

Medieval Academy of America

Notes on Some Latin Manuscripts at Wolfenbuttel in Natural Science, Medicine, Alchemy, and Astrology

Author(s): Lynn Thorndike

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Apr., 1933), pp. 175-179

Published by: Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2846746>

Accessed: 01/06/2010 16:12

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>

Museum, compared with Leinberger's figure of the same saint, emphasizes differences between these two artists, with which we are already familiar. Similar differences in treatment of the same subject appear from a comparison of Leinberger's figure of the judge with balanced scales in Nürnberg with Riemenschneider's St Michael weighing the deeds of Emperor Henry II in Bamberg. Comparison of reliefs made by both men illustrate Leinberger's progressive appropriation of renaissance material and Riemenschneider's subservience to Gothic tradition, in superimposing one surface on another in the mediaeval manner.

Our exposition has discovered in Leinberger and Riemenschneider two pronounced personalities, who exemplify the two possibilities of late Gothic German sculpture. The Bavarian artist, Hans Leinberger, develops the inherited forms of the epoch to the point where they are ready to produce something new. He indicates the transition from the late Gothic style to the baroque. Tilmann Riemenschneider, on the other hand, a Franconian sculptor, harmonious and serene in technique and temperament, remains unmoved by modern tendencies and follows the old formulas of a time already past. A new, wider world would open for us with the consideration of still a third circle of sculptors, who introduced the renaissance to Germany. They started their reforms also, it would appear, in the German territory south of the river Main, in the two most flourishing centres of artistic activities of the time in Germany, Nürnberg and Augsburg.¹

¹ One aspect of the artistic activity in Augsburg at this time was discussed in my article, 'Hans Burgkmair, 1531-1931,' *SPECULUM*, VII (1931), 231-238. Fuller treatment of the subject will be found in a forthcoming article in *Harvard Studies and Notes*, vol. xv (1933), entitled 'Hans Burgkmair's Work for Emperor Maximilian I.'

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

NOTES ON SOME LATIN MANUSCRIPTS AT WOLFENBÜTTTEL IN NATURAL SCIENCE, MEDICINE, ALCHEMY, AND ASTROLOGY

BY LYNN THORNDIKE

THE following notes, based upon a recent examination of the manuscripts in question, are offered in correction of the notices of the same which appear in the elaborate but too often inaccurate catalogue of Heinemann.¹ I list the manuscripts by Heinemann's numbering rather than by the old shelf marks of the different component collections.

In *Wolfenbüttel 3683*, what are listed in the catalogue as an anonymous Herbal (*Herbarium*) and 'Concerning birds and other beasts' (*De avibus aliisque bestis*) are really parts of one well-known work, the *Secreta Alberti* or *Liber aggregationis* ascribed to Albertus Magnus and frequently printed. The *Herbarium* begins with

¹ Otto von Heinemann, *Die Handschriften der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel*, 1884 et seq., 9 vols.

its incipit, 'Sicut vult philosophus in multis locis' These two items are immediately followed by a third which the catalogue describes vaguely as 'Astrological, also various medical experiments, partly from Albertus Magnus,' but which is really the *De mirabilibus mundi* ascribed to that author and commonly printed with the *Secreta* or *Liber aggregationis*. It also is recognizable by its incipit, 'Postquam philosophus certificatum est quid' Since this manuscript was written in 1495 or thereabouts, it is not unlikely that these works possess no independent value and were copied from a printed edition by Conrad Hake who later in the manuscript signs some excerpts from the *De anima* of Albert as made by him in 1495. They are followed in the manuscript by some fifteen leaves of text which the catalogue describes as 'On clock-making' (*De confectione horologiorum*), thus raising hopes as to something of value on the history of the development of mechanical clocks. But these leaves actually deal first with the astrological properties of the planets, then of the signs, and next discuss the quadrant. Only the last two leaves (fols 61^v-63^r) deal with the topic 'De horologiis in plano,' or sun-dials.

It is the more strange that the catalogue failed to identify the *Secrets* of Albert in this manuscript, since it had correctly listed them in another, *Wolfenbüttel 3650*, aided by their explicit at fol. 213. It had, however, there made them include the work on plantations, or the planting of trees, which is often ascribed to Albert, and so had made them begin at fol. 202^r, and in consequence probably had overlooked their usual incipit at fol. 206^r.

In *Wolfenbüttel 2794* the first and principal item (at fols 1-160^v) is a good legible copy of the *Breviarium practice* of Arnald of Villanova, who is further described in the catalogue as the physician of Pope John xxii. But I could see no such statement in the manuscript itself, and of course Arnald, while he had rendered medical services to both Boniface viii and Clement v, had died in 1311, five years before the pontificate of John xxii opened.

In the next item in the same manuscript the initial rubric, 'De pronosticatione febris effimere,' applies only to the first paragraph and not to the entire text from fol. 161^v, col. 1 to fol. 169^v, col. 2, which goes on with prognostics of other fevers, variolae, poison, snake-bite, mad dog bite, in fact all sorts of diseases. It is thus a general book of medical prognostics, and not a special discussion of ephemeral fever, as one might infer from Heinemann's catalogue.

Finally, the medical *Consilia* of this manuscript begin at fol. 189^r and not at 204^r, col. 1, as the catalogue states. The rubric at this later leaf, 'Incipiunt consilia Gentilis et recepte ad egritudines cordis . . .' is merely that of a section of the work which, after dealing with diseases of the head and other superior parts of the body, finally comes to the heart at this point. Many earlier *Consilia* have been ascribed to Gentile da Foligno before this rubric is reached. Heinemann has described the contents of fols 189-204 as a Book on Complexions of Franciscus bishop of Olenus (?) ('Francisci episcopi Olmensis liber de complexionibus') but this is a totally erroneous interpretation of the opening words of the first *Consilium*, 'Dispositio venerabilis patris et domini domini Francisci episcopi Olmensis hic est complexio eius. . .' That is to say, Franciscus is not the author but; he first patient with whose case Gentile of Foligno, or whoever the compiler

of this collection of *Consilia* may have been, deals. The word *Complexio* here of course refers to the patient's physical constitution and state of health.

Furthermore, Heinemann was mistaken as to where the *Consilia*, at least of Gentilis, end as well as begin. He made them extend to fol. 239^v, col. 1, but at fol. 229^v, col. 1 we read, 'Expliciunt consilia eximii medicine monarche magistri Gentilis de Fulgineo.' Various remedies, human figures marked for cauterizing, and other matter then intervene before the *Consilia* of Taddeo of Florence begin at fol. 239^v, col. 2.

In the case of another manuscript (3175, fol. 102^v) the catalogue has misread the name, Gentilis, as *generalis*, so that a brief *Antidotarius* of Gentile (da Foligno) becomes a brief general *Antidotarius*. Yet in a table of contents on the fly leaf of this manuscript the book is again ascribed to Gentile, as well as in the aforesaid titulus of the work itself: 'Incipit antidotarius brevis Gentilis, recepte satis bone et seriose.'

In manuscript 3650 the abbreviated form *Bartol'* at fol. 125^v which the catalogue has interpreted as *Bartoli* is more likely to stand for *Bartolomei*, so that we would have 'Judgments of Urine of Master Bartholomew' rather than of master Bartolus, a name better known for legal than for medical writings. Earlier in the same manuscript medical 'Synonyms according to Platearius' (fol. 31^v-32^r, 'Expliciunt synonyma secundum Platearium') should not be called as they are in the catalogue, 'Synonyma sive platearium, i.e., Synonyma herbarum cum interpretatione, incerti auctoris,' nor as they are listed in a table of contents on the inside back cover of the manuscript itself, 'Incerti auctoris plantiarum seu synonyma herbarum cum interpretatione Latina.' The author is not uncertain, since Platearius is a fairly familiar name in mediaeval medicine and pharmacy. Misreading the abbreviation for *secundum* as *seu* or *sive* has further misled the writers of the old table of contents and modern catalogue into regarding *platearium* as a name for a collection of plants. As a matter of fact, the synonyms are not merely for herbs but for such other things as asphalt, amber, and 'antrax est apostema venenosa.'

In the case of the commentaries upon the *Antidotaria* (fols 1-67^v, 83-98) of Mesue and Nicolaus by Gorgi of Florence in *Wolfenbüttel 2841*, written at Perugia in 1432, the catalogue might have further noted that in the explicit to the first part he is also called Christopher Gorgi of Florence, doctor of arts and medicine, and was apparently already deceased.¹ In the same manuscript Heinemann has misread the author of a tract or extract on sterility as 'Iahalus Jacobi,' whereas the manuscript reads plainly enough, 'Tractatus Iohannis Iacobi de sterilitate.'² John Jacobi was chancellor at Montpellier and addressed his *Secretarium practicae* to Charles v of France in 1379.³ Also in the same manuscripts the so-called *Secrets* of Galen, opening, 'Rogasti me amice Montee ut describerem tibi librum . . .'

¹ *Wolfenbüttel 2841*, fol. 67^v col. 1: 'Et hic et finis huius duodecim distinctionis de oleis et totius antidotarii Mesue compilatus per famosissimum artium et medicine doctorem magistrum Christoferum Gorgi de Florentia cuius anima requiescat in pace . . .'

² *Ibid.*, fols 81^v, col. 2-82^r, col. 1, where it ends or breaks off, leaving the rest of the leaf blank. Its incipit is, 'Signum potissimum humiditatis matricis est emissio . . .'

³ A copy is *MS. Prag. 696*, fols 142^r-214^v. For other works by him see my 'Vatican Latin Manuscripts in the History of Science and Medicine,' *Isis*, xiii (1929), 53-102.

are not said to have been translated from the Arabic into Latin by Gerard of Cremona but merely 'by a master of Cremona' ('translatuſ a magiſtro Cremonenſi de arabico in latino' [*sic*]).¹ Heinemann's *Gerardino* does not appear at all. Still in the ſame manuſcript I do not underſtand why the catalogue ſpeaks of 'Excerpts by an uncertain author from the *Grabadin* of Meſue,' when the text appears to be the *Grabadin* and the author Meſue himſelf.²

In *Wolfenbüttel 3914* the firſt item at folſ 1^r-7^r, which the catalogue deſcribes as an extract from the famous *Natural Theology* of Raymond of Sebonde (died 1432), is really one of the alchemical treatiſes which paſſ under the name of Raymond Gaufredi, general of the Franciſcan order in the thirteenth century, and here bears the title *Ars operationiſ*. Its preliminary obſervations anent divine creation are perhaps what led Heinemann or ſome earlier catalogueſer whom he copied to jump to the reckleſſ conclusion that it waſ from the work of Raymond of Sebonde, but I ſaw nothing in the manuſcript itſelf to ſuggeſt thiſ.

Again, in *Wolfenbüttel 3076* Heinemann haſ aſcribed to Raymond Lull another alchemical work of thiſ brother Raymond which beſinſ at fol. 147^r with the title, 'Verbum abbreviatum fratris Raymundi de leone viridi,' a treatiſe which Raymond the general of the Franciſcans iſ ſaid to have owed to Roger Bacon. In the ſame manuſcript, at fol. 124^r, the opening wordſ of the colophon to the alchemical *Teſtament* aſcribed to Raymond Lull read, 'Per voluntatem de A' (which in the Lullian alphabet indicateſ God) 'noſtrum fecimur teſtamentum in inſula Albionis . . .' but are given by Heinemann aſ, 'Per voluntatem de[cani] A.'

According to the catalogue, *Wolfenbüttel 3098*, a manuſcript of the early ſixteenth century, containſ (at folſ 172^v-190) an aſtronomical work with the title 'I know' (*Scio*) which Alfonſo, king of Spain, ordered to be tranſlated from the Arabic into Spaniſh. Thiſ waſ an undertaking of Alfonſo x, or the Wiſe, of Caſtile of which I could not remember to have heard before. But upon conſulting the manuſcript itſelf, I found that it waſ merely a fragment of the book of magic and aſtronomical necromancy of Picatrix³ which 'he completed from two hundred and more bookſ of philoſophy and to which he gave hiſ own name.' The catalogueſer had miſread *ſuo* aſ *ſcio* and turned 'quem ſuo proprio nomine nominavit' into 'Liber proprio nomine "ſcio" dictuſ.'

Another catalogue entry which excited one's curioſity waſ 'Judicia ſtellarum Hali de anno 1456' (*Wolfenbüttel 3778*, paper, fifteenth century, folſ 33^r-37^v), for the Arabic aſtrologer Hali or Haly of courſe lived centurieſ before 1456. I thought that it might turn out to be an annual prediction for the year 1456 by ſome contemporarieſ baſed upon Haly's principleſ of judgment, but it turned out that 1456 waſ merely the date of copying ſome extractſ from Haly's work.

Another work for which an incorrect foliation iſ given in the catalogue iſ that of Matteo de Guarimbertiſ of Parma on the direction (not *domination* aſ in the

¹ *Wolfenbüttel 2841*, fol. 107^v, col. 2. The initial rubric merely ſtaſeſ, 'Incipit liber ſecretorum Galieni tranſlatuſ ex arabico in latinum.'

² *Ibid.*, fol. 108^r, col. 1: opening, 'ſcripſimur in libro explanationum ex hiſ que experti ſumur quedam adhuc commemoratione digna ex quarum aggregatione ſummam conteximur quod grabadiim noſtrum vocamur . . .'

³ Concerning it ſee *Magic and Experimental Science*, II, chap. 66.

catalogue) and projection of rays in *MS. 2816 (81.26 Aug. fol.)*, which the catalogue places at fols 186–200. Actually it begins on fol. 182^r, ‘Secundum radios et aspectus planetarum et stellarum’ The text ceases or breaks off on fol. 182^v, after which five leaves have been torn out of the manuscript, while those now numbered 183, 184, and 185 are blank. The work of Guarimbertus then resumes on fol. 186^r, but as the opening words then show, with its third and last section: ‘Quantum autem ad tertium et ultimum presentis operis’

The author of *Wolfenbüttel 3721*, 1467 A.D., fols 155–196, *Rosarius (Buch der Alchimei genannt der Rosengart der Philosophorum)*, is not John of Rupescissa (‘Iohannes Rupicissa’), as Heinemann suggests, but Arnold of Villanova. And in *Wolfenbüttel 3882* the *Flos regis* of Arnold extends only from fol. 41^v to 44^v and not to 125^v as catalogued by Heinemann.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BEDE'S EARLY READING

By RUBY DAVIS

APPARENTLY there is no adequate list of the books that helped to make Bede the foremost scholar of his day in Western Europe, a man in whom ‘the whole learning of his age seemed to be summed up.’¹ Plummer, it is true, gives a ‘stately’ list of about 140 authors known to Bede either at first or second hand.² But Plummer’s extended footnote is at best the basis for ampler study; I here present a fuller account of the books Bede read, as well as those he probably read, since they were accessible to him, during his early years. For reasons I shall give in Section IV, Bede’s thirtieth year marks the limit of my investigation.

Thanks to the abbots Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrid, the libraries of the twin Northumbrian monasteries at Wearmouth and Jarrow were from the outset well-stocked with books. We have Bede’s word for it. In his account of the death of Benedict Biscop, founder of both monasteries and the first abbot of St Peter’s at Wearmouth, Bede writes: ‘The large and noble library, which he had brought from Rome, and which was necessary for the edification of his church, he commanded to be kept entire, and neither by neglect to be injured or dispersed.’³

Of the efforts of Ceolfrid, who, beginning eight years later, i.e., in 681 or 682,⁴ ‘with the advice and assistance of Benedict, founded, completed, and ruled the monastery of St Paul’s [at Jarrow] seven years; and afterwards [beginning a short time before Benedict’s death] ably governed during twenty-eight years both of these monasteries,’ Bede says:⁵ ‘The libraries of both monasteries, which Abbot Benedict had so actively begun, under his zealous care became doubled in extent.’

¹ Bright, *Early English Church Hist.*, 1897³, pp. 368–369.

² Plummer, *Baedae Opera Historica* (Oxford, 1896), I, 1–liv.

³ *Lives of the Holy Abbots of Weremouth and Jarrow, Bedae Opera*, IV (1843), 379, trans. by Giles.

⁴ Plummer, *op. cit.*, II, 361.

⁵ *Hist. Abb., Bedae Opera*, IV, 387, trans. by Giles.