Additional note

After having prepared the final version of the above I have now received Jacques Sesiano's newly published edition of the *Liber mahamaleth (The* Liber mahamaleth: *A Twelfth-Century Mathematical Treatise*. Heidelberg etc.: Springer, 2014). As it turns out, the main argument for ascribing the text to John of Seville (p. xix) is a reference in a fifteenth-century abbacus manuscript to the author as *Ispano*, "Spaniard/Spanish", which is taken to be a mistake for *Hispalensis*, "Sevillan", but might just as well mean what is says and refer to Gundisalvi or any other Spanish writer. The phrases shared with the *Liber algorismi* are also taken note of on the same page as a supplementary argument, while those shared with Gundisalvi are interpreted as evidence for use by the latter of the *Liber mahamaleth* (p. lx). Gundisalvi's reference to "the book which in Arabic is called *Mahamalech*" is interpreted, against normal usage, as "the book which is called, in Arabic manner, mahamaleth" (Sesiano corrects Baur's edition tacitly – cf. above, note 9).

It is admitted on p. xix that there are some problems in the ascription – that the style does not fit other writings ascribed to John of Seville, and that a work supposedly written in Muslim Spain and then going to Toledo together with its author seems curiously unfinished. Beyond the troublesome interpretation of *arabice* as "in Arabic manner", however, one decisive difficulty is disregarded: that the *Liber mahamaleth*, originally written in Arabic surroundings (Sesiano, p. xviif) already makes use of what was to become the standard Latin algebraic terminology (*res, census*), while the short algebraic section of the *Toledan regule*, which must have been written when John was already working in a latin environment, does not know it (see above, note 27); Sesiano mentions this presentation of algebra on p. xiv, but says nothing more.

In consequence, there seems to be no reason to change the above conclusion, that is, that the *Liber mahamaleth* was originally an Arabic composition, and that it was translated rather freely by Gundisalvi or somebody close to him.