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Abstract: In this paper, we discuss an unedited medico-botanical synonym list (Iberoromance-Arabic), copied at the end of the 15th c., that can be found in manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 87, and which we believe to be a valuable document both for Romance and Arabic studies and for the history of medicine, including medical translation and lexicography. After making some notes on the characteristics and the history of this kind of lists, we mostly discuss the Iberoromance languages involved. We identify at least three languages: Old Castilian, Old Catalan and one other variety which might be Aragonese, Leonese or Mozarabic. At the end of the paper we provide the commented edition of five lexical entries.
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1. Introduction

The aim of this paper1 is to present more extensively an Iberoromance-Arabic medico-botanical synonym list in Hebrew characters, which is preserved in manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 87, and which we mentioned briefly in an earlier article.2 We are presently working on an edition of this text, which we take to be a valuable lexicographical document of the language(s) of medicine and pharmacology in Medieval Iberia, and relevant for the history of medical translation.

The manuscript in question consists of 428 leaves; it was copied in a Sephardic Rabbinic script by Ishmael Amilio in 1477, probably in Valladolid,3 and contains Hebrew translations of two medical works by the famous philosopher and physician Ibn Sīnā (980-1037), namely of his medical encyclopaedia Kitāb al-Qānūn (Canon)4 and of his treatise On Cardiac Remedies, entitled Kitāb al-adwiya al-qalbiya.5 The translation of the Kitāb al-Qānūn is from the hand of two authors; the first translation is actually an adaptation of an earlier translation by Nathan ha-Me’ati and covers book one and the first section of book two. It was done by Joseph b. Joshua Lorki some time before 1402.6 The second translation covering the rest of book two and books three to five was prepared by Nathan ha-Me’ati (of Cento) who finished his translation in the city of Rome in the year 1279.7 The translation of the Kitāb al-adwiya al-qalbiya (On Cardiac Remedies) covering fols. 121a-127b was prepared by an anonymous translator under the title מהמשלים. This translation was very popular in Jewish circles especially in the 14th and 15th centuries, in which it was copied eight times;8 and sometime around 1485 it was commented upon by the philosopher and translator Baruch ibn Ya’ish, who was probably born in Spain, but lived and died in Italy.9 This work is followed on fols. 127b-130a by the synonym list that will be described in the present article, which is in “vernacular” and Arabic. This list is unique since it is the only list contained in this manuscript in addition to the alphabetical description of the simple remedies and their properties, which features in the text itself in chapter thirteen. The list numbers around 785 entries, organized according to the Hebrew alphabet. As to the languages involved, the famous Jewish bibliographer Moritz Steinschneider suggested that the vernacular was perhaps Spanish,10 while according to the recent description of the Munich manuscript in the Online Catalogue of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts it is Latin. A close scrutiny shows that both opinions are only correct when combined together, since the terms indicated as vernacular are sometimes (Castilian) Spanish and sometimes Latin, but in addition there are also many words that stem from other Iberoromance linguistic varieties.

As an introduction to the text and some of its problems, see the following entry:

* Universitäts zu Köln (Germany). Address for correspondence: Gerrit.Bos@web.de.
** Freie Universität Berlin (Germany).
In the second line, we transcribe the original Hebrew spelling.13 The first string represents a Romance word, whereas the following is the Hebrew transcription of an Arabic term — this is the usual form of the whole list, i.e. the list is organized according to Romance (or often Latin) words. As is a well known fact and can be easily seen from the transcription, the Hebrew spelling does not usually represent vowels, although the letter Aleph (transcribed as ’) often represents the letter a, whereas waw and yod, apart from their consonantical values, are frequently used for i/e and o/u, respectively. Thus, the Romance word in the example (M’RWYLYY’S) most probably corresponds to the Spanish word maravillas (plural).

As a plant name, this word is missing in the Diccionario español de textos médicos antiguos (DETEMA), but is mentioned in the Diccionario de autoridades (3,495a) with the meaning ‘heliotropium minus’. The Arabic term is definitely to be read as habb al-nil (الحب النيلي), that is ‘seed of indigo’ (Indigo tinctoria L.).14 Thus, apart from the difficulty to decipher the Romance and Arabic words, another obstacle in this kind of lists is that the meanings of the terms indicated as equivalent do not always match. Here, it seems that the synonymy is due to a similar use of two plants (i.e. for dyeing), cf. the following quotation from John Gerard’s Herball or General Historie of Plants (1633), concerning heliotropium minus: “With the small Tornsole they in France doe die linnen rags and clouts into a perfect purple colour, [...].”15 Fortunately, in the text we are focussing on here such a mismatch is rather rare.

In what follows we will make some brief comments on this type of lists in section 2 within the context of medieval lexicography. In section 3 we will examine the languages used in the text, whereas in section 4 we will provide an exemplary edition of some entries. The article closes with a brief summary and outlook in section 5.

2. Some remarks on medieval medico-botanical synonym lists and related literature

If we roughly review the literature on the history of lexicography, it seems to be a widespread view that, at least in Western Europe, bilingual or even multilingual dictionaries are a phenomenon that appeared in the Humanist/Renaissance period, stimulated by the growing awareness of vernacular languages (Hü llen, 2006: 13) and by “the fact that the humanist languages which dominated the education of the period were from the ancient languages” (Adler, 1941). However, when we consider the lexicographic situation in the history of medicine and pharmacology, the situation is quite different: The Latin nomenclature of simples, compound medicines, illnesses etc. was, in itself, of multilingual origin, containing mostly Greek and, later also Arabic words that had been adapted to Medieval Latin, often not only in the shape of one but of several diverging variants. This situation explains the existence of the so called synonym lists, in which each entry shows two or more terms to which the same meaning was attributed. One well known example is the Alphita,16 the earliest manuscripts of which appear in the 12th century, and which mostly reflects the Materia Medica of the School of Salerno (cf. Mensching, 1994: 19-22). Although many of the synonyms given there are of Greek origin (plus a small number of words stemming from Arabic and some Old French words; see Mensching, 1994: 20 and 28), this list was probably not perceived as multilingual at that time, because most of the terms were well established in Medieval Latin. A clearer example of a bilingual list is the index to the Latin translation to Ibn Sinâ’s Kitâb al-Qânûn (Canon) by Gerard of Cremona, where the Arabic words transcribed in Gerard’s translation are explained through their Latin equivalents.17 Finally, we find synonym lists in which Romance languages are involved. With respect to the Iberian Peninsula, one example is the “Sinonima delos nombres delas medeçinas griegos e latynos e arauigus” (14th c., ed. Mensching, 1994), in which the two sources just mentioned (the Alphita and the Latin index to the Canon) were merged, partly translated into Spanish and supplemented by more Spanish synonyms, so as to form a real multilingual kind of dictionary.

Until recently, it could generally be assumed that synonym lists or similar texts that involve Romance are extremely rare, the Sinonima being one of the very few examples. However, as the authors have shown in some previous publications (Bos & Mensching, 2001, 2005) there is quite a great number of synonym lists that has escaped the attention of scholars because they are written in Hebrew characters. In Bos & Mensching (2005), we examined six lists of this type, five of which, as far as Romance is concerned, contain lexical material stemming from the Occitan-Catalan area, although the vernacular language had sometimes been wrongly described as Spanish. In what follows we briefly sketch the background of these lists, of which one Iberoromance example is the subject of the present article.18

During the Middle Ages, when there was no uniform binary system for identifying plants and herbs, the risk of a doctor administering the wrong drug was certainly not imaginary. Such a risk would be especially acute at a time when a doctor would move to and settle in a different country, in a different linguistic environment. Jewish doctors were especially confronted with this problem when several of them emigrated in the wake of the Berber invasions of the Almohads and Almoravides into southern Spain in the 11th and 12th centuries to the Christian northern part of Spain and to southern France, from a society where Jews used and understood Arabic next to Hebrew and Romance to a society where they lost their knowledge of Arabic. Because of this shift in languages an urgent need arose for “lexica or glossaries in which technical-medical expressions have been listed alphabetically, especially the names of simple medicines”, to use the definition introduced by Steinschneider.19 Several doctors responded to this need by composing such glossaries, foremost amongst them Shem Tov Ben Isaac of Tortosa (fl. 13th century) who added a double list of synonyms (Hebrew-Arabic-Romance and Romance-Arabic-Hebrew) to his translation of al-Zahrâwi’s Kitâb al-ta’rif.20 The same Steinschneider
Thus, in spite of these fundamental bibliographical surveys and in spite of Steinschneider’s explicit suggestions to publish some of these glossaries because of their inherent importance, in particular, the one composed by Shem Ben Isaac of Tortosa, and the one extant in Ms. Florence, Mediceo Laurenziana Or. 17,23 we do not have any major modern study devoted to this particular genre, let alone text edition. The only exception known to us is the list contained in Ms. Jerusalem, Nat. and Univ. Libr., Heb 8-85, an Arabic-Catalan-Latin synonym list edited by Magdalena Nom de Déu in 1993.24 Despite the great value of this edition itself, it has to be said that the terms figuring there remain uncommented and the identification of the Romance words is only approximate. The use of Catalan in such a list might be surprising at first sight, if we look at the bibliographical literature, that is, mostly, the relevant manuscript catalogues, where the Romance language that appears in these lists is usually classified as Spanish or Italian.25 But, as we showed in Bos & Mensching (2005), this classification is usually wrong, and, instead, the Romance component is most frequently Occitan or Catalan, which suggests that the list edited by Magdalena Nom de Déu is not just an isolated example.26 The six manuscripts that we focus on in the mentioned article have never been adequately described, and, more importantly, have remained unedited up to now. And while – as we just said – some synonym lists have not been classified correctly or not identified, others do not feature at all in the current bibliographical literature. Without much exaggeration one may say that the situation in this particular field of Jewish (and Romance) studies is distressing. It is a situation which sharply contrasts with that in the field of Arabic studies, which can pride itself upon a recent review of the extant material, namely in Manfred Ullmann’s fundamental Die Medizin im Islam which was published in 1970. Moreover, part of the Arabic sources containing synonym material is available in critical editions and translations, as, for instance, some of the works composed by Ibn al-Baitār, botanist and pharmacologist born in Malaga towards the end of the twelfth century, namely his pharmaceutical encyclopaedia entitled al-Jāmī’ li-mufradāt al-adwiyā wa l-aghddiyyā,27 and his commentary on Dioscorides Materia Medica,28 and likewise an anonymous commentary on the same work which was recently published by Albert Dietrich under the title Dioscurides Triumphans.29 To improve upon this sad record in the field of Jewish (and in part also Romance) studies we are currently editing the glossaries composed by Shem Tov Ben Isaac (see above).30 Since Shem Tov, although of Catalan origin, worked in Southern France, these glossaries mostly contain Occitan terms (see Bos & Mensching, 2001), in conformity with the general trend that we have already mentioned. It seems, in fact, that the use of other Romance languages is rather rare. This makes the list in manuscript Munich 87, to which we return now, even more interesting, as the Romance involved is mostly not Catalan, but other Ibero Romance varieties.

3. Some linguistic notes

In this section, we make some comments on the Romance, Latin and Arabic used in the synonym list at issue.

As we have stated elsewhere one of the basic problems with Hebrew based synonym lists (or Hebrew medical texts in general, see Bos & Mensching, 2000) is to identify the Romance language involved in these texts. In particular, as we have seen in section two, it is often Catalan or Occitan (in the latter case this is due, of course, to the importance of the medical schools of Toulouse and Montpellier), whereas sometimes it is Spanish and sometimes French (see the article by Julia Zwink in the present volume). The identification of the Romance language would not be a problem in a text in Latin spelling, but in a semitic script, without punctuation marks as is the case in our manuscript, the task is not always easy (see Mensching & Savelberg, 2004, Bos & Mensching, 2005 for discussion). Thus, to take an example from our text, ‘WRYNH (Aleph 29), i.e. orina or urina ‘urine’ could be almost any Romance language (as well as Latin in this case); another example is ‘NYŠW apio ‘anise’ (Aleph 45). One might think that Romance words derived from the Latin 1st declension are better indicators, because their ending was lost in Catalan and in Gallo-Romance but preserved as an -o in Spanish and should thus be represented as a waw in the Hebrew spelling. In fact, our text shows abundant evidence of such words, but here a further complication arises: the ending was also common in Hebrew transcripts as an abbreviated form of the Latin ending -um.33 Thus, ‘PYW (Aleph 44) excludes Occitan or Catalan api ‘celery’ (usually spelled ‘PY in texts of Occitan/Catalan origin, see Bos & Mensching, 2005: 204-205 as well as SHSI: Kaf 12), but might still represent a Latin reading apium besides Spanish apio; likewise ‘WRYGW (Aleph 95) might be read either as Spanish oregano or Latin originum. However, the text we are dealing with here regularly shows the ending -WM, especially in words that even without this ending are unambiguously Latin, e.g. ‘SYTWM acetum ‘vinegar’ (Aleph 7), ‘LWM alum ‘alum’ (Aleph 162), ‘MYGDLWM amygdalum ‘almond’ (Aleph 99), PYTRWLYWLM petroleum ‘petroleum’ (Pe 37) or PNYQWLWM foeniculum ‘fennel’ (Pe 71). We therefore rather tend to interpret words ending in -W as
Romance, even if a Latin reading would be possible. Thus, to give some further examples, it seems more probable to us that 'MWMMW (Aleph 181) represents Spanish amomo (DETEMA: 100b), likewise BYDLYW (Bet 25) would be bedelio (DETEMA: 206a), or G'LB'NW (Gimel 3) to be read gálbano (DETEMA: 762a). But whereas this double reading is often possible in principle (due to the high degree of Latin loan words in medico-botanical terminology), there are also many clear cases that exclude Latin, e.g. 'ZYRW (Aleph 127), which can only be read as Spanish acero 'steel' and not as the late Latin aciarium; likewise 'YNYLDW (Aleph 147) is Spanish envelo 'dill' (DETEMA: 603b) (not anetum); even clearer cases are GWŚ'NW gusano 'worm' (Gimel 34), ŢRYGW trigo 'wheat' (Tet 10), 'WMBRY hombre 'man' (Aleph 117), QW'L'NTRW culantro 'coriander' (Qof 73). Diphthongs are well represented, see the results of Latin short stressed e and o (ie/ye; ue, appearing as YY and W respectively), as in WYYNTRY (Waw 12) vientre 'stomach', YHYDR yedra 'ivy' (Yod 1), 'WYSWS huesos 'bones' (Aleph 113), GW'GW güevo 'egg'.32 The presence of these diphthongs should be sufficient evidence for excluding some other Iberospanish languages, such as Galician/Portuguese and Catalan. Furthermore, if we look at the evolution of vulgar Latin or Romance -i-, and -g-, we see that the romance result of these Latin consonant clusters is represented by the letter Gimel, like in 'GW (Aleph 108) 'garlic' or QW'GW (Quf 18) 'rennet', where the letter gimel unequivocally represents the post-alveolar sound [3]; these words can thus clearly be identified as Old Castilian ajo, cuajo, pronounced [a][3], [kwa][3], from Vulgar Latin / Proto-Romance *ailo, *kwag'lo. In all other Iberospanish languages (and also in Gallo-Romance), Latin -i- and -g- became [i], so we should expect spellings like 'LY(Y)W 'garlic' or QW'L(Y)W for non-Castilian linguistic varieties.

Whereas most of the Romance lexical material in the list can, thus, in fact, be identified as Old Castilian, there is a considerable number of exceptions. The term YŚQWMH M'RSYS (Aleph 38) represents the Latin spuma maris ('pumice stone', see Sin.: 214a), but the first element shows a quf as the M'RSYS (Aleph 38) represents the Latin

So far, then, we can describe the text as a Romance/Latin-Arabic synonym list with mostly Castilian and some Catalan and maybe some Occitan elements. Yet, there are still some elements which do not match either Castilian or Catalan/Occitan. First note the term 'LYW GRŠT (Aleph 52), literally 'wild garlic'. The second element could easily be identified as Catalan or even Old Castilian agrest, 'wild', but the first element neither permits a Catalan reading (ajo, see above) nor a Catalan/Occitan reading (like all, ayl, alh). The spelling LY together with the conservation of the final vowel rather suggests yet another linguistic variety of the Iberian Peninsula, such as Leonese or Aragonese (thus a form that might be spelled allo in Latin script). This might be confirmed by the conservation of Latin initial F- (see PYG'DW figado 'liver', Pe 62, PYYRW fierro, Pe 75 'iron'; instead of higado/hierro), But whereas this might also be a Castilian archaism in spelling or reflect an earlier state of Castilian, maybe of the manuscript from which the text was copied, there is at least one other case which is rather more clear: In entry Lamed 48 (see section 4) we find LYY'TSYNWS for 'endive', that suggests an Aragonese or maybe Leonese reading leitacinos (see section 4). Behind this background, the form WYSQWWYT (bescueit) mentioned above is probably not Occitan but also Aragonese, see section 4. The supposedly Catalan elements of the text would merit some further study, since some of them might also be interpreted as Aragonese. For example, BWQ (Bet 8), boe 'he-goat' can be Occitan/Catalan but is also documented for Aragonese (DECLC, 2, 15a-17b, see Bos & Mensching, 2005: 187). Another term, GRNWTh granota (Gimel 11), at least in modern times, comprises the whole Catalan area, but extends unto the Alta Ribagorza and still to linguistic zones of transition between Catalan and Aragonese (DECLC, 5: 614a).

These speculations about Leonese or Aragonese elements will have to be checked by examining more material that appears in the list and must remain provisional in the present paper. There is possibly yet another solution, which will, in part, depend on a detailed study of the sources used by the author of the synonym list. Perhaps the author of the list has used earlier manuscripts of works by Arabic botanists of Mus-lim Iberia. In this case, we could expect Mozarabic material that appears in works like, for example, those of Ibn Biklārish, Ibn al-Baytār, or Ibn Luyun.26 In fact, *leitacinos (see above) is perfectly possible and even probable as a Mozarabic variant (see section 4). Some other elements mentioned above may also be Mozarabic, see, e.g. the above mentioned 'LWM, YYDR and 'LBRQWQ (اليغ) 'garlic' [plural], see Asin Palacios, 1943: 14, or PALA (يَوْدُ 'ivy', see Asin Palacios, 1943: 339, [LBRQWQ] 'apricot' albercoc, see Simonet, 1967: 33-34). As we said, possible sources would have to be checked, see section 4, n° 5, for a first hint that a Mozarabic source may be involved. We will not go any further at this point (but see some speculations in section 5) and rather turn to the Arabic component.

In general the Arabic terminology is the standard terminology as found in the classical medical compendia and pharmacological handbooks. Sometimes, however, we find
unattested terms which seem to be a transcription or adaptation of the Romance term. One example is "NGYŁW'T 'sarcocol' (Aleph 19), which should be 'anzarāt' in Arabic (cf. VL, 1: 126; DT, 3: 80; M, 4; SHSI, Aleph 40). The letter gemel might indicate Persian 'anganārāt', but the letter lamed undoubtedly points to Catalan angelot, which was borrowed from Persian in the course of trade relations with the orient (FEW, 19: 8b-9a) and, according to Corominas (DECLC, 1: 314b) was changed through popular etymology by the influence of ángel 'angel'). The lemma is 'NGYŁW'TWS, a latinized variant of the Catalan word (that also appears in the Hebrew version of Alphita; cf. Bos & Mensching: 2005: 204) and we cannot be sure if the author really thought that he was using an arabic word or whether he wanted to indicate a Romance correspondence. At least in one other case, we do find a clear adaptation from Romance or Latin into Arabic: the Spanish 'YRB' DTWTNY'S (Aleph 114) yerba de Túnez / yerua de Túnez (Latin herba tunica; maybe Origanus dic- tamnus L., Dictammus albus L. or Peucedanum officinale L., cf. Sin, 292, and DETEMA, 1: 825a) appears in Arabic as 'SBHTWTNY'S, to be read as 'ūshā Tūnīs. This term is not attested in the literature and seems to have been coined definitely after the Romance or Latin.

In many cases, the synonym list that we are discussing will be helpful for determining the meaning of some Arabic terms of the materia medica. Thus, e.g., the identity of the plant designated by Arabic tubbāq (تَبْبَقَ) is uncertain; according to some it is eupatory (Agrimonia eupatoria L.), while according to others it is identical with fleabane (Inula conyzaoides L.), cf. M, 403; IBF, 1448; DT, 4: 36. The latter hypothesis might not be too far fetched: in our text we find this word transcribed as T'BQ (Aleph 142), as an equivalent of WLY'B'RD', without any doubt to be read as Spanish olivarda (Inula viscosa (L.) Aiton). In other cases, the Arabic synonym remains enigmatic, such as WSMH (Nun 5). Since the Arabic letter corresponding to H is pronounced /h/ under certain circumstances, we might think of a transcription of German wismuth, i.e. bismuth. We are not sure about this interpretation, because it figures as a synonym of nitrum. However, it has to be taken into account that this mineral was very new, since it had been discovered around 25 years before the date of the Munich manuscript (Basilius Valentinus described some of its uses in 1450; the Swiss scientist Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (1493-1541) probably better known under his latinized name of Paracelsus, mentioned the latinized variant von Hohenheim (1493-1541) probably better known under his latinized name of Paracelsus, mentioned the latinized variant "Bisemutum". In fact, this mineral was confused in early times with other minerals (although usually with tin and lead due to its resemblance to those elements). In addition, the synonymies given here and in medieval synonym lists are, as we already said in section 1, not always exact and in a few cases totally wrong: another example is escuma maris 'pumice stone', see above, explained in Arabic as 'SPRG (Aleph 38), which can only be interpreted as Arabic ifṣaranāq, a popular variant for hilyawn, i.e."asparagoes" (cf. DT, 2: 108, n. 3).

In a few cases the synonym to the Romance term is not in Arabic, but in Hebrew. One example is SPRD' (Gimel 11), which is not Arabic but Hebrew for 'frog, toad (cf. FA, 112)

— the analogous Arabic term is dīfḏī' (ضَفْدُ). In another entry we find DBQ in the sense of 'viscous', which is Hebrew (cf. BM, 873; the corresponding Arabic term is lazīḡ).

4. Exemplary edition of 5 entries

In order to provide a better idea about the nature of the synonym list, we procede with an examplary commented edition of some entries.

Waw 17 (fol. 128v)

(Vern.) WYŚQWYY'T; (Arab.) K’K Š’MY (biscuit)

The lemma is a Romance form belonging to the Latin bis coctus, showing the lack of final -o, which would suggest, at first sight, a Catalan reading (bescuit, DECLC, 2: 1020b). However, the spelling with YY indicates a diphthong in the last syllable, which points towards an Old Occitan reading: bescuit 'biscuit' (RL, 1: 505b). In fact, a very similar transcription (BYŚQWYYY'T) appears in SHSI (Kaf 8), a text of Occitan origin. But it has to be noted that the diphthong can be found in some Iberoromance varieties too, cf. the participle cuyoeto mentioned for Aragonese in Zamora Vicente (1967: 242), and the final vowel often disappeared in this variety; as far as Mozarabic is concerned, this form would also be possible; cf. Zamora Vicente (1967: 29), where the participle cutit is mentioned, but it is also said that the diphthongization before the semifinal vowel yod is well attested for Mozarabic; for the loss of final vowels after -t, see Zamora Vicente (1967: 30-31).

Arabic ka‘k šāmi (كَعْك شامي) means 'something baked (rusk, biscuit, or the like)'; cf. WKAS, 1: 234-5; SHSI, Kaf 8. Accordingly, ka‘k šāmi means 'something baked (rusk, biscuit, or the like) hailing from Syria'.

Lamed 48 (fol. 128v)

(Vern.) LYY'T'SYNWŠ (Arab.) HNDB'

The Romance term suggests a reading *leitacinos, which could be an Aragonese, Leonese, Galician/Portuguese or Mozarabic form belonging to the hypothetical Latin plant name *lacticus, postulated by, e.g. Corominas in DECLC, V: 176b (see section 3, in particular with respect to Mozarabic). The forms indicated there as Aragonese are more evolved variants (without diphthong and/or palatalization of I (see, e.g. Aragonese lechacinos). The meaning according to DECLC is Sonchus levis. See ibidem for further references. In Lamed 20, the same Romance word appears as LYT'SYNWS, with the Arabic synonym TRHSQWN (طَرَحْشُوقَن), i.e. "dandelion" (Taraxacum officinale), a synonym of hindabī barrī (wild chicory); see M: 175; IBF: 1469. This latter variant, LYT'SYNWS, where the diphthong is not represented, is very closely resembles the form هِلْطْجَس, i.e., LYTGYNS by Ibn Bikārīsh (Simonet, 1967: 307; DECLC, 5: 176b); for the Arabic letter Gimel in Mozarabic versus the Hebrew letter Samech in our text, see below with respect to entry Pe 30.

Arab. hindâbâ’ (هندب) or hindibâ’ means ‘chicory, endive’, designating several species of Cichoraceae, such as Cichorium intibus L. and Cichorium endivia L. and Var.; cf. DT, 2: 114; M: 114; SHSI: Ayin 7.

The Arabic term appears two more times in this synonym list, as a correspondence to ‘YNDBY’, i.e. Lat. Romance endivia (Aleph 83) and to SYRQ’S (Samech 17), i.e. Old Spanish cerrajas (plural), prob. Sonchus ciliatus Lam. or Sonchus fallax Wall. (Sin.: 242b, DETEMA, 1: 303a).

Lamed 26 (fol. 128v)

\(\text{LYQTYRW’YLYH (Arab.) YTW\textsuperscript{a}}\)

LYQTYRW’YLYH represents Castilian lecheruela or an equivalent in some other Iberoromance variety, identified as Euphorbia helioscopia (SG: 685a),\textsuperscript{37} Euphorbia segetalis L.\textsuperscript{38} The sequence QT might just be a latinalizing spelling for \([f]\), so that the word may be Castilian;\textsuperscript{39} more probably, however it is a Latinizing spelling for -\(t\)-, so that the word might correspond to some Navarro-Aragonese variant; see, e.g. the form literuela (alavés) quoted by Asín Palacios (1943: 145). As a last alternative, it might represent the archaic state of the Latin nexus -CT- in Mozarabic, that is often preserved, although the C mostly appears as the letter \(\text{H}\); see the transcription \(\text{LiHTYRWLH}\) in Ibn Bilkârîsh (cod. Leiden, see Simonet, 1967: 291), \(\text{LiHTYRW\textsuperscript{L}A}\) (Asín Palacios, 1943: 144). For the first vowel, the \(\text{Y}\) od in our manuscript versus the \(\text{Aleph}\) in the latter Mozarabic form might be problematic, but see the vocalised plant name \(\text{literuela}\), i.e. \(\text{LiHTaYRaH}\) (where the lemma featuring here derives from) in Asín Palacios (1943:152), so a Mozarabic form \(\text{lektoruela}\) or \(\text{lexeruela}\) would be perfectly possible (in addition it must be said that Arabic \(\text{Alif}\) was probably pronounced as something like \(\text{e}\) in Hispano-Arabic).

The Arabic equivalent pertains to the genus Euphorbia: Arabic yâtit\(\text{t} (\text{يتيت})\) designates first of all plants which produce a milky juice, latex, and then the species Euphorbia; cf. DT, 4: 153; SHSI: Shin 22. The same Arabic word appears in Aleph 129 as a synonym to ‘\(\text{YSWL}\)’, i.e. Lat. esula or Span. ysonal. prob. Euphorbia pitithusa L., see Sin.: 293b, and in \(\text{Tt}\) 30 as a synonym of ‘\(\text{TYTYLM}\)’, i.e. Cat. titital (genus Euphorbia, in particular Euphorbia helioscopia, DCVB, 10: 316a).

Qof 47 (fol. 129v)

\(\text{Koramosemey beit yamareaq} (\text{Vern.) QWR’SWNYLYYW; (Arab.) HYWP’RYQWN}\)

The vernacular term is Castilian coraconcillo, literally ‘little heart’, which, as a plant name, means Hypericum perforatum L. (Sin.: 246a), (DETEMA, 1: 401c). The name is due to the form of the leaves (see Dicc. autor.: 591a, coraconcillo).

The meaning is confirmed by the Arabic term, which is hayafadaira (هفادار وس), ‘hypericum’; and it is reconfirmed in entry Aleph 82, where the same Arabic term features as a translation of ‘\(\text{YWPR’RYQWN}\)’, i.e. (h)ypericum; the letter Nun instead of final Latin M is frequent here and in other Hebrew medico-botanical texts.

Pe 30 (fol. 129v)

\(\text{Ma’alim ra’bim ma’anasemey (Arab.) MŠK’TM’SYR}\)

The Arabic term is misspelled for \(\text{miškit\textsuperscript{a}rāmašīr}\), that is ‘dittany’ (Origanum dictamnus L.), cf. DT, 3: 31. The synonymy found here can also be found in Mozarabic sources: a Mozarabic term interpreted by Simonet as poleyo chervuno is used as a synonym of \(\text{miškit\textsuperscript{a}rāmašīr}\) by Ibn Tharif, Ibn Bayt\(\text{ār}\), and Ibn Bikhlarîsh: \(\text{LYQTYRW’YLH}\) (where the lemma L., see Sin.: 270 as a synonym of \(\text{TYRW’LA}\) (Asín Palacios, 1943: 144). For the \(\text{YRW’YLH}\) represents Castilian poleo, without diphthong, like in our text. It must also be noted that, since Arabic has no letter for [p], the spelling is with the Arabic letter \(\text{b}\) in the forms we have quoted, but Simonet (loc. cit.) also mentions forms with \(\text{fa}\) (FLYH / FLYW, among others). The term is a Mozarabic version of Med. Lat. pulegium cervinum (Alphita, see Sin.: 137, note 12). Latin [k] (spelled \(\text{c}\)) before \(\text{e}\) and \(\text{i}\) usually shows as [\(\text{ç}\)] in Mozarabic, spelled with Gim in the Arabic script, hence Simonet’s transcription as chervuno. But, according to Zamora Vicente (1967:39-40), the most typical pronunciation of the sound represented by Gim was dental, so the use of the Hebrew letter Samech in our text may still reflect a Mozarabic variant. Of course the term featuring here could also be read as Castilian poleo cervuno (which does not figure neither in DETEMA nor in Sin. however). But note that the Hebrew letter at the beginning of the first element of the term, PZWLYW, is Pe with an overstroke (raphae), indicating the pronunciation [\(\text{f}\)]. We see no real reason for this unless the author had a Mozarabian form like, e.g. FLYW (see above) as a model.

**Summary and outlook**

The synonym list that we have been discussing in the preceding sections and which we are planning to edit is an interesting document Jewish and Arabic medicine in medieval Iberia. From a linguistic point of view, apart from Arabic and Latin (which in most cases represent “standard” medico-botanical terms), we have been able to identify Old Castilian and Old Catalan elements and some of at least one other Iberoromance variety. It is not clear at this stage, which variety (or varieties) these elements stem from. Do we have to think of an author from Aragón, who, due to geographic and cultural reasons might have had at hand both the Castilian and the Catalan names for plants, animals or the like and only sometimes switched to his native language? Or were the non-Castilian elements introduced by a copyist? Since the copy was made in Valladolid, do the few non-Catalan/non Castilian items possibly reflect the Leonese language of the copyist? Or do these elements represent Mozarabic terms that were transcribed from an older source, maybe one of the famous Arabic botanists? For the latter hypothesis we think we have adduced some (admittedly still very few) evidence. We hope to be able to find a more definite answer to these questions after a more thorough scrutiny of this text during our preparation of the edition.

<www.medtrad.org/panacea.html>
Notes

1. This paper is a preliminary report of a wider project which will aim at editing and commenting upon the manuscript discussed. It is related to other projects directed by the authors; cf. footnote 30. We thank Nina Riehl and Julia Zwink for their support and layout of this article.


3. For the manuscript see Steinschneider (1895).


5. An edition of the Arabic text and Hebrew translations is in preparation.


7. For Nathan ha-Me’ati, see Steinschneider (1893: 678-681); Vogelstein & Rieger (1895-1896: 398-400).

8. For the data concerning the manuscripts I thank Benjamin Richler.


10. Hebrew be-la’az; note that in Hebrew texts often no principal distinction is made between Romance and Latin, both counted as vernacular; cf. Bos & Mensching (2005: note 2).


12. In what follows, we will indicate with each entry or word the Hebrew letter and the entry number where it figures in the manuscript (we numbered the entries starting from 1 in each letter).

13. We use a transcription system that has been adapted from the Encyclopaedia Judaica for the purposes of our projects mentioned below.


15. Gerard (1633).

16. So called because of its incipit: “Alphita, i.e. farina hordei”. See the editions of Renzi (1852-1859) and Mowat (1878), also cf. Mensching (1994), Bos & Mensching (2005). A modern edition, directed by E. Montero Cartelle at the university of Valladolid is in press.

17. About this index see Mensching (1994: 21-22), some unpublished manuscripts are mentioned there on page 39.

18. The rest of this section was adapted from an unpublished paper presented by the authors at the Welcome Trust in London (Bos & Mensching 2000: see as well Bos (in press).


23. This list featuring on fols. 68-91 and entitled: ‘השם הנקראים סינונמי (On the different terms which are called synonyms) is part of a manuscript that was copied in 1462 by Abraham Ben Daniel the physician. The list is an enlarged index to the second book of Ibn Sinà’s K. al-Qānūn which contains not less than 1760 entries. Cf. Steinschneider (1893: 839).


26. For Hebrew medical texts (also containing Romance and Latin words) outside the genre of glossaries/synonym lists, see Bos & Mensching (2005) footnote 23.

27. The work was printed for the first time in Cairo 1874 and has been reprinted repeatedly.


30. We thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft that has supported this initiative by means of two grants (2001-2004, 2004-2007). The project is directed by the authors of the article who are assisted by Martina Hussein and Frank Savelsberg.


32. Variant of ‘huvo’, for its occurrence in Old Spanish medical texts see DETEMA (847a-c).

33. See SeSh1, Shin 10: Hebrew ŠBWLT HWDYYT, Arab. SNBL HNDY, o.l. ‘ŠPYQ N’RDY, where the Latin-Romance term appears as ‘ŠPYQ NRdy in one manuscript (O). Also cf. Shin 11 for espic celtica as well. These forms also appear in Magdalena Nom de Déu (op. cit., p. 23, lines 47-48); note that the transcription asafic nardi/ceItalian ‘milk’ (Lamed 1).

34. See DCVB (1: 428a).

35. See below.


37. Also cf. the Spanish Wikipedia (<http://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euphorbia_heliscopia>-

38. Tardio et al. (2006: 45).

39. Note the regular spelling with Gimel and raphe in LYGY leche ‘milk’ (Lamed 1).
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