The article by J.F. Meirinhos, *Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis? Elementos para uma diferenciação de autores*, together with my own paper *Petrus Hispanus O.P., auctor Summularum* have put an end, in my view definitively, to a tradition which arose during the Renaissance and was furthered in the twentieth century by the work of Martin Grabmann. In this tradition, there has been a tendency to regard any work attributed to someone by the name of “Petrus Hispanus” as the work of a single author, who is identified as being “Petrus Juliani”, Pope John XXI. A major *Corpus* has come to be attributed to this author, encompassing works about logic and theology, medicine and natural philosophy, *bullae* and sermons, and even works on alchemy and mathematics. As a result of this, John XXI has come to figure as an eminent intellectual of the thirteenth century, almost comparable with St Albert the Great or St Thomas Aquinas.

Although some earlier studies brought to light the doctrinal inconsistency between some of the works included in the *Corpus* ascribed to John XXI, before the publication of J.F. Meirinhos’s article attempts were made to explain this inconsistency by recourse to a supposed development in the thought of “Petrus Hispanus” which ran parallel to the gradual reception of Greek and Arab medicine and Aristotle’s thought; or by denying the authenticity of the attribution to “Petrus Hispanus”. Meirinhos was the
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1 *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval*, 3 (1996), 51-76. In this study, Meirinhos argues for the existence of at least three “Petrus Hispanus”, among whom the works previously attributed to John XXI ought to be redistributed. However, Meirinhos would seem to be having some doubts regarding his earlier conclusions, albeit more in connection with issues in Portuguese cultural politics than with questions concerning the specific problem of “Petrus Hispanus” (see P. Calafate (ed.), *Historia do Pensamento Filosófico Português*, vol. I, Idade Média, Lisbon 1999, 364).

first to propose explicitly the need to recognise the existence of several “Petrus Hispanus” and to divide the works that make up this Corpus accordingly. Meirinhos argues that it is necessary to distinguish at least three “Petrus Hispanus”: “Petrus Hispanus O.P.”, “Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis” and “Petrus Hispanus medicus”. My own article went along the same lines, arguing for the need to distinguish “Petrus Hispanus O.P.”, the “auctor Summularum”, from “Petrus Juliani”, Pope John XXI (who, paradoxically, would seem never to have been known as “Petrus Hispanus” until the works of the various genuine “Petrus Hispanus” began to be attributed to him; John XXI not only acquired other scholars’ works, but also their name).

In my view, the publication of these two articles has prepared the way towards a better understanding of the works grouped together in this Corpus and the complex relations between them, one which does not rule out the existence of developments and false attributions, but which no longer presupposes a need to seek consistency within the ideas contained therein. None the less, the results of the two studies have been mainly negative in character, and have left research into “Petrus Hispanus” bereft of the necessary precise biographical or chronological references that might enable us to examine these works in their strict historical context. These articles give explicit expression to the problems that were latent, but fail to provide fresh documents which could enable us to respond to the problems that arise as a result of the new situation. We know hardly anything about the biographical itineraries of these different “Petrus Hispanus”, or about the relations between them. Nor should we assume that they are all thirteenth-century works or authors: we are probably looking at a group of writers and writings scattered across a period of two hundred years, from the second half of the twelfth century to the first half of the fourteenth century.

It is therefore now necessary to undertake fresh research to reconstruct the biographical profiles of the various “Petrus Hispanus” and seek criteria
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3 In my view, the division proposed by Meirinhos is still insufficient: rather than being the division of a species into its lower individuals, his division resembles the division of a genre into species: there are several “Petrus Hispanus O.P.”, several “Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis” and several “Petrus Hispanus medicus”; “Petrus Juliani”, Pope John XXI, can certainly not be identified with “Petrus Hispanus O.P.”, nor, to my mind, with “Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis” or “Petrus Hispanus medicus”, to whom some manuscripts refer. In my opinion, the names “Petrus Hispanus medicus” or “Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis” are intended precisely to distinguish these “Petrus Hispanus” from “Petrus Hispanus O.P.”, who is “Petrus Hispanus” par excellence, while Pope John XXI would always have been called “Petrus Juliani” and not “Petrus Hispanus”. If this hypothesis is accepted, then this would indicate that “Petrus Hispanus O.P.” predates all the other “Petrus Hispanus”.