

still be the same: on the whole, *Don Alvaro* was the least successful of the four. It would be possible to find between twenty and thirty other plays which outdid it in popularity—beginning with Larra's translation *El Arte de Conspirar*, which was given 26 times in a few months, and Lombía's, *El Pilluelo de París*, which had 39 performances in two years, and ending with *¡A la plaza! ¡A la plaza!*, a play of little merit, which achieved a total of 282 performances. Between these extremes come no less than seven plays by Bretón de los Herreros, beside whom Rivas cuts a very poor figure as a popular dramatist. But I have probably quoted sufficiently to prove that *Don Alvaro*, a Romantic drama of both intrinsic and historic interest, which played an important part in the Romantic Revolt, attained only a very moderate success and had, as I have said, "a distinctly discouraging reception."

E. ALLISON PEERS

University of Liverpool

SEVERAL OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING *LO LIBRE DE SAVIESA* ATTRIBUTED TO JAMES I OF ARAGON

Lo Libre de Saviesa has been the subject of a number of speculations concerning its authorship or the rôle played by James I in its composition, and its sources have been up to the present very vaguely defined. The extracts published by Rodríguez de Castro in his *Biblioteca Española*¹ and the statements of Helfferich² to the effect that there is a very close resemblance between the aphorisms of this Catalan text and the collection made by Honein ibn Ishak caused Knust to establish certain parallels between it and the *Buenos Proverbios*.³ In the absence of the complete text of the *Libre de Saviesa*, he was unable to determine any exact connection between the two works although he suspected that James I had the *Buenos Proverbios* before him and not the *Bocados de Oro* as maintained by Amador de los Ríos.

Other statements concerning the origin of the text are made by Tourtoulon⁴ and by Llabrés in his edition of the *Libre de Saviesa*.⁵ Much less reliable are their conclusions, based on an extensive knowledge of the period, but involving certain suppositions which are untenable. The

¹ Rodríguez de Castro, Joseph, *Biblioteca Española*, Madrid, 1786, vol. II, p. 605.

² Helfferich, Adolf, *Raymund Lull und die Anfänge der catalonischen Literatur*, Berlin, 1858.

³ Knust, Hermann, *Mittheilungen aus dem Eskurial* (Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, No. 141), Tübingen, 1879, pp. 526-27.

⁴ Tourtoulon, Charles de, *Don Jaime I, el Conquistador*, Valencia, 1874, vol. II, pp. 355-361.

⁵ Llabrés y Quintana, Gabriel, *Libre de Saviesa del Rey En Jacme I d'Aragó*, Santander, 1908.

Catalan work is not the product of the Jewish translators of Barcelona, nor is it a compilation based on a notebook kept by James I as a student. A consideration of the manuscripts and of the printed edition may serve to clear up several points.

The published version of the *Libre de Saviesa* is based on Manuscript 921 of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, representing in this edition a somewhat modernized orthography. The editor consulted also Manuscript M. I. 29 of the Escorial Library, but he attaches little importance to this mutilated version, announcing that it served only to provide a few variants. In truth, the Escorial manuscript (*E*) is mutilated, but it is important in that it presents a summary of the complete work. A comparison of both manuscripts will show that, even though in summary form, there are sections in the Escorial manuscript not found in the Madrid version. A part of these additional paragraphs were printed by Llabrés in his introduction, but the final sections are not included. Such a comparison should show at least the content of the original version.

The work may be divided into five parts for our consideration: 1. The prologues. 2. The sayings of the philosophers. 3. The tract concerning the government of kings. 4. The account of eclipses (Madrid only). 5. Conclusion (Madrid only). The prologues and the concluding prayer may be dismissed as being written by scribes or translators, and the section on eclipses likewise is an addition quite aside from the main body of the work. The two remaining sections are then the portions whose sources are to be accounted for.

In the Madrid manuscript (*M*) the sayings of the philosophers are not all found together, some coming after the section dealing with the rule of kings. Manuscript *E* leaves them together, ending with that heterogeneous section which I have termed the *rule of kings*.

With the published texts of the *Libre de Saviesa* and the *Buenos Proverbios* at hand, it is possible to make the comparison which Knust began, and to establish at once the similarity of the two texts. The opening of the Catalan work is found on page 3 of Knust's edition of the *Buenos Proverbios*, and a literal translation of the Spanish text is found after that point. Not until the end of the section dealing with the seals of the philosophers is any difference noted, and there it is merely a matter of the omission of Alexander's seal in the Catalan text. The translation continues, however, through the sections devoted to the assembly of four philosophers, five philosophers, the sayings of Aristotle, the assembly of seven, ten, thirteen, and four philosophers. The sayings of Socrates are interrupted by the rule of kings, but continue immediately after, under the heading of *Eximpe de Sócrates*, and they follow the text of the *Buenos Proverbios* with minor omissions until paragraph 209 in the edition of Llabrés which begins: "E quant volguren ociure Sócrates, dix li un seu dexeble." What follows has no correspondence in the *Buenos Proverbios*. Paragraphs 212 to 307 follow in sense and order another

Catalan text which has been published as *Los Proverbis de Salomo*.⁶ There are numerous differences in language between the two works as well as omissions in one or the other text which indicate the existence of another version as their common source. These proverbs are probably an interpolation, as are the astronomical section and the prayer following. Several proverbs traceable to Mobasschir ben Fatik⁷ are found at the very end of the manuscript together with a few also used by Jahuda (or Jafuda) Bonsenyor in his *Llibre de paraules e dits de savis e filosofos*. The aphorisms of Manuscript *E* which have no correspondence in the Madrid version are directly connected with the *Buenos Proverbios* and to the original work of Honein as it appeared earlier in Spain in its Hebrew version.⁸ These additional sayings are taken from the sections dealing with Socrates, Plato, Diogenes, Hippocrates, and Aristotle. The appearance of many sayings in only one manuscript with no corresponding proverbs in the other indicates omissions on the part of both scribes. The scribe responsible for Manuscript *E* appears to have selected and condensed his material while Manuscript *M* was subjected to the omission of large sections of the original compilation.

It is worthy of mention that the order of the sayings is not the same as in the *Buenos Proverbios* as we have the text. There has been quite a bit of confusion in the latter due to the incorporation of several chapters with the *Poridad de las poridades* in the Escorial manuscripts, and the version printed by Knust required alterations in the position of various chapters.

The other section of the *Libre de Saviesa* consists of a prologue of "Johanicy," found only in Manuscript *E*, an exchange of letters between Alexander and Aristotle, the prologue of "Joanici" who translated the book, a letter from Aristotle to Alexander followed by a table of contents. The book is here declared to be divided into eight treatises, of which only two are found in the Madrid manuscript: the sections dealing with the kinds of kings and the conduct of kings. At this point the Escorial manuscript supplies, always in summary form, treatises on justice, knights, physiognomy, a rule of health, and a section on geomancy. These are not all that the table of contents promises, but the fragmentary contents of Manuscript *M* at this point are considerably amplified.

⁶ Jahuda Bonsenyor, *Llibre de paraules e dits de savis e filosofos; Los Proverbis de Salomo; Lo Llibre de Cato*, fets estampar complets per primera vegada ab un pròlech y documents per En Gabriel Llabrés y Quintana, Palma de Mallorca, 1889, pp. 81-90.

⁷ *Cinquième Extrait de l'Ouvrage Arabe d'Ibn Aby Ossaïbi'ah sur l'His-toirs des Médecins*, traduction française, accompagnée de notes par M. le Dr. B. R. Sanguinetti, in *Journal Asiatique*, cinquième série, 1856, VIII, 175-196, 316-353.

⁸ Honein Ibn Ishâk, *Sinnsprüche der Philosophen*, nach der hebräischen Uebersetzung Charisi's ins Deutsche übertragen und erläutert von Dr. A. Loewenthal, Berlin, 1896.

These contents correspond to a part of the *Poridad de las poridades*, which is the Spanish version of the short form of the *Secretum Secretorum* ascribed to Aristotle, and the table of contents corresponds exactly to this work. A word for word comparison of the Spanish work and the Catalan text of Madrid reveals no essential differences, and the contents of the Escorial manuscript agree with those of the *Poridad*. There can be no doubt after such a comparison that the Catalan scribe translated the Spanish text integrally. A few discrepancies, such as the statement that the work is translated from Hebrew and an occasional change in the order of some phrases, may be attributed to scribal errors in part and partly to the manuscript of the *Poridad* serving as a basis for the translation. There is evidence that it was superior to any of those known to me. The "Johanicy" of the prologue of Manuscript *E* was a fanciful addition by the scribe, doubtless suggested by the Joannici of the first part, who is Honein ibn Ishak, and the translator into Arabic, Yahya ibn al-Batrik.

It is very natural that these two works should appear together under one title. The two manuscripts of the *Buenos Proverbios* are preceded by the *Poridad de las poridades*, and, as stated before, there is a certain amount of confusion shown in them as to the limits of the two works. As works dealing with the mediaeval Alexander legends they are both found in the Hebrew translations of Judah Al-Harizi in the early thirteenth century, and due to their earlier associations in Arabic it is possible to point out similarities between the two texts. It is probable that a Spanish manuscript containing the complete version of the *Buenos Proverbios* and the *Poridad de las poridades* was utilized for the Catalan translation, and that the other sections are either additions made by the translator or by later scribes. The principal part of the *Libre de Saviesa* represents the Catalan version of these two important mediaeval works, which have not been recognized as translations in their Catalan form. Instead of an original compilation influenced by these texts, it is necessary to consider the work as another translation in the body of Hispano-Arabic literature.

LLOYD KASTEN

University of Wisconsin