

Medieval Academy of America

Further Consideration of the Experimenta, Speculum Astronomiae, and De Secretis Mulierum
Ascribed to Albertus Magnus

Author(s): Lynn Thorndike

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Jul., 1955), pp. 413-443

Published by: Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2848079>

Accessed: 13/08/2010 10:39

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=medacad>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Medieval Academy of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE *EXPERIMENTA*,
SPECULUM ASTRONOMIAE, AND *DE SECRETIS*
MULIERUM ASCRIBED TO ALBERTUS
MAGNUS¹

BY LYNN THORNDIKE

THE purpose of this paper is threefold: to show that the *Experimenta* or *Secreta Alberti* (I use the former title the more clearly to distinguish the work from *De secretis mulierum*) are in part but only in part by Albertus Magnus; to discuss a renewal — this time by Bernhard Geyer — of the attempt to prove that the *Speculum astronomiae* is not by Albertus Magnus; and to note some rather miscellaneous points with reference to text and commentary, manuscripts and editions, of *De secretis mulierum*.

In the *Experimenta*, current in manuscripts² and printed editions under the name of Albertus Magnus, in the case of its second book upon the virtues of stones, some thirty-seven out of its forty-three or forty-four stones³ are found

¹ These works have been previously discussed by me in *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 692–750, Chapters lxii and lxiii.

² To MSS of *Experimenta* listed *ibid.*, 746–748, there may be added: Copenhagen Gl.kgl.S. 1658, 4to, paper, 15th century, fols. 76–83: “*Experimenta parva naturalia Magni Alberti. Sicut dicit philosophus in pluribus locis, Omnis scientia est de genere bonorum . . . / . . . voluntatem expedirent, exsequerentur et effectum.*”

Escorial O.III.30, 16th century, fol. 69–(77r), *Tractatus de secretis naturae et herbarum virtutibus lapidum et animalium*.

London, British Museum, Harley 2378, fols. 325–349, *Secreta fratris Alberti de Colonia ordinis fratrum predicatorum*.

Padua, Antoniana XXIII, 616, 17th century, *Liber secretorum*: incipit, “*Sicut vult Philosophus in pluribus locis . . .*”; explicit, “*Albertus Magnus de proprietatibus herbarum, lapidum et animalium quorundam explicat.*”

Vatican Latin 4482, paper, 15th century, fols. 79r–89v: heading, “*De virtutibus herbarum lapidum et animalium secundum Albertum de Sasonia (sic) per me Petrum Iacobum de la Pruffa(?) scriptus*”; incipit, “*Sicut dicit Aristoteles in pluribus locis, Omnis scientia de genere bonorum est . . .*”; explicit, “*. . . agnoscerent et custodirent in supradictis voluntatem exequerentur. Finis tractatus Alberti de Sasonia scriptum per me Petrum Iacobum de la Paffa anno domini M^o CCCC^o xlviii^o.*” To the usual sixteen herbs is added a paragraph on *Boviscum* or *Lunaria*. Only thirty-three stones are considered, but eighteen animals as usual.

Vatican Latin 4864: already described in *Isis*, XIII (1929), 57, note 13. Columbia University, Special Collections, has a photostat of fols. 1r–17r.

Vatican Latin 5370, Albertus Magnus de herbis, lapidibus et animalibus.

Vatican Palat. Lat. 1144, fifteenth century, fols. 74r–78v: *Experimenta Alberti*. “*Omnis scientia est de genere bonorum . . . / . . . quin aliquid utilitatis eveniat. Hec sunt lecta fratris Alberti Coloniensis.*”

Vatican Palat. Lat. 1948, fol. 457, Alberti Coloniensis Ord. Praed. *Secreta*.

Zurich C. 150, fifteenth century, fols. 66r–67v, presumably incomplete: “*Incipit tractaculus magistri Alberti de virtutibus herbarum et membrorum animalium. Prima herba dicitur elitropia . . .*”

³ This reckoning is based on the MSS of the work: see *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 727, note 3. The edition of 1740 lists 46 stones.

in the alphabetical list of ninety-six stones in Albertus Magnus, *Libri V Mineralium*, Liber II, Tractatus ii. Moreover, in practically every one of these 37 instances, the account of the stone's virtues as given in the *Experimenta* is taken almost verbatim from Albert's aforesaid work, the divergences being hardly greater than one might expect to find in two different manuscripts of the same text. This may be illustrated by use of the parallel column method for the gems Eliotropia, Epistrites, Chalcedonius and Celidonium, adding in the case of Ophthalmius a passage from a third work on precious stones which cites the *Experimenta* for it.⁴

Eliotropia

Mineralium, II, ii*Experimenta*, ed. 1740, p. 137

Eliotropia lapis est viridis fere smaragdo similis, respersus sanguineis guttis. Hunc eliotropiam dicunt esse vocatum necromantici, qui est gemma Babylo-nensis: quia si ungetur succo herbae eiusdem nominis et in vas aqua plenum remissus, facit sanguineum solem videri sicut si pateretur eclipsim.

Si vis ut sol appareat sanguineus, accipe lapidem qui Eliotropia dicitur, et est viridis similis quasi Smaragdo, et est respersus sanguineis guttis. Hanc Eliotropiam appellant Necromantici proprio nomine gemmam Babylo-nicam, quod si ungetur succo herbae eiusdem nominis et in vas plenum aqua mittatur, facit videri solem sanguineum, sicut si videretur eclipsis.

Cuius causa est: quia totam aquam ebullire facit in nebulam quae inspissando aerem impedit solem videri nisi quasi in rubore et spissa nube rorando: postmodum autem descendit illa nebula rorando sicut per guttas pluviae.

Cuius causa est quod totam aquam ebullire facit in nebulam quae inspissando aerem impedit solem, inde (*sic*) nisi quia rubeum in spisso colore: post modicum recedit illa nebula rotando quasi per guttas pluviae.

Oportet autem quod quodam carmine sacratus sit et quibusdam characteribus mixtus: et si tunc arreptitii praesentes sint, divinando quaedam praedicunt: propter quod templorum pontifices isto lapide utebantur et maxime in festis idolorum.

Oportet autem ad (*p. 138*) hoc ut fiat, quod sit quoddam carmen sacrum cum quibusdam characteribus, et sicut accipi, Principes divinando quaedam praedicant, propter quod templorum Pontifices isto lapide maxime utebantur in festis idolorum.

⁴ I quote from *Libri V Mineralium* as contained in *B. Alberti Magni Ratisbonensis episcopi, ordinis praedicatorum, Opera omnia*, ed. Aug. Borgnet Paris, v (1890); and the *Experimenta* from *Alberti Magni De secretis mulierum libellus, scholiis auctus et a mendis repurgatus. Eiusdem de virtutibus herbarum, lapidum, et animalium quorundam libellus. Item de mirabilibus mundi . . . Adjectum est . . . Michaelis Scoti, philosophi de secretis naturae opusculum . . .* Amstelodami, 1740. The latter edition will also be used later for *De secretis mulierum*, for which I have especially compared it with two earlier editions of 1490 and about 1530, found at the Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität Basel. Aside from small additions and omissions, minor variations, and careless misreadings, the texts in the 1740 edition seem roughly reliable continuations of the previous printed editions.

Dicitur autem reddere hominem
bonae famae et incolumen et
longae vitae, et contra fluxum
sanguinis et venerea valere.

Dicitur etiam
quod unctus herba sui nominis,
ut praediximus, visum fallit in
tantum ut hominem prohibeat videri.

Invenitur autem pluries in
Aethiopia, Cypro, et India.

Et jam gestatum hoc reddit hominem
bonae famae et incolumen et
longae vitae.

Dicitur autem a philosophis anti-
quis quod unctus herba sui nominis,
ut praediximus, pollet virtute,

et inveniuntur plures in
Aethiopia, Cypro et India.

Epistrites

Epistrites lapis est natus in
mari rutilans et rubicundus:

(see below)

in incantationibus autem et physi-
cis ligaturis^a dicitur, quod
ante cor gestatus, tutum hominem
servat et compescit seditiones et
compescere etiam dicitur locustas,
et volucres, et nebulas, et gran-
dinem et tempestates a fructibus
terrae compescere fertur.

Expertum etiam est, quod oppositus
oculo solis, ignem et radios
igneos emittit:

dicitur etiam
quod si hic lapis in aquam
ferventem projiciatur,
cessat ebullitio eius, et post-
modum frigescit.

Causa autem huius alia esse non
potest nisi quod pro certo frigi-
dissimus est: et motus a calore
bullientis aquae frigiditas suae
complexionis agere incipit.

(see above)

Si vis refrigerare aquam bulli-
entem quae stat super ignem.
Accipe lapidem qui Epistrites
dicitur, qui in aqua oppositus
oculo, Solis radios suos
igneos emittit:

et dicitur ab antiquis philoso-
phis et a modernis quod si pona-
tur in aqua bulliente, statim
cessabit ebullitio, et post
modicum refrigerescet,

Et est lapis rutilans et rubi-
cundus.

^a The allusion is to the *Epistola* of Costa ben Luca *de incantatione, adiuratione, colli suspensione* or *Liber de ligaturis physicis*.

Chalcedonius

Chalcedonius autem lapis est pallidus fuscus aliquantulum obscurus: hic si perforatur, et cum virtute lapidis qui sineris dicitur collo suspendatur, dicitur valere contra illusiones phantasticas ex melancholia exortas: facit etiam convincere causas,

et virtutes corporis conservat, et hoc ultimum est expertum.

Celidonium duas habet species. Unus est niger, alter rufus invenitur: trahuntur autem ambo de ventre hirundinis. Rufus autem involutus panno lineo vel corio vitulino et sub sinistra ascella gestatus, dicitur valere contra insaniam et antiquos languores

et lunaticam passionem.

Et Constantinus dicit eum valere contra epilepsiam praedicto modo gestatum.

Evax autem refert quod facundum gratum et placentem reddit.

Niger autem, ut Joseph dicit, contra nocivos humores et febres et iras operatur et minas. Et lotus aqua oculos sanat, ad finem etiam inceptum perducit negotium: et si involvatur foliis celidoniae herbae, dicitur offuscare visum.

Sunt autem hi lapides parvi valde et tales jam vidimus per socios nostros de stomacho hirundinum extractos in mense Augusti: tunc enim abstracti magis valere dicuntur: ut frequenter autem semper duo simul in una hirundine inveniuntur.

Si vis effugere illusiones omnesque phantasias, et omnes causas vincere. Accipe lapidem qui Chalcedonius dicitur, et est pallidus, fuscus et aliquantulum obscurus. Si hic perforatur, et cum virtute lapidis qui Seneribus dicitur, collo suspendatur, valet contra omnes phantasticas illusiones.

Et facit vincere omnes causas contra adversarios viresque corporis conservat, et hoc ultimum expertum est moderno tempore.

Celidonium

Si vis esse gratus et placens. Accipe lapidem qui Chelidonium dicitur. Et est niger et rufus, (p. 139) et de ventre hirundinum extrahitur. Rufus involutus panno lineo vel corio vituli, sub sinistra ascella portatus, valet contra insaniam et antiquos morbos et languores,

contra lethargicam passionem et contra epidemiam.

Evax refert quod iste lapis hominem facit facundum et gratum, et placentem eum reddit.

Niger autem valet contra feras, et iras, et ad finem incepti perducit negotii. Et si involvitur in foliis Chelidoniae, dicitur obfuscare visum

et debent extrahi mense Augusti,

et frequenter duo in una hirundine inveniuntur lapides.

Ophthalmius

Mineralium, II, ii, 13

Experimenta (1740), p. 132

Conradus, *De lapidibus pretiosis*, MS. Vienna 4401, fol. 213vb.

Si vis fieri invisibilis,
accipe lapidem qui dicitur
Ophthalmius, et involve
in folio lauri.

Ophthalmus lapis est
ab ophthalmia dictus:
cuius color non nominatur,
forte ideo quoniam
multorum est colorum.

Et dicitur lapis Ophthalmius,
cuius color non nominatur,
nam multorum colorum,

Dicit dominus Albertus
in suis experimentis
quod est multorum colorum,
et ideo color suus
non exprimitur
Et dicit idem dominus
Albertus quod si Ophthalmius
in filo-(sic) lauri reddit
tenentem invisibilem,
quia virtute sua visum
circumstantium execat.

Valere autem dicitur
gestanti contra omnes
malos morbos oculorum:
visus autem circumstantium
dicitur obcaecare:
et ideo etiam patronus
furum vocatur: gestantes
enim eum quasi invisibiles
redduntur.

et est hic talis virtutis,
quod visus circumstantium
excaecat vel abortat.

Constantinus autem pugno
clauso reddebatur per eum
invisibilis.

Et addit quod Constantinus
pugno clauso optalium tenuit
et per eum invisibilis
reddebatur.

On the other hand, in the case of the first book of *Experimenta* on the virtues of some sixteen herbs and its third book on the virtues of some eighteen animals, there is almost no resemblance between any of its accounts and those of the same plants and animals in the alphabetical lists of trees and plants in the sixth book of Albert's *De vegetabilibus et plantis*, or of particular quadrupeds, birds, aquatic animals, serpents and insects in Books 22–26 of his *De animalibus*.

One reason for this is that in *De vegetabilibus* Albert recounts only the medical virtues of herbs, while in *Libri V mineralium* he often gives the magical virtues of stones. In the case of animals, even where his ascription of virtues to them seems quite as superstitious as that in the *Experimenta*, as in the case of the lion, weasel and hoopoe, it is nevertheless totally different.

The first and third books of the *Experimenta* on herbs and animals first give the name in “Chaldean,” Greek and Latin,⁵ which is not the case in the second book on stones, each of which is introduced by the words, “If you wish . . .” to accomplish this or that marvel.⁶ Perhaps the intention in this is to imitate Di-

⁵ Except in the case of *Experiolus*, *Anguilla*, *Mustela*, *Corvus*, *Talpa* and *Merula* under animals. The spelling of the “Chaldean” and “Greek” names varies greatly in the manuscripts and editions.

⁶ In the manuscripts there is sometimes an introductory or transitional sentence before the first stone which does not appear in the edition of 1740: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Digby 153, fourteenth century, fol. 176r, “Et quia magnes inter alios multum est famosus et a modernis coztatus(?) et maxime a nautis . . .”

In MS. Sloane 351, fols. 25ra–38rb, at the British Museum, the account of animals breaks off with “De anguilla” at fol. 34rb. Then come recipes for waters (“Si quis aquam vite facere voluerit . . .”;

oscorides or the *Herbarium* of the pseudo-Apuleius. But the Greek names are quite erroneous. Thus it is said that among the Greeks *mutuchiol* (marichiol, etc.) is the name for the Latin *eliotropia*. Then it is immediately added that the latter word comes from *elyos*, meaning sun, and *tropos*, meaning to turn. Both are of course Greek and not Latin words.

In the case of animals there is at times a superficial initial likeness between *Experimenta* and *De animalibus*. Albertus Magnus sometimes opened his account of an animal by stating that it was well known.⁷ In the *Experimenta* this opening was adopted for everyone of its eighteen animals, with addition of the word, *satis*, to *nota* or *notum* for the sake of further emphasis. This sounds like an attempt to imitate the style of *De animalibus*, but it is overdone, since the accounts of most of the eighteen animals open differently in *De animalibus*.⁸

The introduction to *Experimenta* states that use has been made of *Kiranides* and Alcorath. In treating of the camel and the pelican there is further citation of Hermes in the book Alcorath.⁹ *Kiranides*, which was translated into Latin in the twelfth century, is concerned chiefly with animals, its second, third and fourth books dealing respectively with quadrupeds, birds and fish. Only in its first book on Elements is there listed under each letter of the alphabet an herb and a stone as well as a bird and a fish. It therefore might seem probable that the compiler of the *Experimenta* drew on *Kiranides* for animals, as he did on Albertus for stones. But actually there is no textual identity between the accounts of animals in the *Experimenta* and in the last three books of *Kiranides*. Different parts of the animal are employed in every instance, and the virtues attributed to these are chiefly medical in *Kiranides* and primarily magical in *Experimenta*.¹⁰

fol. 35rb, "Si vis facere aquam ad deaurandum ferrum . . .") and an *oleum benedictum* (fol. 35va), which are not found in the edition of 1740. But at fol. 38rb we read, ". . . Item valet nefriticis, si ex eo renes frequenter ungantur ad ignem. Expliciu[n]t experimenta Alberti." The writer then adds that, because in what preceded no mention was made of the wolf and its properties and virtues, he will add what Albertus says of that animal "in libro XII (xxii?) de animalibus." After which at fol. 40ra, we again have the rubric, "Expliciu[n]t experimenta Alberti."

⁷ *De animalibus libri XXVI nach der Cölnher Urschrift*, herausgegeben von Hermann Stadler, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, xv–xvi (1916–1920): xvi, 1408, "Lepus notum est animal"; 1414, "Mustela est animal notum"; 1501"; "Milvus avis est nota"; 1511, "Turtur avis est nota"; 1513, "Upupa avis est nota."

⁸ Such is the case for *bubo*, *camelus*, *corvus*, *foca*, *leo*, *merula*, *talpa*, and *turtur*.

⁹ Ed. of 1740, p. 148, "Et hoc dicitur in libro Alcorath ab Hermete"; in MS Digby 37, fourteenth century, fol. 53r, "libro alkorat et Hermetis et Ptholomei"; ed. 1740, p. 150, "Et hoc testatur Hermes in libro Alchorat et Plinius"; Digby 37, fol. 54r, "hoc testatur Hermes in libro alkorat et Tholomeus." Vatican Latin 4864, fol. 1ra, "ex kiranidibus libris et libro alaroth"; fol. 9ra, "et hoc habetur in libro alcorat ad Hermetem pro tolemeo"; fol. 10ra, "et hoc atestatur hermes in libro alcori et tholomey."

In one MS of *Kiranides*, of the sixteenth century, it is true, the name of the author is given as Alchiranus: Venice, S. Marco VI.201 (Valentinelli XIV, 37), fols. 11–73.

¹⁰ I have used the 1169 Latin translation of *Kiranides* in the critical edition by L. Delatte, *Textes latins et vieux français relatifs aux Cyranides* (Liège, 1942). As there is no index, I give its pages for the animals corresponding to those treated in *Experimenta*: *Upupa*, 47–49; *Mustela*, 102–104; *Camelus*, 112–113; *Lepus*, 117–119; *Hircus*, 129–130; *Talpa*, 140–142; *Aquilla*, 142–147; *Bubo*, 152; *Corvus*, 158; *Pellicanus*, 170; *Turtur*, 172; *Anguilla*, 185; *Phoca*, 201–202. Usually the accounts are much longer than those in *Experimenta*; but in the cases of *Bubo*, *Corvus*, and *Turtur* are shorter.

The first book of *Kiranides* is more magical than the other three and in a general way is much the same sort of work as the *Experimenta*. It gives the names in Greek and Latin, as the other does in Chaldean, Greek and Latin; it often calls the thing in question *omnibus nota*, as *Experimenta* says *satis nota*. It indulges in mixtures and ceremony. Its aims are sometimes magical as well as medical, and its methods are usually magical. But it does not consider the same herbs, and in only a few instances the same animal or stone. In those few cases there is no particular agreement, as may be shown by the accounts of the hoopoe, seal and kite: first from *Experimenta*, then from *Kiranides*.

Upupa

Upupa est avis satis nota, a Chaldaeis Bori dicta, a Graecis Ison. Oculi eius gestati faciunt hominem grossum, et si oculi eius ferantur coram pectore, omnes eius inimici pacificabuntur, et si caput eius in bursa tua habueris, non poteris decipi ab aliquo mercatore. Hoc autem expertum est a fratribus nostris hodie. (Edition of 1740, p. 150)

Animal est in aere volans quod vocatur epops, id est upupa, septicolor regnum habens in capite altitudine digitorum ii, quod aperitur et contrahitur. Ipsum autem est quattuor colorum, ut sit dicere ad quattuor tempora anni. Haec avis vocatur cucufas, sicut scriptum est de ea in priori libro qui vocatur archaicus. Est autem hoc animal sacrum. Accipe ergo hanc avem et discerpe eam et ea palpitante degluti cor eius versus solem in initio horae primae vel octavae, die Saturni, luna orientali existente; et superbibe lac vaccae nigrae cum modico melle ex compositione; vide ut sanum et integrum transglutias cor. Et eris praescius quae in caelo et quae in terra et quicquid in anima habet quis, aut quicquid in climatibus et civitatibus fit et ventura omnibus hominibus.

Erit autem mellis compositio haec: mellis cotyla i et magnetis viventis triti unciae ii et herbae yringii corda, id est cymae, vii; haec contrita confice cum melle.

Habeas et alium magnetem in quo sculptus sit cucufas, id est upupa, quem oportet in mellis compositione intingi. Cum autem volueris praescire aliquid, praegusta cum uno digito et appone sculptum lapidem magnetem circa collum, et praescies quicquid volueris.

Si autem et aliud cor et iecur cucufae mittes in confectione, melius erit, quoniam memorabilem te faciet.¹¹ (*Kiranides*, 1942, pp. 47-48)

Phoca

Foca est piscis satis notus, a Chaldaeis Daulaubur, a Graecis Labor dicitur. Hic piscis est diversae naturae. Si enim lingua eius accipiat, et cum aliquantulo de corde eius in aqua ponatur, pro certo congregabuntur ibi pisces. Et si sub ascella portaveris, nullus iudicio contra te victoriam habere poterit, iudicem benignum et suavem habebis. (Ed. 1740, p. 149).

Accipe ergo phoci marini piscis pilos qui sunt inter nares et os et lapidem iaspidem viridem et cor et epar upupae et radiculam paeoniae et semen herbae peristereae, id est columbariae, et mundanum sanguinem chrysanthemii, id est succum herbae plumariae vel sticados, et extremitatem cordis phocae piscis, insuper autem et coronam capitis upupae; melius est si habueris de omnibus praedictis speciebus. Quae cum modico musci involve cum thymiamate quattuor specierum et mitte in corio ichneumonis aut phocae aut cervi aut vulturis et porte caste.

Si autem et deauraveris exterius, melius erit: acquies enim quaecumque volueris, amatus

¹¹ In *De mirabilibus mundi*, ascribed to Albertus Magnus, an almost contrary effect is attributed to suspension of parts of the hoopoe: Et si suspenditur cor Upupae aut oculus, aut cerebrum supra se ad collum suum, confert oblivioni et subtilizat intellectum hominis. (Edition of 1740, p. 186).

a viris et mulieribus, apparebis autem et reverendus, pacificus et quietus: feras domabis et inimicos reprimes. Si autem et lupi oculum dextrum mittes in praedictis et feres, vinces omnes per omnia et acquires, fugient et daemonia et ferae et eris felicissimus et sanus ac illaesus omnino.

Ego autem et coagulum phocae permiscui et vincebam omnes inimicos meos et invincibilis eram. Qui autem portaverit hoc phylacterium habebit a Deo bona quae non speraverit et honoratus erit ubique vicens omnes sermone et opere, eripiens ab omni periculo et daemone et veneficio et omni malitia; et ut universaliter dicam, omnia mala avertit et bona confert. (*Kiranides*, 1942, p. 50).¹²

Milvus

Milvus est avis satis nota, a Chaldaeis Bificus, a Graecis Melos dicitur. Si caput eius accipiatur et feratur ante pectus, dat amorem et gratiam omnium hominum et mulierum. Si suspendatur ad collum gallinae, numquam cessabit decurrere donec deponat illud, et si ex eius sanguine inungatur crista galli, de caetero non cantabit. In genibus eius invenitur quidam lapis, si inspicitur subtiliter, qui si ponatur in cibo duorum inimicorum, fient amici, et erit optima pax inter eos. (*Experimenta*, 1740, p. 151).

Ictis volucris, id est milvus Ictis avis nota omnibus In iaspide autem sculpe milvum dilaniantem serpentem et sub lapide pone lapidem de capite iulidis et reclude: da portare in pectore: omnem enim dolorem stomachi fugabit et appetitum comedendi et bonam digestionem praestabit. Habet autem et alias virtutes; portetur tantum in pectore.¹³ (*Kiranides*, 1942, pp. 54–55)

Since in books two, three and four *Kiranides* often gives the virtues for a number of parts of the animal in question, it might almost seem that *Experimenta* is purposely avoiding repetition of these and adding a sort of supplement to them. Or, since it asserts that it has made use of *Kiranides* and Alcorath, perhaps it had access to a fuller text than that published by Delatte, and which contained its excerpts, which are not found in Delatte's edition.

The one point on which *Experimenta* covers the same ground as Delatte's text is also that where it alone coincides with *De animalibus* of Albertus Magnus, namely, the well known legend of the pelican and its young. But this legend any treatment of that bird would be almost certain to include.

Except for this legend of the pelican, the only close resemblance between the accounts of animals in *Experimenta* and the *Speculum naturale* of Vincent of Beauvais is in the case of the owl (*bubo*). Vincent cites *Physiologus* that its heart, placed on the left side of a sleeping woman, will make her tell all that she has done. In *Experimenta* is a similar statement that, if its heart and right foot are put on a sleeper, he will straightway tell you whatever he has done and whatever you ask of him. "And this has been tested by our brothers in modern times." Otherwise, there does not seem to be much resemblance between the *Experimenta* and either *Physiologus* or the Bestiaries or the *Speculum Naturale*. Vincent's accounts of animals, which bring together excerpts from many authorities, are much longer than those of *Experimenta*, but are largely devoted to their physical features, habits

¹² Also, at p. 82, under the letter, Phi: "Phoca, id est vitulus marinus piscis videlicet animal est marinum optimum, manus habens ut homo, faciem ut vitulus vel bos." Then at pp. 83–85, opening, "Phocae quoque pili qui sunt inter nares et os . . ." much the same passage is repeated as that quoted above.

¹³ This one feature of being worn on the breast the two passages do have in common.

and sagacity, with occasionally an additional sentence or chapter upon their medicinal virtues. Even when magical powers are attributed to them, these differ completely from those recounted in *Experimenta*, as may be illustrated again by the example of the hoopoe.

Speculum naturale, xvii, 148

. . . Cuius sanguine qui se inunxerit dormitum pergens daemones suffocantes se videbit. . . . Pitagoras in libro Romanorum: Sanguis upupae illitus homini dormienti daemoniaca gignit fantasmata. Pennae vero upupae positae super caput hominis sedant soda .i. dolorem capitis. Huius etiam lingua super illum suspensa qui multam oblivionem patitur ei confert. . . . Huius avis cor malefactoribus et incantatoribus valere dicitur.

Experimenta Alberti (1740), p. 150

Upupa est avis satis nota, a Chaldeis Bori dicta, a Graecis Ison. Oculi eius gestati faciunt hominem grossum, et si oculi eius ferantur coram pectore, omnes eius inimici pacificabuntur. Et si caput eius in bursa tua habueris, non poteris decipi ab aliquo mercatore; hoc autem expertum est a fratribus nostris hodie.

Vincent's treatment of herbs is entirely different from that of the *Experimenta*, and, although he takes up a large number, and the *Experimenta* only sixteen, I could not find all of these in his account. *Provincia*, *lingua canis*, and *serpentina* seemed missing.¹⁴

Another work from which the *Experimenta Alberti* might have been expected to have taken its account of eighteen animals is the *Liber sexaginta animalium* attributed to Rasis,¹⁵ especially since it too is primarily concerned with the virtues of the parts of animals and is cited in Albert's genuine *De animalibus*.¹⁶ Yet of its sixty or fifty-six animals only six are included in *Experimenta Alberti*, and in each of these cases the text is quite different. Moreover, as in the case of *Kiraniides*, not even the same parts of the animal are mentioned. Rasis treats of the virtues of many other parts of the lion, but not of its skin, flesh and eyes, as *Experimenta Alberti* does. The marrow, spittle, lung, teeth, milk and urine of the

¹⁴ I also failed to see a chapter on heliotrope but probably overlooked it, as Vincent would hardly have omitted it. I have used the Nürnberg, Koberger, 1486 edition of the *Speculum naturale* at the library of the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

¹⁵ Printed in the 1497 and 1500 editions of the *Opera* of Rasis. For an account of the treatise, see *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 762-63. Some MSS of it are:

Erfurt, Amplon. F. 244, early fourteenth century from Italy, fols. 193-143, "Liber Rasys philosophi Zaccariae (filii) de proprietatibus membrorum animalium, de utilitatibus et nocumentis eorum aggregatis ex dictis antiquorum et quod ipse et alii antiqui philosophi probaverunt." Incipit, "Verbum Aristotelis et Dyascoridis. In collo leonis . . ." Desinit, ". . . Explicunt secreta Rasys de proprietatibus animalium et membrorum eorum."

Prag 839, A.D. 1404, fols. 95-103, opening "Verbum Aristotelis et Diascoridis . . ."

Vatican Palatine Latin 1211, fifteenth century, fols. 66r-72v: "Incipit liber Galieni de animalibus et plantis De libro Rasis de animalibus rationalibus; Verbum Rasis a Dyascoridis est in collo leonis non est alique coniuncture . . . / . . . in quo terminatur Galeni sermo universalis de quadrupedibus quam universalis de volatilibus quam in animalibus rationalibus Rasis omnia hec post(?) describendo."

¹⁶ xxii, ii, 1 (pp. 1360, 1367 of Stadler's edition of 1916): "Alzabo ut in libro sexaginta Animalium dicitur, animal est multum valens medicinae . . ."; "Dicitur autem in libro sexaginta animalium quod caro canis calida est et sicca . . ."

camel engage the attention of Rasis; only its blood is used in *Experimenta*. Of the hare Rasis uses the flesh, blood, head, liver, excrement, teeth, gall and ashes; only its feet are utilized by *Experimenta*. And so with Corvus, Mustela and Upupa. So that it again almost seems that the compiler of *Experimenta* is purposely avoiding repetition of the other work and revealing new secrets or trying to do so.

The chief difference between the early manuscripts of *Liber aggregationis* or *Experimenta Alberti* or *Secreta Alberti* and the printed editions is in citations and personal and contemporary allusions. Of this a few specific examples may be given. In the brief introduction the editions have "imo et egomet Albertus ut in pluribus veritatem inveni et veritatem suppono quo ab aliquo ex Chyrandis libro Alchorat. Primo narrabo de quibusdam herbis. . . ." Manuscripts Sloane 351 and 3281 at the British Museum do not have "Albertus." MS 351 gives the citation which follows as "ad aliqua ex Kiranidis libro et libro Alcorath ordinationem accipi narrando primo de quibusdam herbis . . ." and MS 3281 similarly has "ad aliqua ex Kiranidis libro et libro Alcorath, primo narrans"

In the editions the account of the first herb, *Eliotropia*, concludes, "Et hoc ultimum probatum est et verissimum." This sentence does not appear in Sloane 351 or 3281. Similarly the ending of the printed account of *Lilium*, "et hoc maxime expertum est tempore nostro a quibusdam sortiliatoribus (*sic*)," is not found in Sloane 351, but 3281 has a like statement, "Et hoc in tempore nostro a quibusdam sortilegis expertum est."

Incidentally it may be added that in Sloane 3281 the description of the virtues of the lily opens with the words, "Hanc enim herbam multum laudaverunt magi," which are not found in either Sloane 351 or the printed editions.

In the case of the second book on stones, the "Si vis . . ." opening ("If you want to become invisible, take the stone called Ophthalmius . . ." etc.), characteristic of each item in the printed text, is not found in Sloane 351, but is found in Sloane 3281.

The mediaeval Latin translator of *Kiranides* said that it should be preceded by the book of Alexander the Great on seven herbs of the seven planets. In the editions of *Experimenta* such a book is added, after the account of the sixteenth and last herb is finished. It does not occur in Sloane 351 or 3281. After the last herb they merely add: "Modus autem operandi omnium predictorum est ut effectus bonus fit in planeta bono et malus in malo," whereas the editions continue:

id est, in horis et diebus horum.

Virtutes herbarum 7 secundum Alexandrum Imperatorem . . .

etc.]

The citation of Aaron and Evax at the close of the book on stones is not found in either Sloane 351 or 3281. In the case of the account of the crow in the third book on animals, it is not in Sloane 351, but is in 3281. In the passage on the owl (*bubo*) both Sloane manuscripts lack the assertion in the editions, "et hoc a nostris fratribus expertum est moderno tempore," and in the account of the hoopoe (*upupa*), "hoc autem expertum est a fratribus nostris hodie." But the latter al-

ready occurs in Digby 37, a Bodleian, Oxford, manuscript of the fourteenth century.

The concluding passage of the editions is the same except for minor variants in Digby 37, 147 and 153, all of the fourteenth century, but Arundel 251 (British Museum) of the same century at fol. 35r, omits the words italicized in the following passage: "sicut *saepius una cum nostris fratribus temporibus nostris* sum expertus *et vidi*."

The fact that the *Experimenta* or *Secreta* were compiled partly from *De mineralibus* of Albertus Magnus, and partly from other sources, serves to explain the other title, *Liber aggregationis*, which was often given to the work.

In the case of the other experimental and magical treatise ascribed to Albertus Magnus, *De mirabilibus mundi*, which is usually found printed with the *Experimenta* and *De secretis mulierum*, the problem of its possible sources hardly arises, since it cites its authorities with great frequency and fulness. There are few or no parallel passages between it and the *Experimenta*.

* * *

Despite all the evidence of tradition, of the manuscripts, and of the similar attitude towards astrology, engraved astrological images, and necromancy and magic, shown in the *Speculum astronomiae* and the works of Albertus Magnus in the field of natural philosophy and science,¹⁷ Bernhard Geyer asserts that Albertus is not the author of *Speculum astronomiae*¹⁸ on the basis of a single passage in Albert's *Summa theologiae*. The author of the *Speculum*, trying to show that Albumasar was not dangerous reading for Christians, cited his statement that the Virgin birth of Christ was prefigured in the sky as a notable confirmation of the true Faith. In the *Summa*, on the contrary, Albertus remarks that what Albumasar says is a very bad error, and that those are to be censured who adduce it as evidence that the philosophers bear witness to the Virgin birth.¹⁹

But let us examine the context of this passage. In Question 61 of the eleventh tractate of his *Summa theologiae* Albertus is discussing the sixth day of creation and the divine command, "Producat terra . . ." ("Let the earth bring forth the living creature"). He inquires how that can be, "since the power to produce animals is not in the earth, but according to astronomers is in the heavens." Presently he says that Albumasar in his *Introductorium* stated that in the first *facies* of the sign Virgo rises a constellation, resembling a virgin with a child on her lap, which has such virtue that it fecundates certain virgins without virile intercourse. "And he gives an example, which is quite heretical, that the blessed Virgin so conceived Jesus whom Christians worship." Ultimately Albertus reaches the con-

¹⁷ It would take too long to repeat it again here: see *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 556-557, 566-567, 577-592, 692-719.

¹⁸ Das *Speculum astronomiae* kein Werk des Albertus Magnus," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift*, IV (1953), 95-101, concluding, "Damit scheint dann auch die alte Streitfrage, ob Albert der Verfasser der Schrift ist, im negativen Sinne entschieden zu sein."

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 101, quoting *Summa*, II, XI, 61 (*Opera*, 32, 591-593): "Hoc autem quod dicit Albumasar, error pessimus est, et vituperandi sunt, qui hoc adducunt quasi pro testimonio, quod philosophi nobis testificentur de partu virginis."

clusion that when God said, "Producat terra," He designated the earth merely as the material principle from which animals are formed, but that the active principle is the heavens. He then adds the further censure of Albumasar already quoted. But this is not what Albumasar is represented as saying in the *Speculum astronomiae*. There, after contending that Albumasar did not regard the planets as rational beings but as natural instruments of God, and that he identified the ninth astrological house as the house of Faith in his sixth tractate, 26th *Differentia*, it is carefully stated that the constellation announcing Christ's birth "was not the cause why He was born, but rather its signification, nay He himself was in truth the Cause why the manner of his wonderful birth was signified by the heavens."²⁰

The passage in the *Summa theologiae* merely cites Albumasar's *Introductorium* without stating where in it the heretical and erroneous statement is to be found. On the other hand, *Speculum astronomiae* tells exactly where it is to be found, "in tractatu sexto, differentia prima, in capitulo de ascensionibus imaginum quae ascendunt cum Virgine." Let us now compare what the *Speculum* says Albumasar said with the corresponding passage in the 1506 edition of his *Introductorium*,²¹ which reproduces the translation of it by Hermann of Carinthia, and in the translation by John of Seville, for which I use several manuscripts: at Oxford, Corpus Christi College 248, thirteenth century, fol. 48va; Digby 58, fourteenth century, fol. 9r; Digby 161, fourteenth century, fol. 7v; at Munich, cod. lat. 374, thirteenth century, fol. 46rb; at Paris, Bibl. Nat. latin 16204, thirteenth century, fol. 108v

HERMANN'S TRANSLATION	JOHN OF SEVILLE'S TRANSLATION	SPECULUM ASTRONOMIAE (<i>Opera</i> , x, 644b.)
Virgo signum fertile bipartitum triforme. Oritur in primo eius decano, ut Perse Caldei et Egyptii omniumque duorum Hermes et Ascalius a primeva etate docent, puella cui Persicum	Virgo est divum corpus suntque ei tres species. Et ascendit in prima facie illius puella quam vocamus	Et ^a ascendit in prima facie illius scilicet virginis puellae quam

^a Borgnet has "Invenitur quod," but *invenitur* belongs with the preceding sentence. See Paris, Bibl. nat. 7335, fol. 112rb.

²⁰ *Opera*, x, 644b, "non quod coeli figura esset causa quare nasceretur sed potius significatio, imo verius ipse erat causa quare modus admirandae suae nativitatis significaretur per coelum." For the passage in Albumasar is cited *tractatus 6, differentia 1*, "in capitulo de ascensionibus imaginum."

²¹ *Introductorium in astronomiam Albumasaris Abalachi octo continens libros partiales*; incipit, "Apud ianos (latinos) artium principiis que ars extrinseca prescribi solet librorum in initiis . . .;" colophon, at fol. (h 7) verso, "Opus introductorii in astronomiam Albumasaris Abalachi explicit feliciter Venetiis mandato et expensis Melchionis Sessa per Jacobum Pentium Leucensem anno domini 1506 die 5 Septembris regnante inclyto domino Leonardo Lauredano Venetiarum principe."

In this printed edition the text is divided into books and chapters instead of tractates and *differentiae*. The passage in question is found in Book 6, in the course of a long cap. 2, at fol. e 4 verso.

For MSS of Hermann's translation see Haskins, *Studies in Medieval Science* (1924), p. 45.

nomen Sacdeidos de
Darçama, Arabice in-
ter ad re. nedefa,^d

id est, virgo munda,
puella dico, virgo
immaculata, corpore
decora, vultu venu-
sta, habitu modesta,
crine prolixo, manu
geminas aristas te-
nens, supra solium
aureatum residens,
puerum nutriens ac
iure pascens in loco
cui nomen Hebraea^e

Puerum dico a quibus-
dam nationibus nomi-
natum Ihesum signi-
ficantibus Eiča,^e

quem nos Grece Chris-
tum dicimus. Oritur
cum ea virgine vir
eidem solio insidens
nec attingens pari-
ter, et stella Ariste
que finis est Ser-
pentis secunde, deinde
Caput cervi (*sic*) Caputque
Leonis.

Telthius Darosthal^b

et est virgo pulchra
atque honesta et
munda, proluxi capilli
et pulchra facie

habens in manu sua
duas spicas
et ipsa sedet supra
sedem stratam et
nutrit puerum dans ei
ad comedendum ius in
loco qui vocatur Abrie

Et vocant ipsum puerum
quedam gentium Ihesum,
cuius interpretatio
est Arabice Eice^b

Et ascendit cum ea
vir sedens super
ipsam sedem
nec eam tangens.ⁱ
Et ascendit cum ea
stella Virginis que
est posterior Serpen-
tis secunde et Caput
Corvi et Caput Leonis.

vocant Celchius Dora-
stal^o

et est virgo pulchra
atque honesta et
munda, proluxi capilli
et pulchra facie

habens in manu sua
duas spicas
et ipsa sedet super
sedem stratam et
nutrit puerum dans ei
ad comedendum jus in
loco qui vocatur Abrie.

Et vocant Christum^f puerum
quaedam gens Jesum,
cuius interpretatio
est Arabice Eice.

Et ascendit cum ea
vir sedens super
ipsam sedem.

Et ascendit cum ea
stella Virginis, etc.

^b CLM 374, "elchius torastor"; Digby 161, "elegius dezista."

^o Borgnet, "Celchuis"; BN 7335, "telthius Dozaschal."

^d BN 7331, fol. 19va, "nomen Persicum Sedith Dardenia, arabice Defaa."

^e BN 7331, "Hebraa."

^f So Borgnet, but BN 7335 reads *ipsum*.

^g BN 7331, "Eizae."

^h Corpus 248, "Eiceh"; CLM 374, "Eicob"; Digby 161, "Citeh." Three MSS have *gens* rather than *gentium*, but only one of these has *vocat* instead of *vocant*.

ⁱ "Nec eam tangens" is found only in Digby 58 out of five MSS.

It is evident that the *Speculum astronomiae* has used the translation of Albumasar's *Introductorium* by John of Seville and quoted it very accurately. The *Summa theologiae*, on the other hand, not only fails to cite chapter and verse, but puts into the passage a statement which is not there, namely, that the constellation which rises in the first *facies* or decan of the sign Virgo has such virtue that it fecundates certain virgins without sexual intercourse. Nor does the *Speculum* contain any such statement. Nor does Albumasar assert that the Virgin birth was caused by the rising of such a constellation. He merely suggests that it was prefigured by it. All which raises a suspicion that this inaccurate citation of

Albumasar in the *Summa theologiae* is not by Albertus Magnus but an interpolation.

If it is by Albertus, it is to be noted that he not only has no objection to the doctrine that the active principle and virtue productive of living beings on earth is in the heavens; he does not even object explicitly to the statement that there is a constellation in the first *facies* of Virgo of such virtue that it fecundates some virgins without sexual intercourse, which he adduces (if the passage is genuine and not an interpolation) as a striking, not to say extreme, particular example of the aforesaid generalization. What is objected to as heretical and most erroneous is Albumasar's citing the Virgin birth of Christ as an actual instance of the particular example. However, Damascenus is quoted that male and female of every species of perfect animals were in the first instance created immediately by God, and afterwards propagated their kind, and it is accepted that only imperfect animals can be formed directly from the elements by the virtue of the stars. For these imperfect animals there is sufficient semen in putrefied matter and enough active principle in the radiation of the stars, since such animals often do not have the distinction of sex perfectly. But this is not quite denying that a virgin (who does have the distinction of sex and perhaps in rare cases sufficient semen) may be fecundated by the stars. The doctrine here attributed to Albumasar is left hanging in the air, unanswered except in the case of Christ, who was "conceived by the Holy Ghost," not by the stars. It seems rather beside the main line of argument and to be either an alien interpolation or possibly introduced by Albertus somewhat awkwardly in order to enable him to disown the aforesaid unfavorable interpretation of Albumasar and of the *Speculum astronomiae's* citation of him.

Undoubtedly the two passages in *Summa* and *Speculum* are contradictory, but that in the *Summa* may be an interpolation, or Albertus may have changed his mind upon this point. I do not suggest that the passage in the *Speculum* is interpolated; it is too long and is found in early manuscripts. As to manuscripts of the *Summa* I am less informed; Geyer does not appeal to them. Account must also be taken of the fact, which I have repeatedly noted in *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, that Albertus, like others, wrote from a different standpoint in his theological and natural writings. In the one he was apt to reflect the views of the Church Fathers; in the other, not merely those of Aristotle and Avicenna, but of Aaron and Evax, Hermes and Albumasar, nay, even "that species of necromancy which is subordinated to astronomy, and which is called of images and seals. Yet because of the goodness of the doctrine, and because our associates want to learn it from us, we shall say something of it here."²² Very different this and the ensuing discussion of such images from the sole passage which Geyer quotes on the subject, from Albert on the *Sentences*:

Without doubt the risings and aspects of the stars have great effect on works of nature

²² *Liber II Mineralium, Tractatus iii, caput 1: Opera*, v, 48: "illam speciem necromantiae quae astronomiae subalternatur et quae de imaginibus et sigillis vocatur: tamen propter bonitatem doctrinae, et quia illud cupiunt a nobis scire nostri socii, aliquid de hoc hic dicemus."

and of art. But the art of images is evil because it inclines to idolatry through the divinity believed to reside in the stars, and because no images are found except for idle or evil ends, such as seducing women or opening doors or stopping ships or inducing terror and the like.²³

If Geyer rejects the Albertine authorship of *Speculum astronomiae* on the basis of the aforesaid contradiction, he might as well pronounce *Libri V Mineralium* spurious because of this.

It is a mystery to me, in any case, why Dominicans seem so anxious to prove that *Speculum astronomiae* was not by Albertus Magnus, or to saddle it on Roger Bacon, a Franciscan. It is a very valuable treatise, shows remarkable bibliographical information, and would be a credit to either Albertus or Roger.

* * *

The same holds true for *De secretis mulierum* which, aside from a few superstitious recipes such as were common at that time, is primarily a sober, factual account of the process of human generation written from a medical standpoint. Its widespread existence in manuscripts²⁴ before the invention of printing, some 55 extant incunabula editions of it,²⁵ and the fact that it was usually accompanied by a commentary,²⁶ show that it was used as a textbook in medieval schools.

²³ *II Sent. d. 7, artic. 9 (Opera, 27, 158b)*. For the Latin see Geyer's article, p. 100, note 18.

²⁴ MSS are listed in *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* II, 749-50; and by E. Wickersheimer, *Henri de Saxe et le De secretis mulierum*, Communication faite au 3e Congrès de l'Histoire de l'Art de Guérir, Londres, 17-22 juillet, 1922, printed at Antwerp, 1923, pp. 3-4.

Extracts also in Copenhagen. Glkg.S.1658, fifteenth century, fols. 18v-24v, "Problemata magni Alberti excerpta de secretis mulierum, et primo de membris generationis videlicet de matrice et de testiculis"; Copenhagen Ny.kgl.S.846, fol. 2r-v.

²⁵ Arnold C. Klebs, *Incunabula scientifica et medica* (Bruges, 1938): 26.01-05, 26.1-50. Of the two early editions at Basel, to which I referred above in note 4, that with the shelf-mark, L.e.VI.10, *Secreta mulierum ab Alberto Magno composita*, without date or place of publication, is, as the librarian, Dr A. Ricker, very kindly informs me: "bei Klebs unter Nr. 26.16 angeführt und dürfte aus der 2. Hälfte der 1490er Jahre stammen (der *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 734 datiert sie 'nicht vor 1495' ohne Begründung). Drucker ist vermutlich Konrad Hist, Speyer; von andern wird das Werk Köln zugewiesen." The other edition, with the shelf-mark, L.e.VI.20, Nr.2, is bound after Ficino, *De vita libri tres*, Basel, 1532, and is followed by *Liber secretorum Alberti et de mirabilibus mundi*, Jehan Petit. It is entitled, *Secreta mulierum et virorum ab Alberto Magno composita, nuperrime correcte et emendata*, In aedibus Petri Gaudoul, 88 pp., without date or place of publication. Concerning it Dr Ricker writes: "stellt einen Druck des Pariser Verleger-Buchhändlers Pierre Gaudoul, der von 1508-1537 tätig war; das Werk ist vielleicht in die 30er Jahre zu datieren."

I shall refer to these two editions as of 1490 and about 1530. They are practically identical in text and commentary up to page 37 of the later edition which there inserts the heading, "Capitulum tertium de influentiis planetarum" before the text, "Post hec vero ad influentias planetarum . . ." which occurs at fol c iii recto in the edition of 1490. Except for such insertion of chapter headings in the later edition, there was little further difference until it added six lines of text at p. 63, omitted an entire paragraph at p. 65, and at p. 69 opened chapter vii, "De signis conceptionis," with a longer paragraph than that in the 1490 edition.

²⁶ Thorndike and Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Medieval Scientific Treatises in Latin* (1937), cols. 22, 273, 300, 369, 646, 653-54. Of the incipits of commentaries there listed, "Homo est optimum eorum que in mundo . . ." and "Ista propositio licet de se sit . . ." apply to the same commentary as "Scribit philosophus tertio Ethicorum . . ."

Thus in Utrecht 723, fol. 46ra, the introduction to the commentary opens: "SCRIBIT PHILOSO-

Albertus often touched on such subjects in his undisputed works on nature, especially *De animalibus*.²⁷

The oldest manuscript of *De secretis mulierum* that I have seen²⁸ states at the close of that work that this copy of it was completed at "Herfordie" on the eleventh of July 1320.²⁹ In this manuscript the work is without any titulus, and in the letter which opens the work the person addressed as "Dilectissimo sibi in Christo socio et amico . . ." is vaguely designated by a single initial letter which is hard to make out (N. or R.?) and as "of such a place," while the writer of the epistle and subsequent work is similarly called "b" (?) "of such a place."³⁰ A simi-

PHUS DECIMO (*tertio* or *quarto* in other MSS) ETHYCORUM, HOMO EST OPTIMUM EORUM ET CETERA. Ista propositio, licet de se sit, non tamen potest persuaderi rationibus . . ."

Here the writing of the opening quotation in large letters, as is done later with the catchwords of the text of *De secretis mulierum*, rather gives the impression that they open the text rather than the commentary. But this is not the case, the text opening, "Dilectissimo . . .", as usual.

Wickersheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 6, divides the commentaries into two groups, one opening like that just quoted, the other opening, "Ad lucidiorem notitiam sequentium habendam . . ."

But the other three noted in *A Catalogue of Incipits* would seem independent of his two groups: namely, "Galienu dicit in libro creticorum . . ." Vatican Palat. Lat. 1264, fifteenth century, fols. 186r-229r; "Sciendum quod in isto libro doceantur . . ." Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 484, fifteenth century, fols. 1-33r; "Homo generat hominem et Sol. In qua quidem propositione . . ." Zurich Car.C.111. fols. 144ra-199vb, "Et sic est finis libri de secretis mulierum anno domini 1445" (Albertus is named as author *passim*; also Vatic. Palat. Lat. 1242, where the text at fol. 1-, is followed by the commentary at fol. 13-.

²⁷ For example, *De animalibus*, VI, iii, 2 (p. 492 in Stadler's edition of 1916): "Ego autem vidi mulierem libidinosam quae mihi ore suo dixit quod similiter se vento exhibuit et multum delectabatur in conceptu venti intra uterum suum."

²⁸ Codex latinus Monacensis 22297, fols. 21v-50v, of which I have a microfilm. It is followed by Averroes, *De substantia orbis*. CLM 22300, fols. 61r-76rb, is dated thirteenth century in the printed Catalogue, but I would call it fourteenth century. It contains superstitious recipes and procedures not found in CLM 22297 nor in the printed editions as represented by that of 1740. For example, in order to make a woman pregnant and conceive a male child, it not only recommends, as they do, drinking in wine the matrix and testicle of a hare, dried and reduced to powder, but also use of dried human testicles and wearing this writing for a year: "Dominus noster Iesus Christus qui de beata et interemerata Virgine Maria pro humani generis salute se nascitur prenoscens fidelibus suis Abrahe et Zacharie et suis uxoribus, Sare videlicet et Elizabet . . ." etc. See 22297, fol. 46r; 22300, fol. 74va. Before, at fol. 71v, 22300 had superstitious procedure to make a woman chaste, not found at the corresponding place in 22297, fol. 42v.

CLM 22300 also contains a treatise on urine by a physician of the bishop of Ratisbon, but since the bishop is further addressed as imperial chancellor, he cannot be identified with Albertus Magnus: fols. 49r-56, Liber urine a physico N. episcopi Ratisbon. compositus, incipit, "Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit(?) utile dulci . . ." Presently we read: "Idcirco ego humilis et devotus qualicumque physicus domini sola miseracione divina Rat. epi. imperialis aule cancellarii aliqua de libris phisicalibus non de meo ingenio digna duxi colligere. . . ."

²⁹ CLM 22297, fol. 50v, "Explicunt secreta mulierum completa Herfordie anno domini M^o. CCC^o. XX^o. V ydus Iulii indictione tercia."

³⁰ "Dilectissimo sibi in Christo socio et amico N.(R.?) de tali loco .b.(?) talis loci vere sapientie et istius presentis in Christo Ihesu incrementa." Variant forms of this salutation are: Erfurt, Amplon.0.79, 1341 A.D., fols. 1-12, "Dilecto sibi in Chr.s. et C. clerico Erphordie Io. de Villa Parisiensi"; Q.15, c.1352, fols. 72-83, "Dilectissimo in Christo socio et amico R. de tali loco B. talis loci rector"; Q.234, a.1362 at Liège, fols. 41-53, "Dilecto sibi socio et amico G. de tali loco clerico camerario loci litteraliter rector salutem"; Q.157, early fifteenth century, fols. 213-226, "Dilectissimo—amico et

lar form of address, "Dilectissimo in Christo N. fratri ordinis predicatorum . . ." is found in the *Alkymia minor* attributed to Albertus Magnus.³¹ It seems likely that the designation in later manuscripts of the person to whom the letter is addressed as a clerk or cleric of Erfurt,³² was an inference from the aforesaid mention of "Herfordie" in the closing statement of the manuscript of 1320.³³ The other alterations in the salutation are harder to account for, including the designation of the writer of the epistle and treatise as of or at Paris. But it is noteworthy that he in no instance calls himself A. or Albertus.

However, in the oldest manuscript, written in 1353,³⁴ that I have seen of what became the most widespread commentary on *De secretis mulierum*, Albertus is named as the author in the introduction to the commentary, and twice in commenting upon the salutation which opens the text.³⁵ We may perhaps discover the reason for assigning *De secretis mulierum* to him in the statement that it is in large measure extracted from *De animalibus*, especially the ninth book.³⁶ The commentator perhaps has the work of Aristotle on animals primarily in mind.³⁷

Clerico de tali loco Iohannes sanctorum talis loci"; (these from Schum's *Verzeichniss*). Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Latin MS 7148 (henceforth cited as BN 7148), fifteenth century, fol. 1r, "Incipit liber de secretis mulierum secundum Albertum magnum. Precordialissimo sibi in Christo socio et amico er clerico erfordensi, n. scolaris parisius vere sapientie necnon huius mundane continua incrementum." In the 1490 edition of Speyer or Cologne (Basel L.e.vi.10), "Titulus. Incipiunt Secreta mulierum et virorum ab Alberto magno composita. (D)ilecto sibi in Cristo socio et amico N. clerico de tali loco vere sapientie et augmentum continuum vite presentis." This wording of the salutation persists in later editions such as that by Pierre Gaudoul about 1530, and that of Amsterdam, 1740 (p. 4).

Wickersheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 6, has noted further variations in the manuscripts of the designation of the person to whom the letter is addressed: in Angers 448, anno 1406, "E. scolaris talis loci"; in Bamberg L.III.54, fifteenth century, "carissimo Ulrico"; in Berlin lat. 976, "Renoldo."

Valentin Rose, *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin*, XIII, 1237-38, has further: "Nicolaus clericus Erfordensis" from CLM 23879, fifteenth century.

³¹ See *A Catalogue of Incipits*, col. 201; James Corbett, *Catalogue de manuscrits alchimiques latins . . . des bibliothèques publiques de Paris*, (1939), p. 49; and, for four more MSS, including one of the fourteenth century, Pearl Kibre, "Alchemical Writings Ascribed to Albertus Magnus," *SPECULUM*, XVII (1942), 504.

³² See note 30.

³³ See note 29.

³⁴ Utrecht 723, fols. 46r-77r, closing, ". . . nascitur illud maxime habet variare. Sequitur finis. Scriptum anno domini millesimo tricentesimo quinquagesimo tercio in vigilia Bartholomei apostoli" (August 24).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 46vb, "Causa efficiens non est curanda, cum effectus sit bonus, tamen ponitur quod Albertus hunc librum composuit . . ."; 47ra, "qui rogavit dominum Albertum ut compilarret sibi librum de secretis mulierum"; 47rb, "Et sic Albertus videns eum iuste petere consensit." Vatican Latin 4456 (a later MS of the same commentary, ascribed by the catalogue, but not in the MS itself, to Gentile da Foligno), fols. 1ra-25ra, has the passages in question at fol. 1va, 1vb.

³⁶ Utrecht 723, fol. 46vb: "Et quia generatio ista nimis diffuse tradita est in libro de animalibus et maxime in nono, a quo ille liber fere extractus est."

³⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 46vb: "Albertus hunc librum composuit suffi (47ra) cienter tritus, id est expertus, in diversis experimentis, a mulieribus informatus, et maxime a Phylosopho in libro de animalibus in nono"; fol. 48ra; "In nono libro de animalibus et in quarto omnia illa secreta Aristoteles posuit multum diffuse et explicite. Hic autem ponuntur compendiose et succincte."

Quarto seems an error, since both Aristotle and Albertus treat of bloodless animals in their fourth books.

The citation of the ninth book, however, applies better to Albert's *De animalibus*, where that book is entitled, "Incipit liber nonus de animalibus qui est de principiis et origine generationis hominis,"³⁸ whereas the ninth book of Aristotle's *Historia animalium* is about animal psychology, and its seventh book is on human generation.

Whereas the text in the manuscript of 1320 was without a titulus, the commentator in the manuscript of 1353 says: "Titulus talis est: Incipiunt secreta mulierum et virorum ab Alberto completa."³⁹

The same commentator further suggests that the words, "living in Paris,"⁴⁰ be inserted as to the writer of the introductory letter, who, he asserts, had been asked by a certain priest to discuss the secrets of women, because at the time of menstruation they are poisonous, intoxicate by their glance, kill animals thereby, and injure infants in the cradle, stain mirrors, and sometimes make leprous or cancerous those who have sexual intercourse with them. He adds that it is necessary for those who wish to live chastely to learn of the impurity and debilitating effect of *coitus* and the like. "And so Albertus, recognizing the justice of his petition, consents." But such reasons for writing are not given in the introductory letter; one wonders if the commentator knew the contents of the priest's original request. Finally, a different wording of the salutation prefixed to the introductory letter is offered by the same commentator: "Dilectissimo sibi in Christo socio et amico H. incrementum continuum, id est, sedulum aucrementum vere sapientie et istius presentis vite." For the sake of brevity, we shall henceforth speak of this commentary, which seems to have been the most widespread and perhaps the earliest, as the leading commentary or as that in the manuscript of 1353.

Another commentator, in discussing the efficient cause of the work, states that some persons say that the author is unknown, but others say that his name was Albert and that he was "learned in diverse experiments from women,"⁴¹ A third commentator, discussing the same question as to the efficient cause of the work, has no doubt as to Albert's authorship, but introduces a scholastic quibble against his being called its efficient cause, strictly speaking, "because what is not cannot communicate knowledge to others," and Albert's body has long since corrupted. He then decides, however, *improprie loquendo*, that Albertus is the efficient cause, since our present copies of the book have been derived from his original text.⁴²

³⁸ Albertus also treats of human generation in Books x, xvii and xxii, while in xviii, ii, 6 (p. 1234 of Stadler's edition) he writes: "Et hunc casum ego vidi in muliere duos globos in matrice habente usque ad mortem . . ."

³⁹ Utrecht 723, fol. 47ra. Earlier, at fol. 46vb, the subject of the text had been described as "secreta viri et mulieris," but as principally concerned with the secrets of women. In Vatic. lat. 4456, fol. 1vb, "Titulus libri talis, Incipiunt secreta mulierum et virorum ab Alberto compilata."

⁴⁰ Utrecht 723, fol. 47ra, "supple morans Parisius." Again, at fol. 48ra, we read: "et bene dicit epistola, quia misit hunc librum de Parisius."

⁴¹ This commentary occurs in MS Vatic. Palat. Lat. 1264, fifteenth century, fols. 186r-229r, opening, "Galenus dicit in libro creticorum ad litteram . . ." and closing, ". . . Et sic finis est textus et commenti secretorum mulierum ipsa die Agate virginis in Iubileo."

⁴² Vatic. Palat. Lat. 1170, parchment, fifteenth century, fols. 1ra-61, opening, "Ad lucidiorem notitiam sequentium habendam videlicet libri de secretis mulierum. . . ." The passage cited comes at fol. 1rb.

The introductory letter does not sound as if written by Albertus Magnus. The writer alludes to his "insignificant and youthful mind,"⁴³ so that it is not surprising that he is called *scolaris* in some manuscripts, and that in one manuscript at least he appears not yet to have progressed far in the study of medicine.⁴⁴ He then proceeds, however, to display his familiarity with the works of Aristotle by quoting *secundo de generatione et corruptione*, commentator *secundo de anima*, *secundo de generatione et corruptione* again, "quod patet ex intentione philosophi in multis passibus philosophie et precipue in *secundo de anima*," Boethius *secundo de consolatione philosophie*, *tertio Physicorum*, and finally *octavo Physicorum et primo de celo et mundo*.⁴⁵ The tone of the introductory letter did not arouse doubt as to Albert's authorship in the minds of the commentators. The leading commentary, already current by 1353, explained the reference to his insignificant and youthful mind as due to modesty.⁴⁶

In the manuscript of 1320 there occurs towards the close of the text the following equivalent of a table of contents:

Ut autem tota habeatur in summa colligamus ea que dicta sunt per modum
compendiose recapitulationis
Primo enim determinatur de generatione embrionis
Secundo de successiva formatione fetus sub influentiam superiorum
Tertio de influentia planetarum ex parte corporis et anime
Quarto de generatione animalium sine semine
Quinto de formatione embrionis
Sexto de generatione animalium monstruorum
Septimo de signo corruptionis
Octavo de signis castitatis
Nono de debilitatione matricis que suffocatio eius
Decimo de impedimentis conceptionis
Undecimo de iuvamentis impregnationis
Duodecimo de generatione spermatis, et hoc est ultimum de quo determinatur
in hoc libello.
Quomodo autem ista capitula sunt ordinata secundum ordinationem prioris et
posterioris patet a principio usque ad finem librum intuenti.⁴⁷

A similar list of twelve points is found in the commentary which opens, "Scribit

⁴³ CLM 22297, fol. 21v: ". . . nulla pigritia a compilatione brevis et compendiosi tractatuli de impetrata materia me retraxit sed pusilla et iuvenalis mea mens . . ." *Mea* is found in the edition of 1490, but is omitted in those of c.1530 and 1740.

⁴⁴ BN 7148, fifteenth century, fol. 1r, "promictens tibi plura de hiis et aliis procedente tempore transmictere cum arte medicinali prolixius insudavero domino concedente." But in others the meaning is less clear: CLM 22297, a.1320, fol. 22r, "promittens vobis plura de hiis et de aliis procedente tempore et medicine methodus insudaverit domino concedente"; edition of 1490 (Basel L.e.vi.10), fol. a ii v, "promitto vobis plura de hiis et aliis manifestare cum presenti opere arte cum medicinali transmittere prolixius insudabo domino concedente"; ed. of 1740, p. 6, "promitto vobis plura de his et aliis manifestare, et cum praesenti opere et arte causa medicinali transmittere, quae prolixius dabo, domino concedente."

⁴⁵ CLM 22297, fols. 22r-23r.

⁴⁶ Utrecht 723, fol. 47vb: "Nota auctor innuit idest dicit quod mens iuvenalis et pusilla ipsum detraxerit. Ibi devitat arrogantiam . . ."

⁴⁷ CLM 22297, fol. 50r; CLM 22300, fol. 76ra.

philosophus . . . ” but there occurs early in commenting upon the introductory letter:

Generatio forme embrionis
 Successiva formatio fetus secundum influentias superiorum
 Influentia ex parte corporis et anime
 Generatio animalium
 Formatio fetus et generatio
 Quomodo plures fetus fiunt in matrice
 De signo corruptionis
 De signo castitatis
 Debilitas matricis
 De impedimentis conceptionis
 De iuvamentis impregnationis
 De generatione spermatis.⁴⁸

In another commentary the summary comes towards its close:⁴⁹

De generatione embrionis in conceptione et eius formatione
 De formatione successive fetus secundum influentiam superiorum
 De influenza planetarum et ex parte corporis et anime
 De generatione animalium imperfectorum
 De formatione embrionis et tempore egressus ab utero
 De formatione animalium monstruorum
 De signis conceptionis
 De signis an vir vel femina sit in utero
 De signis fluxus menstruorum
 Suffocatio matricis
 De impedimentis conceptionis et iuvaminibus ad impregnationem
 De generatione spermatis in viro quod ultimum in hoc opere.⁵⁰

In what purports to be the editio princeps of the commentary which opens, “Ad lucidiorem notitiam . . . ”⁵¹ a similar recapitulation to those already noted occurs on its last page, except that it enumerates only eleven topics, combining the second and third of the others.

Hic recapitulat omnia que dicta sunt hucusque in hoc libro et primo dicit ut videatur intentio totius libri in una summa. Ideo colligamus ea que dicta sunt per modum recapitulationis:
 Unde primum determinatum est qualiter embrio concipitur.
 Secundo de successiva formatione fetus secundum influentiam superiorum septem planetarum ex parte tam corporis quam anime.

⁴⁸ Utrecht 723, fol. 48rab; Vatican Latin 4456, fifteenth century, fol. 2va.

⁴⁹ BN 7148, fifteenth century, fols. 13v-14r.

⁵⁰ I have omitted the chapter numbers and supplied some missing syllables.

⁵¹ Hain *563; Panzer iv, 19 (No. 119); Proctor 4419; Pellechet 368. The colophon, “Explicit liber Alberti magni de secretis mulierum 1478 vicesimaquarta die mensis Iunii,” is misleading, as only catchwords of the text are given by the commentator. These are in large bold type; otherwise there are no headings or titulus. The book is believed to have been printed by Adam of Rottweil at Venice. It is not listed by Klebs or Stillwell. The latest printed catalogue of the British Museum describes it as “The Commentary of Henricus de Saxonia, without the text,” but Wickersheimer, *op. cit.*, has shown that there is no ground for regarding him as either author of, or commentator on, *De secretis mulierum*. I have used the copy at the Bodleian, Auct.2.Q.6.37; others are: at the British Museum, IA.20592; at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Rés.S.750. A MS is Vatican Palatine Latin 1170. See note 42.

Tertio de generatione animalium sine semine.
Quarto de formatione embrionis completa.
Quinto de formatione animalium qui sunt monstra in natura.
Sexto de signis conceptionis.
Septimum de signis castitatis.
Octavo de infirmitate matricis que vocatur suffocatio.
Nono de his que impediunt conceptionem.
Decimo de his que ad conceptionem iuvant.
Undecimo et ultimo de generatione spermatis in viro.
Et iste ordo patuit a principio libri usque ad finem.

But a somewhat different fourfold division of *De secretis mulierum* had been previously indicated in the course of the commentary. At fol. 31r, more than halfway through the commentary, the catchwords, NUNC AUTEM AD EA, were regarded as introducing Albert's second tractate, "De exitu ipsius fetus," which had the following four chapters:

De forma embrionis per animam sensitivam vegetivam et intellectivam (subdivided into 5 parts)
De egressu fetus (in 4 parts)
Quedam accidentia circa exitum ipsius fetus
De peccatis nature in generatione.

Similarly at fol. 41v the catchwords, FINITO VERO SERMONE, opened a third tractate in four chapters on signs of conception, of virginity and chastity, on suffocation of the womb, and on aids to conception. The fourth tractate, noted by fol. 53r, consisted of a single chapter on the nature and generation of the sperm. Throughout this commentary, whose date is uncertain, Albertus was named as the author of *De secretis mulierum*.

A division into chapters was not noted in the edition of 1490 (Basel L. e. vi. 10) but in the later edition of about 1530 (Basel L. e. vi. 20), scattered through the text, I noted the following:

Capitulum tertium de influentiis planetarum
Capitulum quartum et est de creatione fetus
Capitulum quintum de exitu fetus de utero
Capitulum sextum de monstro in natura
Capitulum vii de signis conceptionis
Capitulum octavum de signis an vir vel femina sit in utero
Capitulum ix de signis corruptionis virginitatis
Capitulum x de signis castitatis
Capitulum xi de defectu matricis
Capitulum xii de impedimentis conceptionis
Capitulum ultimum de natura spermatis et digestionem.⁵²

In the editions, in the midst of the commentary on the twelfth chapter on impediments to conception occurs the rubric, "Capitulum aliud quomodo mulier debet juvari ut concipiat, maxime ut concipiat masculum."⁵³ Corresponding to

⁵² In the edition of 1740, after cap. 1, "De generatione embryonis," and cap. 2, "De foetus formatione," the headings are the same as these, except for cap. 4, "De generatione animalium imperfectorum," and "Caput ultimum, De spermatis natura et digestionem."

⁵³ At pp. 108-109 in the 1740 edition.

this in Utrecht 723 at fol. 75ra, we read, “Sequitur aliud capitulum,” followed by the catch words, SI QUIS VELIT IUUARE,⁵⁴ after which the commentary says, “Hic est capitulum distinctum et docet quomodo mulier debet iuari ut concipiat et maxime ut concipiat masculum.” This is what the commentator of 1353 listed as the eleventh point, aids to pregnancy. BN 7148 combined impediments to conception and aids to pregnancy as its eleventh point, while the edition of 1478 gave them in one place as its ninth and tenth topics, but in another place combined them as the fourth chapter of Albert’s third tractate.

After the aforesaid table of contents, the manuscript of 1320 concludes:

Et hec sunt omnia que breuiter mihi sunt visa de presenti negotio et ita me excuso, sicut Commentator 3^o de anima (50v) se excusat circa naturam intellectus. Ait enim sic: Me nunc excuso si⁵⁵ hoc quod apparet mihi non fuerit completum, erit tamen principium complementi. Et ideo rogo fratres videntes hoc scriptum scribere suas dubitationes, et forte per illud inuenietur.

This mention of *fratres* indicates that the work is by a friar, if not by Albertus. The concluding passage then proceeds:

Istis visis finem dictis imponamus et grates deo reddamus qui nostrum scilicet audientis intelligentis et scribentis in hoc opere et in aliis illuminavit intellectum pre ceteris qui numquam didicerunt literam hanc. Sunt enim tales similes ignorantibus quomodo vadunt, ut *secundo metaphysice* satis patet.⁵⁶

This somewhat boastful claim to divine illumination and allusion in the past tense to the author’s other works, is in rather sharp contrast to the tone of the introductory letter with its allusion to the author’s “insignificant and youthful mind.” He then, however, proceeds a trifle more humbly:

Grates ergo de bene dictis et veniam de obmissis, si aliqua sunt, humiliter nunc imploro et auxilium diuine gratie, a qua omnis sapientia orta est et vita eterna, ad quam nos deus omnipotens gloriosus et magnificus perducatur, qui cum patre vivat et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. A . . . M . . . E . . . N.⁵⁷

In connection with the author’s reference to *fratres* and the “sibi in Christo socio et amico” of the salutation in the introductory letter, two other allusions to his *socii* may be quoted:

Et sciatis socii mei quod quamvis quedam mulieres causam illius rei occultarent et occultam ignorant, tamen quedam effectum cognoscunt et plura mala ex isto operantur.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Corresponding to the paragraph of text opening, “Si quis igitur velit mulierem iuare,” in the 1740 edition, at p. 108, where, however, the above quoted rubric follows this paragraph.

⁵⁵ *Sed* in MS.

⁵⁶ In the 1478 edition the commentator similarly concludes: “Ultimo dicit concludendo: Istis igitur intellectis imponamus nostris dictis finem et grates reddamus deo qui illuminavit nostrum intellectum pre ceteris hominibus qui nunquam sciverunt talia et cetera.”

In the 1740 edition, p. 118, is the more modest statement: “His visis finem dictis imponamus et gratias deo reddamus, qui nostrum in hoc opere et in aliis illuminat intellectum.”

⁵⁷ In the 1740 edition: “Et de omissis peto veniam et auxilium diuinae gratiae, a qua omnis sapientia orta est et vita aeterna. Ad quam nos Deus omnipotens et gloriosus, cuncta gubernans atque regens, perducatur. Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto vivit et regnat, et in quo est summa securitas, tranquillitas, iucunditas, et sine fine aeternitatis sanctorum existat omnium per infinita seculorum secula, Amen.”

⁵⁸ CLM 22297, fols. 29v–30r; edition of 1740, p. 45; edition of 1490, fol. c iii (it should be ii) verso.

Et sciatis socii mei quod hee cause non sunt fcte secundum quod recitat Alb' quia passu de operatione et effectu fulminis sub ictu tonitruu aliquando comburitur calceus pede illeso et econverso.⁵⁹

The mention of Albertus in this last passage suggests that the treatise is being composed by a disciple of his, and may be supplemented by other passages. Since they already are found in the manuscript of 1320, which gives only the text of the *De secretis mulierum*, they can hardly be accounted for as bits of a commentary which have slipped into the text in transcription or otherwise. Other passages of text citing Albertus are:

Et, ut sanius intelligatur, advertendum est quod quatuor sunt status lune secundum quod dicit Albertus capitulo et tractatu de statu solis et lune.⁶⁰

Hanc autem rationem ponit Alb' dicens quod diluuium sit ex constellatione humectante.⁶¹
... et non est absolute calor, ut dicit Alb'.⁶²

Albertus is cited with regard to hermaphrodites as follows:

Sed omnibus istis est maior defectus quem narrat Albertus de quodam cui generata fuerunt membra libidinis ex parte viri et ex parte mulieris, unum ita quod potuit subcumbere et incumbere. Causa vero huius originaliter trahitur ex superhabundantia materie spiritualiter(?), tamen quia in materia sufficiens fuit principium generandi utrumque p.(?) membrum ex (super)fluitate talis partis seminis ex qua membra talia generari solent.⁶³

⁵⁹ CLM 22297, fol. 36r; Utrecht 723, fol. 67vb, "Et est sciendum quod hee cause non sunt fcte, ut recitat Albertus." *Socii* are also not mentioned in ed. 1490, fol. (d vi) verso; and ed. 1740, p. 75: "Et sciendum quod illa non sunt ficta, quia recitat Albertus de operatione et effectu fulminis" etc. In Utrecht 723, fol. 68ra, the leading commentator adds after some intervening remarks: "Et dicit Albertus quod semel accidit sibi per ictum fulminis unam partem cappe comburi ipso manente illeso." This last personal experience of Albertus is not mentioned in the MS of 1320, or, so far as I have observed, in other MSS or editions of the text of *De secretis mulierum*. The passage opening, "Audiui in confessione societatis . . ." will be quoted later.

⁶⁰ CLM 22297, fol. 29v; the words, "capitulo et," are omitted in the edition of 1740, p. 44.

⁶¹ CLM 22297, fol. 33r; ed. 1740, p. 63, "Et hanc rationem ponit Albertus, quod diluuium fit ex constellatione humectante."

⁶² CLM 22297, fol. 33v. In the edition of 1740, p. 64, Albert is not cited: ". . . et non est absolute calor, sed est virtus constellationis coelestis." This last clause does not appear in the MS.

⁶³ CLM 22297, fol. 40r. In the edition of 1740, p. 88, the passage reads: "Sed in omnibus istis mirabilior est iste casus et effectus quem Albertus recitat, de uno cui nata fuerunt duo membra libidinis, unum ex parte viri, aliud ex parte mulieris, ita quod potuit succumbere, id est, subiacere, et incumbere, id est, active coire. Et causa huius originaliter trahitur ex superabundantia materiae, quia materia fuit principium sufficiens generandi utrumque membrum ex superflua autem parte seminis ex qua talia membra solent generari."

The passage is based upon Albertus Magnus, *De animalibus*, xviii, ii, 3, "De causa generationis ermafroditorum conceptuum," etc. (p. 1224 in Stadler's edition), which opens, "Accidentia autem monstruosa quae accidunt quibusdam generatis quos ermafroditos vocant quod accipiunt in prima generatione membrum virile et membrum muliebre, similiter causantur a superfluitate quae est materia generationis. . . ." At p. 1225 Albertus continues: "Et non est inconueniens quin talis partus etiam habeat duas vesicas et urinam emittat per utrumque et quod in coitu et agat et patiat, et incumbat et succumbat: sed non puto quod et impraegnet et impraegnetur."

It is characteristic of the author of *De secretis mulierum* that he omits this last sceptical remark of Albertus.

The manuscript of 1320 immediately continues⁶⁴ with another citation of Albertus as to two twins, one of whom possessed the occult virtue in his right side of opening doors, the other in his left side that of closing them:

Recitat etiam Alb' quod sicut accidentia talia monstruosa et realia⁶⁵ contingunt, sic etiam spiritualia, sicut narrat de quibusdam duobus gemellis quorum unus habuit in dextro latere talem virtutem quod ubicumque portabatur a parte illius lateris aperiebantur omnes sere. Et alius habuit virtutem aliam in sinistro latere et ubicumque portabatur clausa fuerant. Et loquitur⁶⁶ de clausione et apertione serarum in hostiis domorum et archarum.⁶⁷

This passage, which was to be much cited in subsequent literature, is based on Albertus, *De motibus animalium*, I, i, 3, where we read:

Exempli autem causa potest induci quod apparuit multis videntibus duobus geminis in Germania natis, quorum unus dum ferretur juxta ostia, omnia ostia versus suum latus sinistrum aperiebantur quantumcumque serrata fuissent: et hanc virtutem quam ille habuit in sinistro, habuit frater ejus in dextro: et in brevi spatio temporis ambo defuncti sunt.⁶⁸

It will be noted that again Albertus's last clause has been disregarded, and his account further garbled. Whereas he states that both twins opened doors, one from his left side, the other from his right, in *De secretis mulierum* doors are closed by the left-sided one. Albertus went on to say that these powers came from the movement of the heavens and not merely by power of the mind. *De secretis mulierum* asserts somewhat differently:

Causam vero huius, si aliquis accipiat, non ex materia sed ex virtute et spirituali eius constellatione, et hee constellationes raro contingunt. Et non solum id contingit ex parte constellationis sed etiam ex speciali dispositione materie (40v) ad hunc effectum qui actus activorum sunt in patiente disposito.⁶⁹

Fascination of children in their cradles by the evil eye of menstruating old wives is also stated upon the authority of Albertus:

Est etiam notandum et diligenter memorie imprimendum quod mulieres antique quarum menstrua fluunt, vel quedam ut in pluribus quibus menstrua retenta sunt, sepe si inspiciant pueros in cunis iacentes toxicant eos visu, ut ait Alb' tractatu suo de menstruo mulierum.⁷⁰

The *Meteorology* of Albertus Magnus is cited in the following passage: "Iuxta quod notandum quod talis est operatio ex parte caloris secundum quod dicit Alb' 4to

⁶⁴ In the edition of 1740 a passage citing Avicenna intervenes between the two citations of Albertus.

⁶⁵ *Et realia* are omitted in the edition.

⁶⁶ *Loquor* in the edition.

⁶⁷ CLM 22297, fol. 40r.

⁶⁸ *Opera*, ed. Borgnet, IX (1890), 262.

⁶⁹ CLM 22297, fol. 40r-v; ed. of 1740, p. 89: "... quia actus activorum sunt in materia bene prae-disposita vel in patiente disposito, ut dicitur *secundo de anima*."

⁷⁰ CLM 22297, fol. 42r: none of the tractates of Albert's *De animalibus* is so entitled. In ed. 1740, p. 101, the passage runs: "Est autem notandum quod mulieres antiquae in quibus menstrua fluunt, et quaedam in quibus menstrua sunt retenta, si inspiciunt pueros in cunis iacentes, intoxicant oculos eorum visu, ut ait Albertus in libro de Menstruo." CLM 22300, fol. 72ra, "... ut ait Alb' tractatu suo de menstruis mulierum."

methaphysice vel methororum capitulo de operatione qualitatum.”⁷¹ The author of *De secretis mulierum* further cites his master, expert in astrology — a not unbecoming description of Albertus — concerning the influence of the planet Saturn upon the human body: “Unde breviter notandum quod secundum intentionem mei magistri in hac scientia experti, quicumque natus fuerit sub Saturno omnes conditiones malas debet (habere) ex parte corporis.”⁷²

It may be that some of these allusions to *fratres, socii*, and Albertus are meant to deceive the reader, but it is to be noted that in no case is the Dominican Order specified, as it was in “fratri ordinis predicatorum” of the *Alkymia minor* ascribed to Albert.

There are further citations of Albertus in the leading commentary which goes back at least to 1353:

. . . quia frigiditas est mater albedinis per Albertum. Respondeo quantum est de natura menstrui⁷³

Item nota penes planetas et stellas specialiter representantes specialem influentiam diversificantur ymagines hominum secundum Albertum⁷⁴

In connection with the passage on the hermaphrodite, besides repeating the citation of Albertus in the text, the commentary adds: “Albertus vidit unum ermafroditum.”⁷⁵ Other passages are:

Unde Albertus in Colonia in quadam fenestra vidit generatum esse quendam lapidem habentem speciem regis, et tunc debuit nasci magnus rex.⁷⁶

Ideo est notandum quod secundum Albertum 4^o Meteororum ipsius caloris sunt plures operationes scilicet dissolvere alterare congregare et disgregare.⁷⁷

The commentary which accompanies the text of *De secretis mulierum* in the editions has been greatly reduced in length from its original full form as found in the manuscripts.⁷⁸ Thus of the introduction to the commentary, before the text

⁷¹ CLM 22297, fol. 48v. Albertus is not named in the corresponding passage in ed. 1740, p. 114: “Pro quo sciendum quod secundum Aristotelem 4. Meteor. cap. de operatione, quod triplex est operatio quae ex parte caloris accipitur . . .” The subject is treated by Albertus, *Liber IV Meteororum, Tract. i, cap. 2* (*Opera*, iv (1890), 708–710).

⁷² CLM 22297, fol. 30v; ed. 1740, p. 48, where the last clause reads: “habet omnes malas dispositiones corporis.”

⁷³ Utrecht 723, fol. 52rb; ed. 1740, p. 16: “quia est summe frigidum et frigiditas est mater albedinis. Respondeo secundum Albertum, quantum esset de natura menstrui. . . .”

⁷⁴ Utrecht 723, fol. 57va; ed. 1740, p. 34: “. . . penes stellas et planetas spiritualiter repraesentantes spiritualement influentiam, diversificantur imagines hominum secundum Albertum.”

⁷⁵ Utrecht 723, fol. 70vb; not in the commentary as printed in ed. 1740.

⁷⁶ Utrecht 723, fol. 71va; ed. 1740, p. 91: “unde Albertus recitat quod in Colonia in quadam fenestra vidit quendam lapidem habentem speciem regis, et tunc debet nasci magnus rex.”

⁷⁷ Utrecht 723, fol. 76va; in connection with the passage of text quoted above in note 71.

⁷⁸ For example, the passage opening, “Hic ostendit causam . . .” at p. 6, ed. 1740, covers only 14 lines as against more than two columns of abbreviated writing at fol. 47 of MS. Utrecht 723. At fol. 59v of the MS, the words “Modo ostendit de aliis signis . . .” introduce nearly two columns of commentary, in ed. 1740 at p. 43, only six lines. Two passages on fol. 64r of the MS have the same opening and closing words as at pp. 60–62 of the edition of 1740, but they have been reduced in length from 20 and 42 lines to 9 and 31 respectively.

opens, as found in the manuscript of 1353, five out of eight paragraphs are entirely omitted in the edition of 1740, and two of the other three are considerably shortened.

There are also differences between different manuscripts of the same commentary. Where the manuscript of 1353 raises only four *dubia*⁷⁹, a later manuscript of the fifteenth century lists fifteen.⁸⁰

More detailed illustration may be offered of resemblance and difference in the text of the *De secretis mulierum* itself as between manuscripts and printed editions.

CLM 22297, fol. 27r

in eo quod tale corpus respicit hanc et illam formam precise, quia eadem ratione daret hanc, eadem ratione daret et illam, cum omnes forme que sunt potentia in materia ponuntur in motore primo virtute.

Quapropter oportet dare aliquam partem celi specialiter respicientem materiam ad susceptionem huius determinate forme. Et cum sufficit agens particulare physicum salvata equali (27v) communitate influentie et actionis corporum celestium, quod patet postquam semen decisum est. Ipsum enim in se gerit vim illius a quo decisum est.

Edition of 1740, p. 32

eo quod tale corpus respicit istam materiam vel istam formam indifferenter: nam qua ratione daret illam formam, eadem daret et alias, quia omnes formae quae sunt in potentia in materia prima et in primo motore, sunt in actu, ut dicit Commentator 12 Metaph.

Ergo cum materia sufficienter disposita est, necesse est esse aliquam determinatam partem in primo motore, primo specialiter respicientem materiam ad huius determinatae susceptionem. Et ideo non sufficit agens particulare physicum stante communi influentia et communi actione corporum coelestium.

Et illud patet ex eo, quia postquam semen est decisum, gerit in se vim illius a quo est decisum.

⁷⁹ Utrecht 723, fol. 52rb, "Hic movet questiones quatuor et dividitur in 4 dubia," fol. 52va, "Ponit secundum dubium et est utrum menstrua . . ." fol. 52vb, "Hic movet tertium dubium," fol. 53ra, "Hic movet quartum dubium et est unde veniant. . . ."

⁸⁰ BN 7148, fols. 2v-3r. At the bottom of fol. 3r, in the text is a sentence as to the *secundina* which I have not found elsewhere: "Iste autem pellicule dicuntur apud mulieres galee et mulieres libenter reservant eas, quia magnam confidenciam habent ad eas, et quedam meretrices faciunt incantationes diversas ex ipsis." But in Albertus, *De animalibus*, VII, i, 2 (p. 545 in Stadler's edition) we read: "Adhuc autem si adhaereat pullis equarum id quod vocatur ycomenez, quod est pellicula secundinae, equae lambunt illud lingua sua et comedunt ipsum, et mulieres incantatrices quando possunt habere hoc, cum hoc faciunt quaedam carmina incantationum quibus provocant parentes ad dilectionem infantium: et haec carmina vocat Aristoteles corrupte proverbia: et est haec culpa non philosophi sed eius qui transtulit librum in latinum. Ab equis enim exit apud partum id quod vocatur kaleion, hoc est secundina . . . quod multum quaerunt magi ad incantandum, sicut etiam quaeruntur secundinae cattorum."

fol. 28v

Et ideo ponunt quidam
astronomi fetum generatum
in hoc octavo mense
morbidum vel mortuum vel
cito moriturum. Causa autem
in sequentibus melius et
planius apparebit.

fol. 31v

Secundo quod me cultorem
fidei christiane vellet
dicere quam hodierno die
(32r) vel ipse mulieres
vel alii baptizant igno-
rantes quod quidem rei nomi-
nis non in gremiis deportarem.⁸¹

Ideo declaratio horum ampliorum
pro hac parte hic obmittatur, et
in tantum de istis planetis et
universaliter de superioribus
respectu eorum influentia ad
inferiora dictum sit.⁸²

The next passage, as to birth in the seventh, eighth and ninth months, comes after three *Dubia* as to the effect of lightning on sexual intercourse. The transitional passage in the manuscript of 1320 is omitted in the edition.

CLM 22297, fol. 37r

De hiis ergo dubitem pro tanto
ut intellectum vestrum . . . ex-
erceatis. Nunc . . . redeamus de
fetu in quo mense libenter
habet bene in egresso suo.
In octavo vero raro vivit, et
causa huius est quia omnis
fetus in septimo mense natura-
liter tendit ad ortum et incipit
laborare ad egressum. Et ideo
si tunc 7 erit, bene habet, quia

p. 40

Et ideo aliqui astronomi
ponunt foetum generatum
in octavo mense
moribundum vel mortuum
esse, ut
in sequentibus manifestabitur.

5 lines of text are then added
as to the ninth month which are
missing in the MS.

p. 59

Secundo quod me occultorem
Christianae fidei vellet
dicere.

Sed quia declaratio amplior est
in hac parte, idoneam omitti-
mus. Et de illis planetis et
utiliter de superioribus corpo-
ribus coelestibus quoad influ-
entiam respectu inferiorum in
tantum dictum est.

ed. 1740, pp. 77–78

Quia foetus in septimo mense,
ut frequentius bene habet, ita
quod motus naturalis est. Si
autem permanserit usque ad
octavum mensem, tunc naturaliter
tendit ad ortum et incipit

⁸¹ BN 7418, fol. 5v: "Secundo diceret me non esse, quod absit, cultorem fidei. Mulieres et alii baptizarent ignorantes quod qui remois(?) non in geminis deportantes"; which is equally puzzling.

⁸² BN 7148, fol. 5v: "Et quia horum determinatio amplior est, ex hac parte obmittatur. Sic ergo de planetarum et utiliter superior influentia rerum inferiorum dictum est."

motus eius est naturalis. Si vero permansit usque ad octavum mensem, et tunc erit libenter mori subito propter hoc quia multum in septimo mense laboravit. Deinde in nono mense exeat sanus est, quia requievit per octavum de laboribus habitis in septimo.

fol. 40v

Sed dicendum quod opera in materiis sic abientibus propter fines sunt. Et ideo de ethica et morte et sexto digito non est instantia quia he a natura particulari non sunt intenta sed ab ea que in hanc regit et universalis est appellata secundum intentionem philosophorum (*4Ir*) qui digne de natura locuti sunt. De hiis igitur tantum ad presens dictum sit

ex parte vulve mulieris.

(see below)

Et si menstrua non currunt . . .

Item aliud signum est si eodem modo non concupiscat coitum. Hoc autem in quibusdam verum, in quibusdam autem non. Quedam enim tales sunt quod magis concupiscunt quando con-

laborare ad egressum. Ideo in septimo mense habet bene, ita quod motus eius naturalis est. Ita quod in octavo mense exit libenter et subito morietur, quia multum in septimo mense laboravit et sic debilitatus est. Si vero nono mense exeat, est sanus, quia requievit per octavum mensem a laboribus habitis in septimo mense.⁸³

p. 92

Dico secundum Avicennam quod non semper possibile est ex parte particularis naturae omne(m) materiam ad suum finem amoveri, nec est concedendum quod privationes suarum actionum habeant fines. Et ideo de aegritudine et morte non est instantia quia haec non sunt intenta a natura particulari sed ab eo qui hanc regit et illa appellata est intelligentia, secundum manifestationem philosophorum qui digne locuti sunt de natura. Et tantum de his dictum est.

p. 94

ex parte vulvae mulieris. . . . Aliud signum, si mulier post coitum appetit continue coitum, hoc est verum in quibusdam, quia quedam mulieres sunt, quae magis concupiscunt, quando non concipiunt, ut visum est in una questione. Aliud signum, si menstrua non currunt . . .

⁸³ The same line of argument is developed at greater length in the *De animalibus* of Albertus Magnus, x, ii, 4 (p. 758 in Stadler's edition), from which it may suffice to quote one sentence: "Sed natus in nono desideravit exitum in septimo et forte tunc solvebatur ab utero sed praepeditus quievit et confortatus per octavum virtute iam reversa exivit in nono, et ideo optime salvatur talis."

ceperunt, sicut visum est
supra in questione quadam.⁸⁴

The following sentences which terminate chapters in the manuscript of 1320 are omitted in the printed text:

Accidit autem quandoque quod menstrua fluunt in coitu, et tunc aliquando prodesset mulieri aliquando nocet secundum quod magis et minus habet de materia.⁸⁵

Nunc autem restaret dicendum qualiter sumitur et respondendum esset mulieribus in partu. Sed quia practice scientie subiacet, ideo obmittemus.⁸⁶

In discussing the cause of difference in sex in his genuine work on animals, Albertus Magnus rejected such explanations as that the male was formed in the right part of the womb and the female in the left, or that the sperm issued from the right or left testicle.⁸⁷ *De secretis mulierum*, on the other hand, among signs whether the child will be a boy or girl, includes swelling of the right side of the abdomen as a sign of a male, or if the woman moves her right foot first.⁸⁸ Albert's brief citation of Hippocrates that a woman who has conceived suffers pain, if she drinks honeyed wine,⁸⁹ is developed in *De secretis mulierum* into "another experiment which I know to be tried and true," with elaborate caution not to let her know why the honeyed wine is being administered.

One more indication of the work's experimental features is had in a text to determine whether childlessness is the fault of the man or woman. Two pots should be taken and the urine of the male put in one, and that of the female in the other, and then the orifices of the pots should be well sealed. "And let such an experimenter diligently observe those pots for nine days or a little longer." If the man is at fault, he will find worms in his pot; if the woman, menstruum in hers. If both are sterile, he will find some of the aforesaid in both pots.

CLM 22297, fol. 45v

Ed. of 1740, p. 107

Iuxta quod notandum est quod
isto modo sciatur si ex parte
mulieris est sterilitas vel
viri. Accipiantur due olle

Iuxta quod notandum quod
isto modo scitur.

Accipiantur duae ollae et in

⁸⁴ This roughly corresponds to the paragraph placed earlier in the edition. Neither statement agrees with that of Albertus, *De animalibus*, ix, i, 5 (p. 694 in Stadler's edition), that woman is the only female animal that engages in sexual intercourse when pregnant, "sed etiam desiderat plus tunc coire et saepius quam fecerat quando non fuit impraegnata, praecipue si est impraegnata de femina."

⁸⁵ CLM 22297, fol. 44v; omitted at end of cap. xi in ed. 1740, p. 105, where, however, part of it occurs in the next to last sentence, "Et ideo quandoque nocet secundum quod materia magis vel minus abundat," which is not found in the MS.

⁸⁶ CLM 22297, fol. 47r; omitted at end of cap. 12 in ed. 1740, p. 111. Also this sentence, omitted between the text on p. 110 and 111: "Alia ratio que habuit materie satis sunt affinia, quia ad practicum magis se extendunt, causa brevitatis hic obmittimus."

⁸⁷ *De animalibus*, xviii, i, 1 (p. 1197 in Stadler's edition). At ix, i, 3- (p. 686), however, we read: "Si autem impraegnetur mulier de masculino, frequentius erit maior impulsus lactis ad mamillam dextram. . . . Si autem impraegnata est de femina, sentietur motus lactis ad mamillam sinistram. . . ."

⁸⁸ Cap. 8, "De signis an vir vel femina sit in utero."

⁸⁹ *De animalibus*, i, iii, 6 (p. 221 in Stadler's edition).

et in utraque tam talium(?)
 et de urina viri in una et
 mulieris in alia. Et istas
 ollas observet talis experi-
 mentator diligenter et supra
 bene obstructas in orificio
 ollarum per ix dies vel parum
 amplius. Et si contingat ex
 vitio viri, tunc talis invenit
 vermes quosdam in olla viri
 et cantabrum fetitum. Si vero
 ex vitio mulieris, menstruum
 in sua olla inveniet. Si vero
 ex vitio utriusque, inveniet
 aliquid predictorum.

utramque urina mittatur, viri
 in unam ollam, et mulieris in
 aliam, et ponatur in utraque
 furfur tritici. Et talis ex-
 perimentator diligenter obstru-
 at ollas per novem dies vel
 parum amplius. Et si contingit
 ex vitio viri defectus, inveniet
 quosdam vermes in olla, et caca-
 bus debet supra poni, et inveni-
 tur rana foetida vel cantabra
 foetida. Si vero ex vitio muli-
 eris, invenitur in olla sua
 menstruum. Si ex utriusque vitio,
 in utraque olla aliquid predicto-
 rum invenitur.

Finally may be quoted a passage which to some may seem the most objec-
 tionable in the treatise, since it states the existence of fornication and concu-
 binage by members of a religious order as a fact, and even justifies it on grounds
 of physical health. Having spoken of suffocation of the womb, the author pro-
 ceeds:

CLM 22297, fol. 44r

Hec autem egritudo contingit
 mulieribus quia multum habun-
 dat in eis de menstruo quod
 corruptum est et venenosum.
 Et ideo cautum est et bonum
 ut tales quecumque fuerunt
 sive iuvenes sive antique sepe
 viris utantur, ut materia
 talis expellatur. In nõibus⁹⁰

autem multum expedit que in
 humido habundant, et hec est
 causa quia iuvenes mulieres,
 cum incipiunt primo coire,
 multum impugnantur (*sic*) ante-
 quam concipiant et curam de
 pueris habeant sive de aliis,
 quia causa, ut dicit philoso-
 phus in libello de secretis
 secretorum, multum facit sene-
 scere. Iste enim mulieres
 iuvenes, quando (*44v*) multum
 habundant in tali natura, mul-
 tum appetunt coire propter
 materie habundantiam. Et hoc
 est ex instinctu nature et

Ed. of 1740, p. 104

Haec enim aegritudo contingit
 in mulieribus ex eo quod abun-
 dat in eis menstruum
 corruptum et venenosum.
 Et ideo bonum est quod
 tales mulieres quaecunque fue-
 rint sive iuvenes sive antiquae
 saepe viris utantur, ut materia
 talis expellatur.

Et expedit juvenibus quia in eis
 abundat humidum. Et hec est
 causa quare iuvenes mulieres,
 quando incipiunt coire,
 multum impinguantur antequam
 concipiant et curam de pueris
 minime habent, quia cura
 (ut dicit philosophus
 in secretis secretorum)
 facit senescere, quod non vide-
 tur in illis. Illae enim iuvenes
 mulieres, quando multum abun-
 dant in tali materia, multum
 appetunt coitum propter
 materiae abundantiam.

⁹⁰ This abbreviated form may stand for *nomimibus*, which would make little sense, or *nonnibus*,
 i.e. nuns.

ideo peccatum est in natura tales retrahere et prohibere eis additum ad illum quem diligunt, quamvis autem hoc peccatum sit in moribus, de quo nihil ad presens.

Ideo peccatum est in natura illas retrahere et coitum prohibere ad illum quem diligunt, quamvis sit peccatum in moribus, de quo nihil ad propositum.⁹¹

The *Secretum secretorum* of the pseudo-Aristotle had been translated into Latin towards the middle of the thirteenth century. The author then proceeds:

Audivi enim semel in confessione societatis ab uno inquirente a me causam quare esset quod quando ipse dormiret cum sua dilecta et iuvenula et ipse iuvenis fuit, quod tunc ipse facto coitu invenit ventrem suum usque ad umbilicum sanguine perfusum. Et timuit multum, quia causam ignoravit, et non fuit ausus se retrahere a iuvenula dilecta propter amorem magnum inter eos.

Audivi in confessione societatis ab una (*sic*) inquirenti causam a me quare hoc esset, quando ipse dormiret cum sua dilecta juvenula, quod tunc (*p. 105*) ipse coitu finito inveniret ventrem suum usque ad umbilicum sanguine profusum. Et timuit multum et causam ignoravit, et non fuit ausus se retrahere a juvenula propter amorem magnum inter eos.

In conclusion, *De secretis mulierum*, like *Experimenta Alberti*, is only in part by him, and that in the sense of being taken from his more genuine writings or modelled, somewhat faultily, after them. It made a better brief textbook than his *De animalibus*, confining itself to the theme of human generation, and as such was accepted, under the aegis of his name, and painstakingly commented upon. As for *Speculum astronomiae*, there is still no adequate reason for questioning the authenticity of its attribution to him or for depriving him of the credit of having composed so outstanding a work in the history of astronomical and astrological bibliography.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

⁹¹ This distinction between a violation of rules of health and sin, or between natural and moral transgression, and the dismissal of the latter as not germane to the present discussion, are paralleled in the leading commentator by a similar separation of science and theology. Thus, speaking of the human soul or intellect, he says (Utrecht 723, fol. 50rb):

. . . loquendo theologicæ facile esset dicere, quia tunc poneretur quod interius sit forma substantialis corporis dans esse corpori humano essentialiter et omne quod habet. Sed loquendo physice (or, philosophice) tunc est difficile. Magis dico quod homo non distinguitur intrinsece ab aliis animalibus per intellectum, potius per animam cogitativam sicut ponit Averoy 3° de anima, 5° commento et multis aliis.

Or, discussing the author's assertion that the operations of the planets cannot be altered by divine sacrifice and immolation of beasts, he explains (fol. 63vb):

Auctor loquitur naturaliter, quando dicit quod per sacrificia et ieiunia nihil potest removeri de effectibus planetarum, quia theologi ibi reclamant oppositam partem, quia omnia sunt in potentia dei, et deus agit libere et sepe exaudit preces Christi fidelium.