papacy had been keeping the Empire and the *Regno* split between two different rulers; never again would it allow what had occurred with Frederick II wherein as Emperor on the one hand, and as King of Sicily on the other, he tried to unite Empire and *Regno*, using central Italy – the Papal States – as a kind of bridge. Recognizing these basic political facts, and making a kind of 'Machiavellian' calculation, Manfred, evidence suggests, proposed an exchange in which Manfred would give fealty to Innocent for Sicily as a papal vassal, and Innocent would gain the papacy's long-desired territorial security. Of course what this meant in reality was ignoring Frederick's legally binding *Testament*, the constraints of feudal law, and Conrad's rock-solid claim to the *Regno*. In the event, Innocent turned down the offer: he entertained hopes of making the *Regno* his own. But word of what Manfred had proposed eventually got back to Conrad.<sup>43</sup>

42. PALUMBO, *Contributi*, p. 53.

43. The hypothesis of Manfred's betrayal originates with C. RODENBERG, *Innocenz IV und das Königreich Sicilien 1245-1254*, Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1892, p. 106-109. See also A. KARST, *Geschichte Manfreds vom Tode Friedrichs II. bis zu seiner Krönung (1250-1258)*, Berlin: C. Vogts, 1896, p. 5, 164-170; H. K. MANN, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, vol. 14, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1928, p. 124; R. MORGHEN, *L'età degli Svevi in Italia*, Palermo: Palumbo, 1974, p. 137-138, 149; PISPISA, *Il regno di Manfredi*, p. 21; RUSSO, *Federico II*, p. 220. I must point out here that assent to Rodenberg's

Conrad, who had been born in Italy, was first brought to Germany by his father at the age of 7 (1235); two years later, after being elected 'King of the Romans and future Emperor', he was left in the north to take up political responsibilities there. Conrad returned to the *Regno* on 8 January 1252, intending to make good on the fullness of his inheritance. Soon after his arrival he received the happy news that his wife back home had given him a son, Conrad (V, known later as Conradin), thereby ensuring the succession.

Innocent was determined not to let the German king Conrad take possession of the *Regno* and did whatever he could to prevent it. Nevertheless, Conrad pushed forward on the work of pacification that had been advanced so far by Manfred, though whether Manfred's efforts had been for his own good or his brother's is unclear. Perhaps thinking the former, Conrad progressively cut Manfred out of the *Regno*'s political equation, taking from Manfred all of the fiefs given him by his father with the exception of the principality of Taranto. Moreover, Conrad exiled the Lancias and annulled the land grants Manfred had made to them. From being at the very center of the *Regno*, Manfred was steadily being pushed to the periphery.

Conrad's ascendancy was short-lived, however. Like so many visitors to Italy from the north during the Middle Ages, Conrad was laid low by malaria. He died on 21 May 1254. But he had one last insult in store for his brother Manfred: according to the terms of his will, the regency of the *Regno* was given, not to Manfred, as would have been natural, but to the German nobleman and *familiaris* of Frederick, Margrave Berthold of Hohenburg; in addition, Conrad's infant son was commended to the protection of the pope, as Frederick himself had been by his mother, with decidedly mixed results. One imagines Manfred's stupefaction at the news.

#### 4. Politics 1254-1258

Conrad was dead and buried. The younger brother Henry had passed away the preceding year. And Conrad's 2-year old son was far away and clearly in no position to do much of anything in Italy. For Manfred, the field was now free for action. Manfred seized with both hands what fate had offered.

hypothesis is not universal: for doubts, see O. H. BECKER, *Kaisertum, deutsche Königswahl und Legitimitätsprinzip in der Auffassung der späteren Staufer und ihres Umkreises*, Bern: Herbert Lang, 1975, p. 45; B. BERG, 'Manfred of Sicily and Urban IV: Negotiations of 1262', *Mediaeval Studies* 55 (1993), p. 111-136 (113 n. 8).