

مؤتمر التعريب بالرباط

٣ - ٦ أبريل ١٩٦١

أقامت وزارة التربية الوطنية والشبيبة والرياضة بالمملكة المغربية مؤتمراً للتعريب دعت للمشاركة فيه طائفة من علماء البلاد العربية وبعض العلماء الأجانب ممن يعنون بالدراسة اللغوية . ومن وجهة النهم الدعوة لحضور هذا المؤتمر من علماء الجمهورية العربية المتحدة : الأمر مصطفى الشهابي ، والدكتور ابراهيم بيومي مذكور ، الأستاذ محمد فريد أبو حديد ، الأستاذ محمد خلف الله أحمد ، الأستاذ محمد سعيد العريان ، الدكتور عبد الحلیم منتصر ، الدكتور سامي الدهان . واشترك في تمثيل الجمهورية العربية المتحدة مستاوها الثقافي في الرباط الدكتور جمال الدين الشيال - الأستاذ بجامعة الاسكندرية .

وكانت النواحي الرئيسية التي دارت حولها مناقشات المؤتمر وبحوثه هي : مبدأ التعريب (تحديده ، مضارره ، مدهاه) ، ونظريات التعريب ، ووسائله .

وقد أرسلت الوزارة بعد انتهاء المؤتمر مجموعة كبيرة من المصطلحات الى مجمع اللغة العربية بالقاهرة لنظرها وايداء الرأي فيها .

يربط المقال بين الأصول اليونانية والهيلينية (Hellenic and Hellenistic) لهذه المعلومات والنصح وتطوراتها عند العرب وعلى يد الناقلين الى اللاتينية ثم في آداب اللغات الأوربية المدارجة ، ويخص بالذكر التراجم الانجليزية الوسيطة (Middle English) وبعضها وجه الى ملوك وحكام معينين في تاريخ انجلترا ، وأثر الكتاب في انجلترا في تطور العلم واللاهوت والنظريات السياسية والشعر الوصفي وغيرها من التيارات .

كتاب "سر الأسرار" وتراجمه الأوربية

للدكتور محمود على الزيدوى

ملخص :

هو كتاب « علم الرياسة في تدبير السياسة » المعروف بكتاب « سر الأسرار » المنسوب لأرسطو كرمالة حررها الى الاسكندر . وأقدم صيغة له عربية تدعى أنها ترجمة يحيى بن البطريق لنسخة سريانية نقلها هو بنفسه من العربية .

يعالج هذا الكتاب كيفية تول مقابله الحكم ، بالإضافة الى ما يبذله من نفاذ في الصحة والفراسة والعدل واختيار الوزراء والكتب والرسل والعمال وقادة الجيوش وفن القتال وعلوم السحر .

لهذا الكتاب صيغتان : صيغة طويلة في عشر مقالات ، وصيغة قصيرة تقع في ثمان . والصيغة الطويلة قد نشرها الدكتور عبد الرحمن بدوى في كتابه « الأصول اليونانية للنظريات السياسية في الاسلام (الجزء الأول) » ، القاهرة - ١٩٥٤

يتناول هذا المقال كيفية تكوين هذا الكتاب والاضافات التي أدخلت عليه وترجمته الى اللاتينية في ترجمتين مختلفتين وبعض التراجم الأوربية المشتقة من اللاتينية ، والدور الذي لعبته هذه التراجم في تاريخ الفكر والأدب الأوربي في القرون الوسطى .

يبين أولاً أن الصيغة القصيرة أقدم من الصيغة الطويلة التي لا يمكن أن يرجع تاريخها الى ما قبل رسائل اخوان الصفا حيث أن من ضمن الفقرات التي زودت بها فقرات هامة نقلت حرفياً من هذه الرسائل . وهو شيء خلاصته بحث الدكتور بدوى .

In 1422, *James Yonge*, presented to the Earl of Ormond a translation of the French version made by the Dominicans *Jeoffrey de Waterford* and *Servais Copale* in the thirteenth century. Yonge omits the extensive medical portions added by *Waterford* and *Copale*, but retains their translation of the *Breviloquium* of *Johannes Wallensis*, which they had incorporated presumably as a means of adding Christian instructions to the non-Christian text. The *Breviloquium* is found connected with the *Secreta* in several Latin mss. and editions, but not incorporated into it. Yonge has added Irish exempla to the text, some deriving from *Giraldus Cambrensis*, and others drawn from contemporary events.

Again for Sir Miles Stapleton, *John Metham* produced a *Physiognomy*, based on the *Secreta* and on two other texts. The physiognomy and onomancy of *Sloane 213* has been mentioned in the body of this article. The physiognomy, the description of the four seasons, and the comparison of man and beasts are incorporated in the *Kalendrier des Bergers* — of which there are three English translations and altogether twelve English editions between 1503 and 1658.

The advice to princes has been abbreviated so as to form a passage of instruction to King Arthur, proffered by a hermit, in the late fifteenth-century Scottish romance of *Lancelot of the Laik*, while a set of somewhat trite aphorisms were extracted from the *Secreta* perhaps by *William Peers*, in Henry VIII's reign, to inscribe upon the walls of rooms in two of the houses belonging to the fifth Earl of Northumberland.

Bodley Lyell 36 is a coarsely-written copy of the same translation, with some sections omitted, and some re-arrangement of the contents.

Another translation of the full Latin text is now the property of Mr. Robert B. Honeyman, Jr., of New York. This is a late fifteenth-century translation by one *Johannes de Caritate*, originally undertaken for Sir Miles Stapleton, of Norfolk, although this copy was written out after 1460. The book was once in the hands of John Harcourt, a step-son of Stapleton's daughter, who took part in Buckingham's rising, and may have fled to France in 1484. The colophon of Part I reads 'Parisiensis, Secundum translationem Johannes de Caritate'. There is therefore some possibility of this being an English work written by a follower of the group of exiles who accompanied Henry Tudor, first in Brittany, and then in Paris. This translation is the only one to reproduce the full list of electroanaries; the medical sections are given great care, and sometimes expanded by the English translator.

Royal MS. 18 A vii, *Oxford University College 85*, and *BM Add. 5467*, are all separate fifteenth-century translations of the abbreviated text, *Bodley Add. 5467* is by John Shirley and *Cambridge Ff 1.33* is a French text of the same version, which was owned by Shirley. There can be little doubt that it was the copy he used for his translation. Shirley also appears to be the translator of the version in *Ashmole 59* an unfinished version of a defective text. Both Shirley mss. contain evidence of oral dictation to the scribe, although the translation which is certainly by Shirley is not in his hand, and the one in his hand is not known certainly to be his translation. In *Add. 5467*, Shirley has in the passage on risings against unjust Kings, added a passage on Jack Straw and Jacques Bonhomme, and has also embedded into the text an account of the commodities and mineral wealth of England.

Gilbert of the Haye produced a Scottish version of the same abbreviated French text for the Earl of Orkney — found in his prose ms. of 1454. The French abbreviation also provides the basis of the *Copland* print of 1528, reprinted by Kitson in 1572.

A short version of the same text was printed by *Walwyn* in 1702 and is probably translated by a friend of his, if not by the publisher himself

Discourse VIII : on Army Commanders. A sketch of the military system, with a hierarchy in which each holder of a post has beneath him ten men of the next highest degree. A description of the instrument of Themistius, with the sound of which you can summon your army rapidly.

Discourse IX : Warfare. Do not enter battle in person, but do your best to rouse the zeal of your troops. Various forms of strategy, and devices and methods of calculating victory by onomancy.

Discourse X : The Occult Sciences. The individual entities of the sublunary world are consubstantial with entities in the spiritual world; their spiritual counterparts are their efficient causes, and control them. If you have knowledge, therefore, of the celestial forms and their movements, you can attain power over the sublunary forms and their contingences.

After the introduction, come the following : the powers of the planets; the philosopher's stone; the Emerald Table; a lapidary; a herbal; and a further onomantic table.

NOTE B

The literal English versions of the *Secreta*

The English vernacular translations perhaps deserve individual reference :

Rawlinson C 83 : a late fifteenth-century prose work, is the only English translation of *Hispalensis*.

The text in Lambeth 501 and Bodley Laud 685, edited by Steele in *Three Prose Versions of the 'Secreta Secretorum'* : This is translated from the full Latin Vulgate version, soon after 1400.

Bodley Ashmole 396 : another fifteenth-century translation of the same nature. It preserves in its list of contents the Arabic order of the discourses, but expands the physiognomy book by incorporating the older pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomy*.

religion, law and astrology; not to trust women, to beware of poisons, and to remember the poison-maiden sent to him once as a treacherous gift — finally, to guard well his immortal soul.

Then follows a defence of astrology as a true means of foreknowledge, which, through informing one of coming ill-fortune, gives one the opportunity to prepare for it, or to pray to God for its mitigation.

The *bab* on Health follows. The theoretical introduction gives the doctrine of humours, and mentions the different schools of medicine, empirical and revealed. The conservation of health is achieved through moderation and regularity. A routine of daily hygiene for the healthy is given, and a description of each of the seasons, with an account of the regimen for each, then are discussed : the four parts of the body, food, water, wines, the bath, electuaries, and medical astrology. A section on spiritual medicine, acting through the effect of music, is not translated in any Latin version.

The *bab* on physiognomy, after a theoretical introduction, gives an anecdote on Polemon's judgement of the character of Hippocrates, and then the practical details of the art.

Discourse III : Justice : the parallel between a king in the state, the power of reason in the microcosm, and God in the cosmos.

Discourse IV : Councillors : The Plotinian theory of emanation, down from the Active Intellect, through the Universal Soul, *materia prima*, and so forth, to the elements, and upwards again to man. The faculties of man, and his rise to union with the Active Intellect. The analogy between the five senses in a body and councillors in a state; this is the reason why it is best to have five councillors. How to treat councillors : with respect, but caution. The fifteen qualities of the good councillor. A comparison between the characteristics of men, and the salient features of the characters of certain beasts. An anecdote concerning the Jew who deceives a Zoroastrian, — showing that one should only trust men of one's own faith.

Discourse V : the qualities of Secretaries.

Discourse VI : on Envoys.

Discourse VII : On Governors.

faith. Both should combine through the open means of benevolence and a certain occult means, a secret known to the virtuous and the holy alone.

There follow ten discourses, to some of which are appended further sections called *Babes*. *Discourse I* concerns largesse, and divides kings into four classes, according to their generosity both towards themselves and their subjects. True largesse, like all virtues, lies in a mean. The fall of the kingdom of Hananikh was due to the kings' spending of their wealth and over-taxing of their subjects. Wealth is one of the efficient causes of the preservation of the animal soul, and should not be wasted. Under liberality is included a charitable attitude towards the faults of others. Govern yourself by reason, and seek fame for the right causes. A chain of virtues leads one from Reason to the establishing of true empire; two chains of vices are given, which lead, beginning either with envy or with concupiscence, to the collapse of imperial rule.

Discourse II: the condition and appearance of a king, and how he should comport himself:

A king should choose a noble and celebrated cognomen as his official name. He should not subordinate religion to worldly rule: else he will be destroyed, and, since he cannot deceive people continually, his religion ought to be truly felt, and not only an outward appearance. He should be clement, moderate and just. He should wear more splendid clothes than others, be eloquent and clear-voiced, but not speak too often nor mix freely with the common people. Praise is given to the customs of the Indians, whose king appears in public only once a year.

The instructions proceed with their combination of moral and practical advice, in parts of general application, in others intended for rulers alone. Thus Alexander is told to lighten taxes, especially upon foreign merchants; not to be overfond of worldly goods and pleasures; how to take relaxation with his intimates, and to present gifts to his nobles; not to laugh overmuch, to punish disrespect, to help the needy, to store grain in case of famine; never to shed blood without due reason, never to break oaths; not to underestimate an enemy's strength, to encourage learning, as the Greeks did, for even their young girls were learned in

NOTE A

The Contents of *Sirr ul Asrar*

It is not easy to sketch the history of the *Secreta* without presenting, if not a précis of the text, at least a summary which serves to bring out its underlying, and its superimposed, principles, and shows the variety of its themes and of its methods of presentation. Here then is a summary of the Long Form, sometimes called the Eastern Form, of the Arabic *Sirr ul Asrar*, the Book of Secrets, or the Book of the Science of Authority' on the Good Ordering of Statecraft (كتاب علم القوياسة في تدبير السيادة).

First, a dedication to the Caliph. His obedient slave has carried out his command, in seeking for the *Book of the Secret of Secrets*. This is the work of Aristotle, son of Nichomachus, compiled for Alexander the Two-Horned when the philosopher had become too old to accompany him upon his conquests. Alexander had chosen Aristotle as counsellor by merit of his wisdom, learning and virtue. Some philosophers place him in the category of the prophets to whom God did not send a revealed book. In the histories of the Greeks, it is written that God sent his angel to him to say : It is truer to call you an angel than a man. One opinion concerning his end is that he is buried in a pyramid, another is that he ascended to heaven in a column of light. By following his advice, Alexander conquered all nations. Among the letters which they exchanged is one in which Alexander announces his intention of putting to death the wise Persians whom he feared as a potential menace. Aristotle replied that as one cannot change their air and waters and land, one should endeavour to come to terms with them, and to win them over by kindness. The translator Yahya ibn Bitriq searched all temples for the acroamatic works hidden in them. Finally, in the temple of the Sun, erected by Aesclepius for himself, he persuaded a monk to show him the Greek ms. of the *Secreta* which he has now translated for the Caliph, from Greek to Syriac, and then from Syriac into Arabic.

The work begins with an introductory letter from Aristotle to Alexander, asking him to keep his instruction secret. In concealed terms, beneath the practical advice, is its true meaning, which should not be revealed to the unworthy. The sources of the power of a king are then given : they are the open cause, his subjects, and the hidden cause, his

luding broad concepts which the original does not deal with, or by adding purely local and topical themes, which could in this way be seen against a general background of values and knowledge. With this tendency goes the ability of the imaginative response to be awoken by purely factual data - the *Secreta* is part of the tradition by which early medical manuals led, first to the establishing of a medical religion and a medical philosophy, then to the forming of a common background of beliefs which was to be the setting of later imaginative literature. Thus the *Secreta*, and other works of its type, grew as an aftercrop of a great movement of the mind, were transmitted with decreasing energy, and finally, when, their own indigenous energy is gone, provide the material for a fresh burst of energy, this time a literary one: the *Secreta* is a fifteenth century favourite because it happens to provide the vernacular prose movement with precisely the ingredients that movement thrived upon; it is also one of the works that illustrate the background of common assumptions against which Elizabethan literature was to grow.

These, then are the reasons why a study of the history of the *Secreta* may be of general interest. But one may well find that the inchoate nature of its ingredients, and the disjointed manner of its influence, outweigh its positive rewards. And in that case, one may agree with a seventeenth century owner of one English ms., that of the *Caritatis* version, one Richard Eide, who set down on the fly leaf an opinion which makes a fitting conclusion and palinode to this article:

O sillie man, Whoe ere compil'd this Booke
 Like to *your* times in foolish Blindnes Lad
 A Booke Vnworthy forre a prince's Looke
 Whose Author was soe vaine, & poorely Red
 That to this age is mere ridiculous
 Stolid, infatuated, friuolous.
 Thy Lines in paper long enough had Lasted
 And worne with time, as did thy Author's glory
 The world Had Long Enough *your* profit tasted
 Which was for to be reap'd by such a Story
 And thou in giving place to Better Worke
 Sholdst to thy Credit in Oblivion Lurke.

monograph on *Seasons and Months in English Poetry*¹, where she notes other literary sources which have combined with the poetic imagination to produce nature-description. Miss Tuve makes out a strong case for the influence of the *Secreta*, but omits two important considerations, which strengthen the case. The first is that the descriptions which we do not know to have derived from our text — such as the prologues in Douglas' *Eneados* and the stanzas in *Sir Gawaine* — are by no means less faithful to the details of the *Secreta* than the passages — such as those in Lydgate's *Governance*, which we do know to be poetic paraphrases of the *Secreta*. The second is that we are concerned with passages which set out specifically to describe the four seasons in their order, that these passages — as opposed to occasional description, or to description of the twelve months, — are few in number, and resemble one another in many of their details.

What, we may finally ask, apart from the incidental interests of such a study — would further investigation of the *Secreta* tradition yield to us? Mainly, I suggest, the striking similarity, or rather continuity and identity, of the common assumptions of the half-learned from late Greek times down to the seventeenth century. There is a similarity in the middle reaches of the intellect, in those aspects of thought which do not belong to folk tradition, but which are not the dominant philosophies, or great original speculations, of the ages that separate Aristotle from Descartes, the lands that lie between Persia and Scotland. The *Secreta* seems to have been formed, translated, adapted, and made use of, through the centuries, by several different currents of the mind. One of these is the desire to create a *summa* of knowledge out of scattered fragments. This seems to have led to the formation of the text, and, later, portions of this same text are in turn made use of in the same way. Another is the converse tendency to extract aphorisms out of more discursive works — aphoristic fragments seem to be the basis of the *Secreta*, more are then added to it, and later, the work itself is subjected to this tendency. Next, one may point to the manner in which a transmitter of this work seems always to have regarded himself as also being its interpreter to his own environment, to have wished to adapt it either by making it fuller by inc-

1. A more recent study of the same tradition is N.E. Enkvist's *The Seasons of the Year*, Helsingfors, 1957.

The *Secreta* tradition is one in which, although there is no philosopher-king, there is a king with a philosopher at his right elbow. In many of the translations, and even in the dedications of the Latin mss., one senses that the translator sees himself in the rôle of a latter-day sage, and affects to see his patron as the Alexander-figure.

A variation of this tendency is the manner in which Bale confuses Yahya ibn Bitriq, the alleged translator into Arabic, with John Scotus Erigena, so that Anthony à Wood, following him, attributes the finding of this treatise in the temple of the sun, to Erigena, and, by implication, places King Alfred in the part which the Caliph al Ma'mun is given in Arabic proem.

The philosopher is, of course, in this tradition, doctor, physiognomist, and alchemist as well. In the medical corpus, the *Secreta* is an integral part of a line of works deriving ultimately from Hippocrates and Galen; its own influence on later popular thought is impossible to disentangle from that of similar works, such as that of Bartholomew Anglicus.

In physiognomical works, one can occasionally trace the definite influence of the *Secreta*: thus in Nicholas Hill's work *The Contemplation of Mankind* (1613) there are numerous quotations, many of them coming in indirectly through Peter de Abano. The *Secreta* must certainly have been one of the most important texts in one of the three main traditions of physiognomical thought, that is, in the academical pseudo-Aristotelian tradition. This ran through the Middle Ages side by side with the folk-tradition of physiognomical judgements, and in the eighteenth century, is replaced by a new pseudo-scientific tradition, deriving from Lavater, and based upon bone-structure.

Alchemical interest in the *Secreta* is clear. In the *Parlement of the Three Ages*, Aristotle, presumably through the influence of the *Secreta*, is represented as an alchemist. John Dastin uses our text in his letter to Pope John XXII. The seventeenth-century owner of MS. *Lyell 86* was the scientist William Crabtree; Ashmole reprinted the alchemical portion of Lydgate's version in his *Theatrum Chemicum*.

The influence of the description of the seasons by the *Ikhwan us-Safa* on European nature poetry is, admittedly, a notion less easy to accept. The evidence is set out in detail by Miss Rosamund Tuve, in her

mony in the individual soul, and that in a monarchy, can thus be suggestively juxtaposed, for the reader to apply to one pattern of things the impressions he receives from the other. Lydgate's *Book of the Governauce of Kynges and Princes* was left unfinished, and in a disorderly state, at his death; Benedict Burgh, who completed it, left the earlier portions disarranged. There therefore remain signs of Lydgate's having used two Latin ms. versions, and of his bewilderment at this. Nevertheless, the poem is the only one which attempts to rewrite the *Secreta*, in its true shape, but in poetic form. The description of the seasons has provided the opportunity for one of the finest passages in Lydgate's output, and would also seem already to have influenced the description of nature in his earlier poems.

William Forrest presented to Edward VI and to Somerset in 1548 his unfinished, rime-royal version of the *Secreta: The Pleasant Poesy of Princelye Practise*. This expatiates in a verbose manner on some of the themes of our text and continues the tradition of treating more local and topical issues. Thus, it contains a curiously inaccurate description of an English coronation, and, like Walter de Milemete's version but with far more cogent reason, a chapter on the marriage of Kings. There are eminently sensible chapters on the wool-trade, and on a project for creating Parochial Boards of Education. Forrest's work is in Lydgate's language and rhythms, and, up to his death in the 1580 's, he kept alive the older tradition both in manner and matter, in the holograph verses he presented to his patrons.

There remains now to point to four or five strands of thought in later mediaeval and early modern literature, in which, if one cannot often with certainty detect the influence of the *Secreta*, one can yet say that the *Secreta* fits so integrally that these movements should receive some mention in connexion with it.

First, the figures of Alexander and Aristotle, or, in more general terms, of the Perfect Prince and the Perfect Sage. The introductory exchange of letters between Alexander and Aristotle completely reverses the attitudes of the two as we have now learned from Sir William Tarn to view them. The concept of the universality of man, of respecting the non-Greek, is closer to Alexander's thoughts than to Aristotle's; in the *Secreta* it is Aristotle who shows this breadth of sympathy.

Richard II. which may possibly therefore have contributed, as an overtone, to the making, or at least, to the perpetuation, of this slip. (Richard himself was presented, by an Irish court official, with a copy of the discourse containing this passage, in its earlier form).

The large number of vernacular translations should not be taken entirely as evidence of popularity. Many are clearly written for the exclusive use of a local magnate and, rather, indicate that, in the new tradition of secular prose instruction in the vernacular, the great family establishments were playing a part analogous to the earlier rôle of the monastic houses, in providing centres for unconnected local flowerings of vernacular prose.

A metropolitan and indeed, royal patron is addressed in three of the four English verse 'rehandlings' of the *Secreta*, while the fourth, Lydgate's, is the work of a court poet. The second portion of Book VII of Gower's *Confessio* is one of these works, and precedes in date the literal translations of the *Secreta*. Gower has presumably followed a ms. which also contained the *Breviloquium*, for many of his exempla in this section are derived from it. The anecdote of the Jew and Magus appears as an *exemplum*, but illustrates Pity. Gower extracts five virtues from the first three books of the *Secreta* — Truth, Liberality, Justice, Pity and Chastity, and discusses them.

In 1411, Occleve presented his *Regement of Princes* to Prince Henry. The teachings derive from the *Secreta* and from Aegidius Colonna's *De regimine principum*, while the *exempla* are, mostly, from Jacobus de Cessoles' *Ludus Scacchorum*. Occleve takes the moral instruction of his sources and rearranges it to fit a fresh plan of presentation of his own. This scheme of perfect monarchy is prefaced by the well-known prologue which recounts Occleve's misery and his shame, just as, in the *Confessio*, the precepts on Rule are embedded into a treatise on Love. One may ask whether this is not an indication of the symbolic status of Kingship in the poetic mind, for Kingship provided a parallel, explicitly made in the *Secreta*, to the macrocosm on one hand, and the microcosm on the other. The chaos and har-

The *De officio regis* attributed to Wycliff, makes use of the *Secreta* (Discourse II) to point to the supreme god-like position and responsibility of a king, and to argue that his religious faith should be sincerely held. A passage in the final chapter, assumed to be a later addition, warns, however, that God's prerogative of vengeance and slaying should not be assumed by rulers. The just methods of raising levies from the people and granting worldly wealth to individuals, and the importance of theological studies (where the *Secreta* speaks of studies in general), are also supported by passages from our text. The Platonic passage on the qualities of councillors is applied to the King's domestic clergy; the argument, though always based on the *Secreta* is in several passages given final confirmation by a Biblical parallel. The same passage forms the starting-point for the contention that the clergy should have no worldly possessions of their own.

We must turn now to the vernacular transmission which, again is too intricate to be dealt with here in anything the but most summary way. The European translations derive, with only two exceptions, from the Latin versions. The earliest Castilian translation, the *Poridat de las Poridades*, is from the Hebrew translation of Harizi and from it derive the passages incorporated by James I of Catalonia into his *Libre de la saviesa*¹. Also from the same Hebrew translation comes the sixteenth century Russian version, which has become conflated with a text attributed to Maimonides².

A number of French versions and of the English translations deriving from them, spring from a fifteenth century abbreviation of *Tripolitanus* which omits much of the theoretical matter, and so reduces the long form to something similar in intention to the Arabic Short Form. In most mss. of this abbreviation - Latin, French and English, the passage which deals with the fall of the kings who overtaxed their subjects, has suffered an interesting change: the words of the Tripolitanus text 'quod fuit destructio regni Chaldeorum' have become 'quod fuit destructio regni Anglorum.' None of these mss. goes back before the deposition of

1. See L. Kasten, '*Poridat de las Poridades*', *Romanes Philology*, V. 1951-2, and *Oriens*, 1955, p. 363.

2. See description in A.I. Soboleviki's Russian monogram, *Translated literature of Muscovian Russia*, St. Petersburg, 1903.

the start of the Latin tradition -- by an anonymous Italian in the thirteenth century, by Nicolas Oreme and by Peter of Candia¹. Of the many rehandlings and derivations of the *Secreta* and the testimonies to its influences, I should like to point in particular to its use by three English thinkers, all members of the university of Oxford; a use which may partly explain the later interest in vernacular versions in England. The three men are Bacon, Bradwardine and Wycliffe.

Bacon produced his own redaction of the *Secreta*, redividing the work into four books and adding a preface and interpretative notes. Bacon is particularly influenced by the final reviser's theoretical proem to the Discourse on the Occult. He therefore reasserts the validity of divination, and evolves the concept of a learned man who by the use of mathematics and medicine, opens the way to knowledge and to moral improvement. Through the theory of correspondences, the pre-conditioned factors of life could be manipulated by a magus-mathematician with immense practical power. Mr. Easton, in his monograph² draws from Bacon's general philosophy a picture corresponding to this picture deduced from his treatment of the *Secreta*: at the same time, Mr. Easton emphasizes the important rôle which an early reading of the *Secreta* played in the forming of Bacon's mind.

Bradwardine makes extensive use of our text in the *De causa Dei*, and defends the *Secreta* against those who doubt its authenticity. His references suggest that he is using Bacon's text. Only once or twice does he use the *Secreta* in discussing the problem of predestination and will; the other quotations from it -- and they are drawn from all the different layers of the *Secreta*, provide him with evidence that the pagan philosophers shared certain of the features of Christian metaphysics. That they believed in prophecy, the efficacy of prayer, the operation of miracles, eternal punishment and beatification, all are illustrated from the words of Aristotle in the *Secreta*, as given to him from out of neo-Platonism, and through Moslem formulae, and the syncretic theology of the *Ikhwān*.

1. See Cecioni's article in *Il Propugnatore*, NS II, 1889.

2. Stewart Easton, *Roger Bacon and his Search for a Universal Science*, Oxford, 1952.

The Vulgate text has one or two unimportant additions and omissions: the translation is, apart from one or two errors or over-specific terms, remarkably accurate for the most part, and is least clear where the Arabic itself, as a result of the accretions, is most confused. Many of the mss. referred to by Foerster reproduce parts of the text on their own: the task of tracing back these fragmentary versions, where they are embedded in fuller treatises, would be a hard one. *Cambridge Dd. iii, 16* — a fourteenth century manuscript — contains an abbreviation called *Conclusiones de secretis secretorum*; the mid-fourteenth century *BM. Royal ms. 6 E vi & vii* is an encyclopaedia, *Liber de Omni Bono*, compiled by Jacobus Anglicus. This is perhaps the Jacobus Anglicus who wrote the preface to the text of Ptolemy's *Cosmographia* in *MS. Vienna 3162*. His encyclopaedia is in alphabetical order and some of the articles consist entirely of the relevant passage from the *Secreta*: thus the article *Bellum* consists of the Discourse on *Warfare*. *Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal ms. 873* contains a Latin versified version of some of the practical instructions of the *Secreta*, with a poem which sums up some principles of mediaeval literary criticism. How far the *Secreta*, on one hand, influenced each of the many *fürstenspiegel* of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries — written in the wake of Giraldus Cambrensis, and, on the other, was used in the medical compilations which were issued under the name of the School of Salerno — is very difficult in most cases to tell: so uniform, continuous, and stereotyped are the traditions of medical manuals and of mirrors for princes. One example of a medical text which mentions the *Secreta* is the letter to Frederick II from Master Theodorus, another is the text which made its way into English in Caxton's translation under the title of *Governayle of Health*. A *fürstenspiegel* compiled in England, using the *Secreta* is Walter de Milemete's *De nobilitatibus, sapientis, et prudentis regum* presented to Edward III in the first year of his reign. This is a companion volume to Milemete's own redaction of the *Secreta* itself: a profusely illustrated ms. in which scarcely a statement in the text is not accompanied by a picture showing Aristotle and Alexander in the appropriate circumstances. Milemete adds a chapter on the marriage of kings — an early example of the tendency in English *fürstenspiegel* to fit general precept unashamedly to immediate and contingent needs.

One should perhaps point out that in spite of the wide currency of the work the authenticity of it was doubted by some persons even at

between Valence and Tripoli, for a 'John of Valentia' was canon of St. Michael of Tripoli in 1244, and Gerard, Bishop of Valence, became Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1226. If the dating of the first conception of Bacon's *De retardatione accidentium senectutis* around 1236 is correct, as this work shows a knowledge of the full *Secreta*, the years around 1220 to 1230 seem the more likely date for the translation.

The early history of the Latin text is obscure. The textual history is difficult to trace, for the text contains many doublets - a literal translation of the Arabic combined with a correct translation: for example, *... ترفع يدك من الأكل* ('withhold your hand from your food') is translated *manum erigere, id est, cessare*. In many mss. one or other alternative is given on its own in many cases. It can be recognized that these doublets develop out of the glossing of the translation, and a later incorporation of the glosses. The necessary hypothesis of lost glossed versions, from which the present variant readings derive, makes the ms. tradition an involved one. One or two older mss. and the lists of contents in others, suggest that Philippus translated the whole of the Long Form. But the Vulgate Latin version of Philippus forms the physiognomy into a tenth discourse, and, omitting portions of the Discourse on the Occult, places the remainder of it in Discourse II. Robert Steele's theory is that the *Secreta* was censored, as part of the revision of Aristotelian texts ordered in the thirteenth century. Certainly, Bacon explicitly states his awareness that the text has been expurgated. The portions omitted are mainly those dealing with onomancy. This form of divination seems to have been specifically forbidden by the Church in patristic days, and there is perhaps no need to look for a further explanation of the omissions. That it is highly probable that these portions were actually translated by Philippus, is lent support in an unexpected way. MS. *BM. Sloane* 213 contains a fourteenth-century English translation of the Physiognomy section, followed by a rehandled English form of the Calculation of Victory by onomancy. This may, of course, derive separately, through Latin, from an Arabic text in which this table occurs on its own, and *Sloane* 213 may have fortuitously recombined two portions of the *Secreta*. But this is unlikely, and it is more reasonable to assume that this English text is the sole evidence of a full Latin translation of the Discourse on Occult Sciences.

describe the qualities of a Ruler. The Shorter *Sirr* seems to have used the same gnomologium for its list of a Councillor's qualities. The *Iktwan* borrow Farābī's list for their definition of a prophet or religious leader. The reviser of the *Sirr* combines both of these two final forms. In this unfamiliar form, but with the content of Plato's thought quite visible, the *Secreta* brought to the Middle Ages this passage from the Republic.

In view of the important stratum of the contents of the *Secreta* that represents the medical-philosophical seam of Arab hellenism, it is fitting that the Discourse on Health should have been the first to have been translated into Latin. This partial translation by Johannes Hispalensis is almost certainly a product of Toledo in the mid-twelfth century. The work is written for a queen Tharasia, tentatively identified with Theresa, mother of the first King of Portugal; she was regent from 1112 to 1128. Johannes Hispalensis is a well-known name in the annals of Toledan translation, but there is now reason to suppose that the name and the works associated with it conceal a confusion between two different translators of the same period.

There is one English version, a fifteenth century translation, in MS. Bodley *Rawlinson C 83*; this follows the aphoristic tendency in that it tabulates the free discourse of the *Secreta* into fifteen points for the preservation of health. The full translation of Philippus Tripolitanus incorporates parts of Hispalensis, even, at one point, inadvertently duplicating some of the matter of the *Secreta*. Since the *Secreta* appropriates to Aristotle much that belongs by right to the traditional figure of the medical teacher, it is only justice that a Provençal translation has attributed the *Secreta* to Galen; an attribution followed by Matfre Ermengau, who incorporates the section on seasonal diets into his *Breviari d'Amor*.

The precise date of the Philippus Tripolitanus version is uncertain. There was a Philip who was a canon of Tripoli between 1227 and 1251. The patron of the work, Guy de Vere of Valence, Bishop of Tripoli, is otherwise unknown, and must have held the see during one of those periods in the first half of the thirteenth century, for which the ecclesiastical lists of the Latin kingdoms of the Levant show gaps: the list of Bishops of Tripoli is defective for 1209—1217. There may have been some special connexion

In an roundabout way, and a greatly transformed shape, then, this passage of Greek verse entered the mediaeval corpus of knowledge through the action of an Arab reviser, who, no doubt because of the medical passages added to the *Secreta* by the earlier reviser, transferred to Aristotle the legends surrounding Aesclepius. These are by no means the only derivatives from classical literature which have contributed to the formation of the *Secreta*. The first three discourses owe a distant but recognizable debt to the *Nicomachean Ethics*, in their constant discussion of virtue as the mean between extremes, in the importance attached to liberality and noble-mindedness, in the threefold distinction of Justice : towards God, towards oneself, and towards fellowmen. The *Physiognomy* seems to derive from the Peripatetic *Physiognomy*, shorn of its theoretical augmentation. Aristotle's introduction partly resembles the introduction to the *De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. The medical passages have parallels in Celsus, Dioscles, and Oribasius. The list of the salient features of various animals resembles a passage in Galen's *De Moribus*, of which an Arabic version is now known. One ought to glance with slightly less hurry at two passages that appear to enter our text through traditional aphorisms which derive from Plato. At one point, the *Secreta* reads : 'He who belittles the divine law will be slain by the divine law'. This is found in an independent form in the *Ikhwan*, who call it a saying of Socrates made just before his death. Surely we are here faced with a distant echo, one might also say a schoolboy lecture note version, of the arguments of Socrates in the *Crito* ?

The fifteen qualities of a Councillor, given in the Long Form, can be seen to derive from the fifteen in the Short Form, modified by a similar list of twelve qualities which occurs, independently, but clearly from the same ultimate source, in the *Ikhwan*. The form in the *Ikhwan* corresponds verbally to a list given by al-Farabi in his *أهل المدينة الفاضلة*. A less formally tabulated version of this list of qualities occurs in another of al-Farabi's works, *Tahsil us-Sa'adah* where he claims to derive it from Plato's *Republic*. A collation of all the lists shows, indeed, that they are formalized and modified restatements of the passage in Book VI part ii of the *Republic* (Plato, 483, 486 and 487 A), where Socrates enumerates the qualities of the philosopher-king. In *Tahsil us-Sa'adah*, Farabi gives the list as that of qualities essential to a speculative philosopher; a more aphoristic form of the passage has been used by him, in his *al-Madinah al-Fadilah* to

Sirr, although no reference to the tomb itself is made in that passage. The apotheosis of Aristotle is recounted of Hermes and of Aesclepius in Ibn Abi Usaybi'ah, and can be traced back to the ancient medical-religious traditions surrounding Aesclepius. The collection of Testimonies to the worship of Aesclepius, made by Professor and Mrs. Edelstein¹, show that the Church Fathers found in the worship of the man-God Aesclepius a particularly stubborn rival, and an outwardly close parallel, to the Gospel. It is therefore ironical to find that, in the Latin ms. tradition of the *Secreta* a significant slip has sometimes altered this legend in such a way as to create a parallel, no longer between Aesclepius and God the Son, but between Aristotle and the Holy Ghost. The 'column of light' (نور in the Arabic) first became *columna ignis* (نار), then in some mss., *columba ignis*, causing Aristotle, in some English versions, to 'ascend to heaven in the shape of a dove of fire'.

The message of God to Aristotle is of greater interest. Again, it is told by Ibn Abi Usaybi'ah of Aesclepius. The Arabic writer claims to be quoting Galen's *Protreptikos*. This text does indeed mention the apotheosis of Aesclepius, but this passage must have become confused with another passage only a few lines below, which concerns, not Aesclepius but Lycurgus. It must first be borne in mind that *angel* (ملاك) is the normal translation of *theos* in the Arabic hellenistic tradition. The passage in question consists of the well-known lines of verse with which the Pythoness of the Delphic Oracle addressed Lycurgus, and which are found in Herodotus, in the *Anthology*, and in Diodorus Siculus, and are referred to by Plutarch :

Thou comest, O Lycurgus, to my rich temple, dear
to Zeus and to all the dwellers on Olympus. I am at a loss
whether I shall proclaim thee to be a god or a man, but I deem
thee rather a god, O Lycurgus².

1. L. and E. J. Edelstein, *Aesclepius*; 2 vols, Baltimore, 1945.

2. Ἡκεῖς ὦ Λυκόργε ἐμὸν ποτε πλοῦτα νηὸν,
Ζητῆ φίλος καὶ πᾶσιν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσι.
δίξω, ἢ σε θεὸν μαντεύσομαι, ἢ ἄνθρωπον.
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον θεὸν ἔλπομαι, ὦ Λυκόργε.

of the *Secreta* was more purely a book of advice for princes, to which this reviser has given the additional status of a practical manual for all educated men. Whether the original eight discourses truly had an origin in another language, it is not possible to tell. It is possible to assert, though, that they contain no detail that could not have been in a Syriac or Byzantine work: where the work discusses the merits of Indian and Turkish soldiers, these names may replace others in a pre-Arab original. The attribution of the work to Yahya ibn-Bitriq may certainly be doubted, but Dr. Badawi's discovery of a reference to it in Ibn Jaljal's *Tabaqat ul-Atibba'*, written before 370 A.H./980 A.D., gives us the *terminus ad quem*.

The proem itself shows signs of a process of accretion. The recommendation of Aristotle, and the letters exchanged between him and Alexander are not translated in the fragmentary twelfth-century Latin of Johannes Hispalensis, which reproduces the Health *bab* of the Short Form, preceded by the Proem. The wording of this Arabic text itself, if these passages are omitted, gives a continuous introductory explanation by the alleged Arabic translator, which is otherwise interrupted to introduce them. What is more, both passages are found elsewhere in the Arabic and Syriac aphoristic tradition.

The exchange of letters is quoted in the *Yaqd ul Farid*, a tenth century work, and in the collection of aphorisms attributed to the ninth-century Hunayn ibn Ishaq. One sentence is even repeated elsewhere in the text of the *Secreta*, unnoticed by the reviser of the proem. This, and another similar passage, suggest that the *Secreta* itself is a compilation based upon the aphoristic collections which were popular in Greek, Syriac and Latin. The quasi-religious myths about Aristotle have parallels - sometimes closely verbal ones - yet they are connected not with Aristotle but, for the most part, with Aesclepius. Although these analogues are mainly in a text later than the *Sirr*, the biographical dictionary of the thirteenth-century *Ibn Abi Usaybi'ah*, they can be seen to preserve an earlier form of the tradition. The 'pyramid' beneath which Aristotle is buried, according to the Long Form, is simply a 'tomb' in the Short Form, and the reference is no doubt to the supposed octagonal tomb which he was believed to have designed for himself. The legendary inscription was a set of eight precepts on rule, each connected with the next in a circular series. This is found in Arabic texts, and is actually in the main body of the

such as the anecdote of the Jew and the Magus, the neo-platonic introduction to the discourse on councillors, the latter part of the health section, and most of the occult sciences, do not appear.

The Short Form must almost certainly be the older form. The Long Form contains one or two obvious lacunae where the Short Form has a full and intelligible text: the Long Form omits names which are unfamiliar; thus an unidentifiable Greek philosopher *Baktam* in the short form becomes merely 'a certain ancient philosopher'. Furthermore, a considerable number of the passages which are in the Long Form alone occur verbatim in the *Encyclopaedia* of the *Ikhwan us-Safa'*, written in the second half of the tenth century: this is a fact that Dr. Badawi has not noted.

Many of the borrowed passages provide the theoretical introduction to the Discourses. The impression one obtains of the reviser who incorporated the *Ikhwan* passages is that of an intelligent compiler, who wishes to give unity and form, as well as a definite metaphysical background, to the *Secreta*. He was a man of some literary taste, for he took the four passages on the diet to be observed in each season, and prefaced each with the descriptive passages which the *Ikhwan us-Safa'* had reproduced no less than three times in their *Encyclopaedia*. His addition of medical passages and occult ones shows him to have been equally anxious to enhance the alleged practical value of the treatise. He is responsible, incidentally, for references to Persian intercalary days and musical intervals, which later, as the Plotinian passage does, give considerable trouble in the European translations. This reviser must have worked before the year 516 A.H. (1122 A.D.) for a portion of the Long Form occurs in the *Siraj ul Muluk* of *Ibn Abi Randaqa al-Turtushi*, completed in that year. *Hajji Khalifah*, the bibliographer, refers twice to the *Secreta*, not noting that the two different mss. he saw belonged to the same work. In one reference, to a ten-discourse ms., he attributes it to one al-Yamuni or al-Tamimi. It is possible that this may be the name of the creator of the Long Form.

Taking the Short Form, we can deduce from the way in which *Dabs* are not mentioned in the table of contents, and the fact that they differ so considerably in matter from the eight discourses, that they too are probably the addition of an earlier reviser, and that the earliest form

Very soon after its appearance, the Latin text is made use of, as we shall see, by Roger Bacon. Albertus Magnus refers to the *Secreta*, and Michael Scot appears to be following it in his *Physiognomy*, that is, in the *De secretis naturae*.

It is cited by Bradwardine, and extensive use is made of it in the Wycliffian text *De officiis regis*. Advice from it is imbedded in the *Siete Partidas*, which were to become part of the law code of Castille, and of parts of the American continent, including Louisiana at as late a date as 1819. The *Secreta* is quoted, in support of his political position, by Prince Kurbski in the correspondence he had with Ivan the Terrible, after Kurbski had fled from the Tsar. Among English kings, we know that copies of the *Secreta*, portions of it, or works partly based upon it, were presented to Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V (while yet Prince of Wales) and, towards the end of the tradition, to Edward VI and James I.

There is, then, sufficient sign in these, the more striking indications of its celebrity, to show that it is of some importance in the tradition of the theory and practice of government, of philosophy, alchemy, and physiognomy. Further uses show that the text can also be seen to be connected with such a diversity of trends and traditions as : the Alexander-legend, the gnomic tradition of aphorisms and anecdotes, and the opposite tendency, towards compiling encyclopaedias and *summas* of knowledge, medical-philosophical beliefs, mediaeval neo-Platonism, the description of the seasons in poetry, the rise of the vernacular treatise-poem, and the rise of the vernacular prose of secular instruction.

Dr. Badawi's edition of the Arabic *Sirr ul Asrar* naturally reproduces the final form from which it was translated by Philippus Tripolitanus in the early thirteenth century. We can make some attempt to surmise how the book came to take this form in Arabic. There are over 40 mss. of the Arabic. Only one claims a date (the eleventh century) earlier than the Latin translation, and Flügel, cataloguing it for the Vienna library, claims the early date of this ms. to be a fabrication. The mss. show two recensions : a Long Form and a Short. The Short Form differs from the Long in containing only eight discourses, the section on secretaries and on governors being called *Bābs* (أبواب). The *bābs* on Physiognomy and on Health appear after the discourse on warfare. Many passages,

Much of the early scholarship that has been directed towards the *Secreta* has approached it obliquely, with some end in view to which the main course of its history has only been incidental. A great deal of the work, including my own, has started from the wrong end, leaving the basic tasks yet undone. Thus the first version of the *Secreta* to be edited by a modern scholar was the Middle Dutch version of Jacob van Maerlant, edited by Clarisse in the 1830s. In his edition of Roger Bacon's works, Robert Steele, in 1920, published a Latin text, and a modern English translation from the Arabic, by an Egyptian named Ismail Ali, whom I have not been able to trace further.

Richard Foerster listed the mss. and printed texts of the *Secreta* in a monograph published in 1889, but no satisfactory collation of the Latin mss. has been attempted. An Arabic text was published by Dr. Abdel Rahman Badawi in 1954, in an edition that still leaves something to be desired¹, but for which as a basis of study, one must be very grateful.

In this general survey, I attempt to indicate the points of contact, as it were, between the text of the *Secreta* and a number of general themes both of Arab hellenism and of the Western mediaeval tradition.

It would be as well first to assure ourselves that the *Secreta* is important enough to deserve further study. To take the European tradition alone, its credentials as a semi-popular work attributed to Aristotle are revealed to be very honourable. It entered Latin in its full form not long after 1200; Foerster lists 207 mss. of the full Latin translation, extant in Western European libraries, and this number does not include several that have since been catalogued. The number does not include, either, the mss. of the earlier partial translation : of these, 62 are listed.

There are more than half a dozen early printed editions of the work. The lists of vernacular translations is impressive. In English there are twenty texts, or portions of texts, which can be called translations or adaptations of the *Secreta* : the dates range from 1390 to 1702. Statistically, then, there is no doubt of its importance.

1. Vol. I of *الأسس اليونانية للنظريات العلمية في الإسلام* ; Cairo.