

MARY A. ROUSE e RICHARD H. ROUSE , *The Texts called Lumen Anime*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 41, (1971), pp. 5-113.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato dalla Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](#) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale. Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



THE TEXTS CALLED *LUMEN ANIME*

BY

MARY A. ROUSE AND RICHARD H. ROUSE

This paper will explore the history of a text which circulated under the name *Lumen anime* in Central Europe during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries¹. It is a topically arranged collection of *exempla* drawn from natural history, designed for use in the composition of sermons. The work has been variously attributed to Berengar of Landorra, Godfrey of Vorau, John XXII and Matthias Farinator. All told, it survives whole or in part in over one hundred and ninety manuscripts and five incunable editions.

The *Lumen anime* has been of indirect interest to the modern students of a wide spectrum of subjects, as is often the case with a popular medieval compendium. From the admittedly secondary attentions of these scholars, the *Lumen anime* has shown itself to be an extremely perplexing text, one that assumes a variety of forms differing in length and in the arrangement of chapters. These problems have been tentatively explained in terms of different recensions, of abbreviations, enlargements and revisions. No one has attempted to establish a clear order of precedence, nor even to demonstrate a single precise relationship, among the various versions.

The *Lumen anime* was first examined in 1879 by R. Cruel². He provides a clear, concise description of the *Lumen* based wholly on the printed edition of 1477, and he draws attention for the first time to the fact that an Augsburg manuscript attributes the *Lumen* to Berengar, archbishop of Compostella. In 1891, Konrad Burdach, who was chiefly

¹ It is a pleasure to thank A. Vernet, Ecole nat. des Chartes, who read this article in typescript, and to acknowledge the generous assistance of Julian Plante, Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, St. John's University. We are grateful to the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, Paris, and to the Academic Senate of the University of California, Los Angeles, for support which enabled us to carry out this study.

² R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter* (Detmold, 1879), pp. 460-463.

interested in the fifteenth century German translation of the *Lumen* by Ulrich Putsch, distinguished three Latin versions, the oldest of which he said was that written by Matthias Farinator around 1330³. The other two he suggested might be extracts from it. In his catalog of the Royal Library in Berlin, 1901, Valentin Rose described in detail two manuscripts of what he called the "small *lumen*" (das sogen. kleine *Lumen anime*)⁴. He recognized that these were quite different from the *Lumen* edited by Farinator in 1477. J. Th. Welter examined the *Lumen anime* in his thorough study of medieval *exempla*, published in 1927⁵. He, like Cruel, used only the printed text; but he provided the first list of manuscripts of the *Lumen anime*, seventeen in all. Welter states that the work was written by Berengar of Landorra, archbishop of Compostella, in the years prior to 1323, and that it was merely edited by Farinator in the fifteenth century. In the same year, 1927, Paul Fournier dealt with the *Lumen anime* under the self-explanatory title, "Un ouvrage apocryphe de Bérenger de Landorre"⁶. Fournier is the first to point out that the *Lumen anime* which some manuscripts attribute to Berengar, and which was printed under his name in 1518, is not the same work as that contained in the 1477 edition. He states, further, that the title *Lumen anime* was applied to divers compendia of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and that Farinator's task in 1477, "a consisté à refondre et à compléter un ou plusieurs recueils antérieurs...". Joseph Klapper described the *Lumen anime* in a series of articles in Stammler's *Verfasserlexikon*⁷. Klapper's major alteration

³ Konrad Burdach, "Zur Kenntniss altdeutscher Handschriften und zur Geschichte altdeutscher Literatur und Kunst", *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 8 (1891), 19-21. It should be said that in the first note to the second part of the article, pp. 145-147, Burdach observed that Farinator was apparently only the editor, and reported Cruel's discovery of the Augsburg manuscript attributed to Berengar; this Burdach took to be part one of the *Lumen* printed by Sorg in 1477.

⁴ Valentin Rose, *Verzeichnis der lateinischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, II. 1 (Berlin, 1901), pp. 77-80, 340-344, 369-370. For a discussion of the "small" or *parvum lumen anime* see p. 42 below.

⁵ J.-Th. Welter, *L'Exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1927), pp. 341-344.

⁶ Paul Fournier, "Un ouvrage apocryphe de Bérenger de Landore", *Mélanges de philologie et d'histoire offerts à M. Antoine Thomas* (Paris, 1927), pp. 173-178. Fournier was in the process of preparing the article on Berengar for *Histoire littéraire*, but it apparently never appeared.

⁷ W. Stammler, *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1933-55), the following articles: "Berengarius de Landora",

of previous studies of the *Lumen anime* was his designation of a version which he calls the *Magnum lumen anime* as the supposed ur-text of the work. This *Magnum lumen* is neither the version edited by Farinator in 1477 nor the one attributed to Berengar. Klapper also distinguished a *Parvum lumen anime* which he considered to be an extract from the former version. He amassed a list of sixty manuscripts of various versions, including the Putsch translation; but his classification of them is unreliable. Lynn Thorndike provides the best description of the contents of the *Lumen anime*, or, rather, of a *Lumen anime*. He knew it only from Farinator's edition and thus treats it as a single text, although he does mention that "a portion of the work" was printed under Berengar's name in 1518. The description of the *Lumen* in Sarton's *Introduction* is based largely on Thorndike's discussion⁸. In 1952, Morton Bloomfield dealt briefly with the treatise on the virtues and vices which appears in the 1477 edition⁹. He used only this version of the *Lumen*, and follows Burdach in attributing it to Matthias Farinator in the 1330's. Most recently C. R. Dodwell examined the *Lumen anime* because of the material which that work purports to derive from Theophilus Presbyter¹⁰. Dodwell states, rather surprisingly, that the *Lumen anime*'s manuscript source "has not survived, but the work was arranged and edited by Matthias Farinator" and published by him in 1477.

The preceding paragraph adequately demonstrates that the *Lumen anime* has given rise to much confusion and contradiction; perhaps not so readily apparent is the fact that, even among the points of agreement, much of what is "known" about the *Lumen* is erroneous. Scholars have never looked at the manuscripts as a whole. Instead, they have described the *Lumen* from the printed edition and have at times compared this with one or two nearby manuscripts or with printed descriptions of manuscripts. Doubtless the lack of manuscripts of the

I cols. 195-196; "Farinatoris, Matthias", I cols. 606-608; "Lumen animae", III cols. 194-199; "Putsch, Ulrich", III cols. 949-950; V col. 926. For discussions of the *Parvum* and the *Magnum lumen anime*, see below, pp. 42 and 58, respectively.

⁸ Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, III (New York, 1934), pp. 546-560. See also his *Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century* (New York, 1929), p. 14. George Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science*, III (Baltimore, 1947), pp. 94, 582-583.

⁹ Morton Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins* (East Lansing, 1952), pp. 138-139, 145, 398-399.

¹⁰ Theophilus, *De diversis artibus*, ed. C. R. Dodwell (Edinburgh, 1961), pp. xliv-lii.

Lumen in the major western European libraries is partially responsible for this¹¹. This article will not attempt to settle all the problems relevant to the *Lumen anime*. It will, rather, attempt to clarify the complex manuscript tradition of this work in order to serve as a primary orientation for scholars whose research on other matters may touch on the *Lumen anime*, and to serve as a basis for any further and more penetrating study of the *Lumen* itself.

I.

The *Lumen anime* is not one work but three works, separately composed though obviously interrelated. Each of them is a fourteenth-century collection of topically arranged exempla drawn from the realm of natural history, designed for use in the composition of sermons. Each cites roughly the same body of source materials; each is the work of a different compiler. The earliest of the three dates from after 1317 and the latest from before 1357. In addition, there is a profusion of later versions, derived from the three original works, which we shall deal with in the second half of this study.

The earliest of the texts we shall call *Lumen anime* A. According to the surviving manuscripts, the author was Berengar, former Master General of the Order of Friars Preachers and later Archbishop of Compostella, who wrote the work with papal aid and encouragement. This could only be Berengar of Landorra (d. 1330), who was Master General 1312-1317 and Archbishop of Compostella from 1317 until his death. Paul Fournier has raised some reasonable objections to this attribution, and others can be added which might cause doubt¹². The most telling objection is the fact that there is no apparent contemporary evidence to associate *Lumen* A with Berengar. There is no mention of Berengar in the Dominican catalogs of their writers¹³. Nor is there any record

¹¹ There are no manuscripts of major versions of the *Lumen* at the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, the Vatican Library, nor, for that matter, in any English (save the Bodleian), Belgian, French, Spanish or Italian library.

¹² Fournier, pp. 176-178.

¹³ Concerning medieval catalogs of Dominican writers, see Heinrich Denifle, "Quellen zur Gelehrten- und Kirchengeschichte des Predigerordens im 13 und 14 Jahrhundert", Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters 2 (1886), 165-248; H. C. Scheeben, "Die tabulae Ludwigs von Valladolid im Chor der Predigerbrüder von St. Jakob in Paris", A.F.P., 1 (1931), 223-263; P. Auer, Ein neu aufgefundenener Katalog der Dominikaner Schriftsteller, Institutum historicum F. P. Romae, Disser-

of aid having been given to him from the papacy in the composition of this work. Berengar was an active ecclesiastical administrator who left no other writings. There are no contemporary manuscripts of this work; in fact, *Lumen anime* A survives in eleven fifteenth century manuscripts, all of Central European provenance. This immediately suggests the possibility—Fournier would say, the probability—that A is a fifteenth century rendering of the *Lumen anime*, falsely or mistakenly attributed to Berengar. These, however, are arguments from silence; and, while they cannot be answered, they also cannot be permitted to outweigh the positive evidence for Berengar's authorship.

First, it can be shown that *Lumen* A was in existence early in the fourteenth century. Not only was it used in the compilation of *Lumen* C, written before 1357; but it was also employed by the compiler of *Lumen* B, which appeared in Austria in 1332. Fournier himself realized the latter fact, but mistakenly assumed that B was a late fifteenth century recension¹⁴. The text of *Lumen anime* A had thus reached Austria no later than two years after Berengar's death.

Second, the surviving manuscripts of A attribute the work to Berengar. Fournier's suggestion that "quelque scribe, en quête d'une désignation d'auteur pour le recueil..., a choisi Bérenger..." is misleading; from this, one would naturally infer that the author's name appeared in a colophon or rubric, added by the scribe of one manuscript and repeated by others. Instead, the attribution is internal. At the end of the introduction, which is written in first person throughout, comes a paragraph which begins, "Tandem ego, frater Berengarius, quondam magister ordinis fratrum predicatorum nunc autem quamvis indignus Compostellis archiepiscopus, hunc sic fundatus librum edidi...". On the strength of this full statement in the prologue, supported by the fact that the text was in use as early as 1332, we must, for the present, at least, accept Berengar as the author of *Lumen anime* A.

Berengar was born near Rodez, around 1262¹⁵. From the time he entered the Dominican Order in 1282 until his eventual translation

tationes historicae fasc. 2 (Paris, 1933); G. Meersseman, "Laurentii Pignon Catalogi et Chronica accedunt Catalogi Stamsensis et Upsalensis scriptorum O.P.", M.O.P.H., 18 (1936).

¹⁴ Fournier, pp. 175-176.

¹⁵ Concerning Berengar see Quétif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, I (Paris, 1719), pp. 514-517; R. P. Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, II (Paris, 1905), pp. 475-529; P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle I, Études de Philosophie*

to Compostella, his career followed that alternation of duties to his Order with periods of advanced education typical of the Dominicans. He was *lector naturalium* at Brives in 1290, sent to study at Montpellier in 1292, reader in theology at Albi in 1297 and at Toulouse in 1301; and in 1308 he acquired his license as bachelor of theology at St. Jacques in Paris, remaining there as regent master until 1310. This scholastic advancement was accompanied—and frequently interrupted—by advancement in the administrative structure of his Order. Most notably, he was chosen on two occasions, 1306 and 1310, provincial prior of Toulouse, and in the latter year was named vicar of his order. On March 13, 1312, he was elected Master General of the order. Perhaps his most important accomplishment at this post was the establishment on a firm basis of the Order of Wandering Friars for Christ, mendicant missionaries to the East. He served John XXII as head of a diplomatic mission to Philip V of France; and his services were rewarded by his being named Archbishop of Compostella in September 1317, while he was still in Paris, with investiture the following spring. He died at Seville in 1330, a result, it is said, of wounds received while accompanying an expedition against the Moors. Besides the *Lumen anime*, Berengar's surviving writings consist of a sermon (24 May 1310), six encyclical letters written 1312-17, a body of official acts as Master General, and two doubtful works—a collection of *quaestiones* and an intervention for Thomas of Wilton.

Berengar provides us with a certain amount of information about the compilation of the *Lumen anime* in his prologue to the work¹⁶. He was already archbishop at the time when he wrote the prologue; this would indicate a date between 1318 and 1330 for completion of the book. He states that he has worked thirty years on the *Lumen*, and, again, that he undertook the compilation at the pope's instigation. If we took these two statements literally, we would assume that Berengar was supported by either Nicholas IV (1288-92) or Boniface VIII (1294-1303). This assumption is improbable for a number of reasons: because he was at those dates a mere beginner in higher education and ecclesiastical advancement; because there is no record of his having any direct connection with these two popes; because he would likely have

Médiévale 17 (Paris, 1933), pp. 207-209; and the article by V. de Wilde in the Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclés., VIII (1935), cols. 372-374; our biographical description is drawn from these. Th. Kaeppli, Script. Ord. Praed. Medii Aevi, Rome 1970, 191-4.

¹⁶ See the text and translation of the prologue of *Lumen A* in Appendix I.

supplied a name, had he meant any but the current pope; and because one does not expend effusive gratitude on a dead pontiff. It is much more likely that Berengar was speaking figuratively. Perhaps he had begun collecting sermon *exempla* from the realm of natural history during his time as *lector naturalium* at Brives and as a student at Montpellier—hence, the “thirty years”—and had continued to record, in desultory fashion, additional examples that attracted his interest through the years. The latest work cited is the third quodlibet of Durandus of St. Pourçain which was given at Avignon in December of 1314. Then, at some time after 1316, John XXII encouraged him to compile the examples into organized and publishable form. Going beyond moral support, the pope, Berengar informs us, provided him with three assistants who were capable of translating Greek; and with this impetus, the book was put together.

Certainly John XXII is the most likely candidate for papal “instigator” of Berengar’s work¹⁷. For one thing, the two men were well acquainted. Berengar knew the pope through his position as Master General of the Dominicans; and Berengar’s interest in missionary preaching in the East was shared and steadily supported by Pope John. John chose Berengar for the diplomatic mission we have mentioned, and Berengar was named archbishop of Compostella by papal fiat, as a means of settling a disputed election.

Furthermore, it is quite in keeping with John’s recorded activities, that he should patronize the compiling of a preaching aid in the field of natural philosophy. Enough, perhaps more than enough, has been written about John’s interest in the magical and occult aspects of science—his attacks against occult practices among the clergy and his condemnation of alchemy—and about his supposed degree of credulity or skepticism¹⁸. Also, recorded among his purchases for the papal library at Avignon one finds the *Almagest* (1317), Pliny (1317), *De istoriis animalium* (1317), a *Philosophia naturalis* (1321), Thomas of Cantimpré, *De proprietatibus rerum* (1329)¹⁹. There was clearly an

¹⁷ Concerning Pope John XXII see the article by Noel Valois in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXXIV (Paris, 1915), pp. 391-630.

¹⁸ See Thorndike, *History of Magic*, III, ch. 2, “John XXII and the Occult Arts”, and the bibliography listed there.

¹⁹ John’s expenditures on books and his payments to compilers and tabulators can be found in K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII...*, *Vatikanische Quellen*, II (Paderborn, 1911); F. Ehrle, *Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum tum Bonifatianae tum Avenionensis* (Rome,

interest in the natural world, occult and real, on John's part. But obviously he was interested in the *Lumen anime* less as a natural history compendium—which it was not—than as a useful tool or reference book. Looking again at John's acquisitions for the papal library, one finds such aids to study and preaching as the *Alphabetum narrationum* (1317), a *flores... sanctorum* (1317), a *flores Bernardi* (1329), biblical concordances (1330), a *Promptuarium* (1332), and the *Mamotrectus* (1333). And while John encouraged and supported various scholars, including Nicholas Trevet, he is particularly well known for his encouragement and support for the compilation of aids to study and reference works. This interest of John's attracted the notice of Petrarch, who remarked that while the pope avidly desired to read, he was often side-tracked by his many duties, so that "one was sure to please him greatly by culling the 'flowers', as they are properly called, from some work or another, and by composing for him in abbreviated form those things which are called tables, in which everything that might be sought from such books could very readily be found"²⁰. Petrarch's statement is substantiated by the records: In December 1321, Gregory of Lucca, an Augustinian hermit, was given thirty gold florins by John for his expenses during three months in which he composed "quoddam opus super Moralia Iob", probably a subject index²¹. On 10 March 1324 John Dominic of Montpellier, a Dominican, completed an *abbreviatio* of Aquinas' *Summa theologica*, and by 12 October 1331 he had completed a subject index to the same work²². In the accounts for 1332, a friar Peter Thomas of Spain is paid for twenty-six days' work as an "abbreviator originalium"²³. A "Laurentius de Antoniano abbreviator noster" also appears in the accounts. According to Chifflet, MS. 142 of St. Benigne at Dijon contained among other things an "Index in

1890), pp. 136-137, 144-154, 179-182; and A. Pelzer, *Addenda et Emendanda ad Francisci Ehrle Historiae Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum ... tomum I* (Vatican City, 1947), pp. 102-106, 110-111.

²⁰ F. Petrarch, *Rerum memorandarum lib. II* 91, ed. G. Billanovich (Firenze, 1945), pp. 102-103.

²¹ Schäfer, p. 427; Pelzer, p. 105. Concerning Gregory, who became Bishop of Sorra in Sardinia and died before February 1327, see B. Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity...* (Oxford, 1960), p. 32 n. 1.

²² Valois, *Histoire littéraire*, p. 521; Ehrle, p. 180; Pelzer, p. 111. On this work see M. Grabmann, *Hilfsmittel des Thomasstudiums aus alter Zeit...* (Freiburg, 1923), pp. 22-30, reprinted in his *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, II (Munich, 1936), pp. 432-439.

²³ Ehrle, pp. 180-181.

epistolas S. Bernardi iussu Joannis XXII pape conscriptus a Francisco Coti de Perusio, minorita et episcopo Sarnensi”²⁴. On 9 March 1334 John purchased a *tabula originalium* and a *tabula philozophie*²⁵. A friar Philippo [de Slane] of Cork dedicated to John XXII his abridgement of the *Topographia hibernica* of Giraldus Cambrensis²⁶. In the last years of his life John seems to have had a “resident indexer”, so to speak, in the person of the Augustinian friar George de Borgolio who appears several times in the papal accounts as receiving payment for compiling subject indexes to a number of works: 24 February 1332, a *tabula* to Augustine’s Homilies on John; 23 May 1332, a *tabula Super Genesim ad litteram*; 22 March 1333, a *tabula Boetii* and a *Liber vocabulorum biblie*; 19 October 1333, a *tabula* on the books of Ps.-Dionysius; and perhaps the tables to the letters of Augustine and Jerome, and a table to Gregory’s *Moralia on Job* in six *peciae*, which were commissioned by John but which do not appear in the accounts until the following pontificate, 19 August 1335²⁷. John’s moral and material support for the compilation of the *Lumen anime*, which is in effect a specialized subject collection of sermon examples, is one more instance of his interest in the creation of practical tools and reference works.

As for Berengar, it requires no explanation that a learned member of the order of preachers, moreover one who helped to establish an order of missionary preachers, should compile an aid to the composition of sermons. But we may examine, for a moment, the reasons for his compiling an aid that was organized alphabetically and devoted to natural history. Works such as herbals, recipe books, lapidaries, dictionaries, and in the thirteenth century collections of distinctions and concordances had traditionally been alphabetically arranged²⁸. But, for the presentation of more lengthy extracts, writers of the thirteenth century

²⁴ Reported in the papers of Dom Benetot on the books of St. Benigne, and from there in Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova*, II (Paris, 1739), p. 1285. We have not been able to trace the manuscript.

²⁵ Ehrle, p. 154, “pro duobus libris magni voluminis *tabula originalium et tabula philozophie*...”.

²⁶ Valois, p. 521 and n. 4; in British Mus. Add. MS. 19513 ff. 164-188^v (s. xiv).

²⁷ Ehrle, pp. 151-154, incorrectly given as “Gregorius de Bergolio”; Pelzer, pp. 105-106, 111. George was also paid by the papacy in 1326 and 1329 “pro scribendis libris” for Augustinus of Ancona and Johannes Parentius; see Pelzer, p. 106.

²⁸ Concerning the history of alphabetization see Lloyd W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Collection Latomus 90 (Brussels, 1967). The study does not profess to investigate the application of alphabetical organization to materials in later medieval Europe.

employed some type of logical organization rather than alphabetic. Albertus Magnus, in his commentary on Aristotle's *De animalibus* written between 1262 and 1268, thought it necessary to apologize for arranging his list of animals in alphabetical order²⁹. However, by the time of Berengar's death in 1330, alphabetical arrangement of materials was a firmly established and respectable practice which, although it never replaced logical arrangement, increased in popularity throughout the fourteenth century with the growth in the number of preacher's tools³⁰. Berengar was probably acquainted with Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus florum*, the first important alphabetically arranged collection of *flores patrum*, which appeared in Paris in 1306 and enjoyed great popularity all during Berengar's years as student and teacher in Paris³¹. While this was the single most popular work, there were numerous others as well, such as the *Alphabetum auctoritatum* (1276) of Arnold of Liège, or the various alphabetically arranged collections of *exempla*, which were available to Berengar as evidence of the advantages of this form of organization³². Concerning his choice of subject matter, Be-

²⁹ Albertus Magnus, *De animalibus* lib. 22 c. 1, ed. H. Stadler, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, XVI (1920), p. 1349. We are grateful to Lynn White for this reference; see his "Natural Science and Naturalistic Art in the Middle Ages", *American Historical Review*, 52 (1947), 421-435.

³⁰ Concerning the development of aids to study and preachers' tools see M. Grabmann, *Methoden und Hilfsmittel des Aristotelesstudiums im Mittelalter*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. (Munich, 1939), and his work on aids to Thomistic studies cited in note 22 above; see also Cruel, pp. 451-468; A. Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland* (Munich, 1886), pp. 168-184; G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1926), esp. ch. 7, "Manuals and Treatises", pp. 279-308; H. G. Pfander, "The Mediaeval Friars and Some Alphabetical Reference-books for Sermons", *Medium Aevum*, 3 (1934), 19-29; D. A. Callus, "The Contribution to the Study of the Fathers made by the Thirteenth-century Oxford Schools", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5 (1954), 145-148.

³¹ Concerning the *Manipulus florum* and Thomas see the article by B. Hauréau in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXX (1888), pp. 398-408; R. H. Rouse, "The List of Authorities Appended to the *Manipulus florum*", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, 32 (1965), 243-250. We are currently completing a study of the *Manipulus*: its background, sources, publication, and influence.

³² Concerning the *Alphabetum*, which is the earliest alphabetically-arranged collection of this sort known to us, see Welter, pp. 310-311, and Glorieux, *Répertoire I*, pp. 194-195. Berengar might have known the *Tabula exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti* (1277), the *Speculum laicorum* (1279-1292), or the popular *Alphabetum narrationum* (1296) of Arnold of Liège. For others see Welter, pp. 290-319.

rengar himself states in the prologue his reason for devoting his book to natural history: "the invisible matters of God may be perceived through an understanding of those things which He has made", and one may "come to a knowledge of the Creator, guided by the events and effects of the natural order". This idea, of course, was a traditional one in Christian literature; and the use of illustrations from nature in popular preaching had received a strong impetus from St. Francis of Assisi. The practice of illustrating lessons with examples from the world of nature appears as a distinguishable and accepted form in the thirteenth century, when *exempla* from natural history take their place with examples from the Biblical, patristic and literary worlds in the collections of *exempla* made for the use of preachers. The natural *exempla* in these derive mainly from the encyclopedias of the properties of things, such as Bartholomeus Anglicus *De proprietatibus rerum*. Natural *exempla* appear frequently in the sermons of late thirteenth and early fourteenth century preachers such as Jacques de Lausanne (d. 1321) and Armand of Belvézer (d. after 23 xii 1333), for example. Interestingly enough, John XXII was noted for illustrating his sermons with natural *exempla*³³. However, there was no collection of extracts from natural history arranged according to the moral topics upon which a preacher based his sermons. Berengar's work was intended to meet that need.

To describe the contents of *Lumen anime* A we shall use as a basis the manuscript from Trier written in 1407 (Marseilles, Bibliothèque municipale MS. 389 ff. 80-126v). This is the earliest dated manuscript; and a collation of the prologues of *Lumen* A shows that the text in Marseilles 389 is the least corrupt of the surviving manuscripts. An undated manuscript at Herzogenburg may be a few years older than Marseilles 389, but the Herzogenburg text is more corrupt³⁴. In Marseilles 389

³³ Valois, p. 540, and Welter, pp. 140-143 give examples from his sermons. Thirty-four sermons survive in a single manuscript, Paris B. N. MS. lat. 3290 ff. 1-112; they were reported by the Spanish Franciscan Raymond de Lados, procurator general of the order. The manuscript and the sermons are discussed by E. Pasztor, "Una raccolta di sermoni di Giovanni XXII", *Bulletino dell'archivio paleografico Italiano*, 2 (1956-57), 265-281. For a fuller discussion of the use of *exempla* from natural history see p. 69 below.

³⁴ Herzogenburg Stiftsbibliothek MS. 38 ff. 158v-188. While the text of *Lumen* A in this manuscript was written by Petrus de Sancto Monte, MS. 38 was assembled for the house by Urban of Chornewburch (Klosterneuburg), a canon of Herzogenburg, who wrote the sermons on ff. 64-108 in 1396. See p. 23 below.

the text is called *Exerptorius luminis anime*, a corruption in itself, for the text is the same as that found in the other A manuscripts; probably the fifteenth century scribe who assigned this title did so on the basis of his awareness that, by 1407, there were other, much larger, texts called *Lumen anime* in circulation. The work is preceded on ff. 80-81 by a table of the seventy-three chapters. For each, one finds the title of the chapter, followed by several synonyms, thus: "Primum: *De amore*. De caritate, de dilectione, de amicitia. Secundum: *De altitudine mundi*. De honore, de gloria mundi, de dignitate, de sublimitate, de celsitudine. Tertium: *De affluencia...*" On f. 81^v begins a rather lengthy "prologus primus" devoted to the Virgin, beginning "Promptuarium eorum plenum, id est Maria...". This prologue has no apparent relevance to the work which follows and may possibly be a later accretion. It makes no reference to the collection which it precedes, nor to sermons and preaching, nor to Berengar and Pope John. It is not phrased as a supplication, even in the most general terms, for help with the task at hand. Rather, it is a short tract setting forth the spiritual qualities of the Virgin Mary, and illustrating them by means of scriptural *exempla*. Thus, for example, Mary is the baptizer of sinners, a fact to be expounded on the basis of John, chapter three; Mary is Jacob's Well—John, chapter four; Mary is the pool of salvation — John, chapter five; and so on. Five other manuscripts of *Lumen A* contain this prologue³⁵; but Clm 4369 omits it and begins with the "second prologue", a more logical arrangement³⁶. It is noteworthy also that in 1332 the compiler of *Lumen anime B*, who thoroughly pilfered Berengar's "second prologue", gives no indication of having seen this extra prologue. However, without making a thorough collation of the A manuscripts, one cannot adduce any positive evidence that the "first prologue" was or was not part of the original work. At this point, we can simply record our suspicions and pass on. On f. 82 there begins the relevant prologue: "Incipit prohemium in librum quem Lumen anime appellarunt. Prologus secundus. Summi michi pontificis favente gratia eius...". As we have discussed previously, Berengar in this prologue explains why and how he compiled the *Lumen anime*. In addition, he lists the works of natural philosophy which he used in compiling it; there are three groups

³⁵ Herzogenburg MS. 38, Klosterneuburg MS. 382, Kornik MS. 116, and Stuttgart MSS. theol. fol. 288 and HB I 84.

³⁶ Those lacking both prologues are Colmar MS. 88 222, Erlangen MS. 555, Frankfurt MS. Praed. 44, Karlsruhe MS. EM 407.

of books: some were found in the tomb of a "gentile" (a Moor?) in Barcelona; some were first brought to light by "dominus Albertus"; and some he got from a Jew. As we shall see below, this list in the prologue is neither inclusive nor particularly representative of the works actually cited in the text. On f. 82^v*bis* the work itself begins, with the chapter *De amore*, "Archita Tharentinus in libro de eventibus in natura. Incendio grandi...". The text consists of seventy-three chapters, each on a given moral or dogmatic subject, the subjects being arranged in first-letter alphabetical order, from *De amore* to *De vilitate*. Each chapter contains *exempla*, extracted from writings on natural history, which can be used for the purpose of illustrating a sermon on the given topic. Usually each example is provided with a ready-made moralization, introduced by some such phrase as "Cuius ratio est:" or simply by "Sic..." The moralization, in turn, is normally buttressed by one or more *auctoritates*, statements from recognized (usually patristic) ecclesiastical authorities. The book's first *exemplum* will serve as an illustration: "Archita Tharentinus in libro de eventibus in natura. Incendio grandi facto rubescit super zenith nostrum perpendiculariter totum celum. Sic, intra nos facto incendio dei amantissime caritatis fulgebit in nos mox celum beatissime trinitatis. Unde Damascenus in libro contra errores grecorum: Cumque divina accendimur caritate mox toti intus perfundimur felicissima caritate". A preacher could introduce this three-part passage into his sermon virtually unchanged. "The love of God is like a fire. Now, as Archita the Tarentine says in his book on events in nature, when a great fire is lit, the entire heaven grows red perpendicularly over our heads. In the same way, when the fire of the most loving charity of God is lit within us, the heaven of the most blessed Trinity will soon shine upon us. As Damascenus says on the same topic, in his book against the errors of the Greeks, whenever we are approached by divine charity, we are soon thereafter filled with most felicitous charity". In some manuscripts of *Lumen A*, including Marseilles 389 and Herzogenburg 38, there are marginal key-words beside each *exemplum*, as an additional aid to the preacher. Thus, to resort once more to the chapter *De amore*, we find in the margins "1^m incendium; 2^m thesaurus; 3^m carbo; 4^m digitus; 5^m fulmen; 6^m lumen; 7^m sal"; and so on. Finally, Berengar has occasionally provided cross-references to other chapters which contain examples on closely related themes. For instance, at the end of a given *exemplum* in chapter 1 *De amore*, one might be referred to the chapter *De caritate* or the chapter *De dilectione*. In sum, Berengar has done much to make natural *exempla*

available to the preacher, beyond the mere culling out of such examples from scientific writings: he has organized them, according to the moral topics which they illustrate; he has provided each with a moralization that interprets its allegorical meaning; he has buttressed his moralization with an *auctoritas* which confirms or restates it; and he has supplied the whole with the necessary reference apparatus to facilitate use—alphabetical arrangement of topics, extensive table of contents, marginal key-words, and cross-references between topics.

Having described what *Lumen anime* A is, we must also state what it is not. Although we are dealing here with text A, the following discussion applies equally to B and C. The *Lumen anime* is not an encyclopedia of natural philosophy, as Thorndike, most notably, has treated it³⁷. It is not even a moralized or allegorized encyclopedia of natural history, as Welter treated it. Thorndike suggests that *Lumen anime* B is in the tradition of Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum naturale*, and his discussion of the *Lumen* comprises more than half of a chapter entitled "Encyclopedias of the Fourteenth Century"³⁸. To situate the *Lumen* in such a context is misleading, in that the work makes no pretense of giving an encyclopedic accounting of natural phenomena. Thorndike never understood the function that the *Lumen* was to perform—that it was first and foremost a manual for preachers. Regarded as such, it appears amusingly naive to our eyes; but if regarded as a serious attempt at natural science, it would indeed appear to be ridiculous nonsense. Welter deals with the *Lumen anime* in a chapter entitled "L'Exemplum dans les recueils d'Exempla moralisés", where he treats it as one of a type of literature represented, for example, by the *De proprietatibus rerum* of Thomas of Cantimpré, the *Liber similitudinum naturalium* of Conrad of Halberstadt, and the *Reductorium morale* of Peter Bersuire³⁹. Of all those which he describes, the *Lumen anime* is unique in organi-

³⁷ Concerning medieval encyclopedias, particularly of natural history, see L. Delisle, "Traité divers sur les propriétés des choses", *Histoire littéraire*, XXX (1888), pp. 334-388; Ch.-V. Langlois, *La connaissance de la nature et du monde au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1911), reprinted and revised in *La vie en France au moyen âge de la fin du XII^e au milieu du XIV^e siècle*, III (Paris, 1927); M. de Bouard, "Encyclopédies médiévales sur la 'connaissance de la nature et du monde' au moyen âge", *Revue des questions historiques*, 112 (1930), 258-304; and the appropriate sections of Thorndike, *History of Magic*, III.

³⁸ Thorndike, *History of Magic*, III, pp. 546-567.

³⁹ Welter, pp. 341-344. He knew only the text of *Lumen* B, and the reference to Berengar reported by Cruel.

zation. In the other collections, form was determined by content, i.e., natural phenomena; the organization into books and chapters was based upon a logical or alphabetical classification of these phenomena. In the *Lumen anime*, the form was determined by intent, i.e., the exemplification of moral and dogmatic themes; these themes, arranged alphabetically, serve as the chapter headings. We have quoted above an *exemplum* from *Lumen anime* A dealing with fire, as illustrative of God's love; but the *Lumen* contains no chapter dealing with fire as a phenomenon and detailing its several allegorical significations. By the same token, in the moralized encyclopedias one could perhaps find, in a chapter dealing with fire, the statement that fire symbolized God's love; but one finds no chapters dealing with God's love as a topic and detailing the several natural phenomena which exemplify it.

Our investigation of the sources used for compiling *Lumen* A focused specifically upon the evidence which these sources might provide concerning the relationships between the different versions of *Lumen*. Nevertheless, this limited study was quite sufficient to indicate that the task of identifying the sources presents an endless number of problems. The sources cited in *Lumen* A are listed in Appendix III. While one can recognize a number of quite plausible sources, equally apparent are a number of quite unusual citations, such as Belinus, Centobius, Evenus, Fontinus, Loxus, Nestorius, Pandolphus. Berengar may well have borrowed their names, and perhaps borrowed as well the quotations which he attributes to them, from other sources. For example, there are the alchemical writings of Ps. Albertus; or Albert's commentary on the *De animalibus*, which cites Loxus; or the *Conciliator* of Peter of Abano, which cites Belinus; or the *Turba philosophorum*, which cites Centobius and Pandolphus. Besides perpetuating the names of fictitious or unknown authors, *Lumen anime* A also links the names of real authors with imaginary, or unidentifiable, works. Authors in this category range from the esoteric such as Archytas of Tarentum (*De eventibus in natura*) or Polemon (*De signis naturarum*), to standard authors such as Boethius (*Epistola ad reginam virginem*) and Damascenus (*Contra errores grecorum*).

For the genuine works as well, it is probable that Berengar did not know them all at first hand, but rather took many of the extracts at second hand from other works. A number of the extracts from patristic authors may have come from the *Decretum*. If Berengar borrowed "ghosts" from Albertus Magnus, Peter of Abano, and the *Turba philosophorum*, he may also have taken real, or plausible, authors and

titles from them, and from similar works. Finally, even among the plausible sources—i.e., references to authentic, known authors and works—there is the likelihood that the extracts attributed to them by the *Lumen* do not, in fact, appear in those works.

A random check of the citations in *Lumen* A strongly suggests that there is very little relationship between the extracts and the texts to which they were attributed. For example, the extracts attributed to Seneca, *Hercules furens*; Sallust, *Bellum Jugurthinum*; Jerome, *Ad Nepotianum*, and Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon lib. 4*, are not to be found in the texts of these works. The case of the extracts attributed to "Theophilus in breviliquio diversarum artium" is particularly curious. There are some forty-two extracts in all. One of these is repeated in slightly different form three times, which suggests that Berengar may be paraphrasing rather than quoting verbatim. The forty-two extracts are basically alchemical recipes, remedies and maxims; and none of the forty-two, paraphrased or not, comes from the *De diversis artibus*. As we can see, Berengar obviously knew of this title and Theophilus' name, but for some reason, purposefully or unknowingly, drew his materials from some other text. While we have not found an example, it is altogether possible that a given extract may appear under several topics and be attributed to a different author each time⁴⁰.

It is typical of *florilegia* which were actually constructed from codices of *originalia*, that the extracts demonstrate some order of precedence and that the extracts from a given text appear in groups of two, three, or more; these characteristics are more or less dictated by the process of working from codices. In *Lumen* A, there is no apparent uniformity of the order in which the extracts are listed under each subject; that is, one does not find that citations to work Y are customarily preceded by those to work X and customarily followed by those to work Z⁴¹. Some authors, of course, appear much more often than others. Normally, however, the citations to a given work are evenly dispersed through the collection. Thus, for example, quotations attributed to Theophilus occur approximately once every folio in the Marseilles manuscript; sometimes a given folio may have two such quotations, or none at all, but only twice are there two folios in a row from which Theophilus'

⁴⁰ See the discussions of the extracts attributed to Theophilus in *Lumens* B and C below, pp. 38, 45.

⁴¹ For an example of such an order, see Rouse, "List of Authors...", pp. 248-249.

name is absent and, conversely, on only one folio (95^{r-v}) does his name occur as many as three times. This sort of data, obviously inconclusive, does tend to suggest again that there is a breach between appearance and reality insofar as the citations are concerned.

No effort has been made to verify references to the larger patristic works, or references to Greek and Arabic scientific works in translation, so that we are unable to give even the roughest estimate of the proportion of Berengar's citations that are erroneous. For the present, we can only stress that every attribution must be regarded with skepticism, until it has been verified.

This seeming lack of relationship between the extracts and the texts to which they are attributed is due in part to scribal error and honest mistake but it is due in much larger part to conscious alteration. Accurate citation of sources was not considered essential to the value or quality of the average thirteenth or fourteenth century *florilegia*. What mattered was the moral truth which the statement revealed. If that moral could be made more convincing by attributing it to a known authority or to an author currently enjoying a high repute so much the better. Berengar's use of important authors to lend authority to statements is common to the compilers of *Lumens* B and C as well as to the later enlarged versions of the *Lumen*. This cavalier treatment of the real sources of extracts, while understandable, is, nevertheless, used to a degree in the *Lumen* texts which sets them apart from other fourteenth century *florilegia* and collections of *exempla*.

In spite of unreliable attributions, in spite of obviously muddled names and titles, it is worth our while to consider Berengar's purported sources. They are the works which he considered it worthwhile to mention. In particular, the titles of Greek and Arabic scientific works, however honestly, dishonestly, or mistakenly used, served to give *Lumen anime* A an air both exotic and authoritative, which probably had much to do with the *Lumen*'s popularity. In the ensuing discussion, obviously, to say that Berengar "cites" something means that he refers to it, with no guarantee that he in fact quotes from it.

The citations of sources, regardless of their authenticity, remind us that the *Lumen anime* was written at the high point of the absorption of Greek and Arabic learning by the West. Working in South France and Spain, Berengar was part of the intellectual milieu which transmitted ancient and Arabic thought to the Latin world. One is struck at once by the number of times Berengar cites the Ps.-Aristotelian *Problems*. The *Problems* had been translated by Bartholomew of Messina in 1265

but were rediscovered by Peter of Abano about 1300⁴². Peter produced a new translation of the *Problems* and a commentary on them, which he began in Paris and finished in 1310 at Padua. The extensive citing of the *Problems* in *Lumen A* is another indication of the impact of the *Problems* on Europe in the first half of the fourteenth century.

Berengar was also much taken by the vogue of the unknown ancient or Arabic author. In his prologue he stresses that three translators supplied him with texts not previously available, that a Jew brought him other texts, and that a number of his books came from the tomb of a "gentile". The sources he displays in the prologue, quite in keeping with his "cult of the curious", are all little-known Greek or Arabic writers. He has even padded his bibliography in the prologue with a number of such authors who are not actually cited in the text, namely, *Liber Hermetis de mutabilibus entium*, *Algazel de quattuor transcendentibus*; *Publius Celsus de mirabilibus nature*; *Evax de sigillis lapidum*; *Aristes (I) de dimensionibus terre*; and *Alkorak in theorica planetarum*⁴³.

Such enthusiasm for the authors of the East is not surprising, if we remember that Berengar was a younger contemporary of Peter of Abano (d. 1316), Arnold of Villanova (d. 1311) and Raymond Lull (d. 1315). Peter lectured in Paris when Berengar was there. He completed his *Conciliator* and began his commentary on Aristotle's *Problems* before leaving Paris sometime between 1303 and 1310. Arnold, a Catalan, taught at Montpellier and Paris when Berengar was at these schools. He was well known to Popes Boniface VIII and Clement V,

⁴² Concerning Peter of Abano and the Ps.-Aristotelian *Problems* see S. Ferrari, *I tempi, la vita, le dottrine di Pietro d'Abano*, Atti della R. Università di Genova, XIV (Genova, 1900); Thorndike, *History of Magic*, II (1929), pp. 874-947; L. Norpoth, "Zur Bio-Bibliographie und Wissenschaftslehre des Pietro d'Abano, Mediziners, Philosophen und Astronomen in Padua", *Kyklos*, 31 (1930), 292-353; Thorndike, "Manuscripts of the Writings of Peter of Abano", *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 15 (1944), 201-219; D. M. Dunlop, *Arabic Science in the West* (Karachi, [1958?]), pp. 82-102; Brian Lawn, *The Salernitan Questions: an Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature* (Oxford, 1963), esp. pp. 92-94. Lawn suggests that the appearance of the new translation and commentary on the *Problems* greatly stimulated the production of collections of problems in natural philosophy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

⁴³ Although Berengar's is one of the most striking uses we have seen of fictitious authors and titles, he is by no means unique in this. One need only call to mind the literary fictions of his Mendicant contemporaries in England, John Ridevall, Robert Holcot, and John Lathbury, in particular; concerning them, see B. Smalley, pp. 109-202, 221-239.

and to Philip IV of France. Like Berengar after him, Arnold uses the "light" image, for the title of his *Novum lumen*. Raymond Lull also lectured at Paris and Montpellier, and wrote a *Liber de lumine*. These four, Arnold, Raymond, Peter and Berengar, worked in the same geographic area, taught at the same schools, frequented to one degree or another the papal court, and wrote somewhat similar works using a common body of ancient and Arabic material. To them, nature embodied the magnificence of God, and was to be studied not only for itself but for its moral value. They would all agree, "that what learned men have revealed in the world of nature can be adapted by convenient metaphor to moral instruction."⁴⁴ In this detailed application of the natural world to moral instruction they distinguish themselves from the approaches of Peter of Spain and Albertus Magnus to nature. Their emphasis on moralization of natural phenomena is in part responsible for the wide-spread circulation of their works. By means of the *Lumen anime* and similar moralized compendia the lore of greco-arabic natural history flowed into Central Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

There are eleven surviving manuscripts of *Lumen A*. As we shall see, the text of A must have been known in fourteenth century Austria at Vorau and at the home of *Lumen C*; but the oldest manuscript of Austrian provenance dates only from the late fourteenth- early fifteenth century. This is Herzogenburg MS. 38, a collection of texts assembled for the abbey by one of its canons, Urban. It contains a collection of sermons by Urban dated 1396. The text of *Lumen A* in the manuscript was written by Petrus de Sancto Monte and is indistinguishable in date from the hand which wrote the sermons. Besides this, there is no further evidence of *Lumen A*'s circulation in Austria. The main area of its circulation is in the upper Rhineland. Here it appears as early as 1407 at St. Martin's (OSB) in Trier (Marseilles MS. 389, the manuscript studied by Fournier and described above). In 1438 a copy is found among the Dominicans in Frankfurt (Frankfurt MS. Praed. 44) and another mid-fifteenth century text, Colmar MS. 88 (222), was probably at the Dominican house of Guebwiller in Alsace. The Benedictines of St. Mauritius in Ehingen had a copy dated 1448 (Stuttgart theol. fol. 288), and a mid-fifteenth century text probably from somewhere in Baden is now at Karlsruhe (MS. EM 407). The provenance of Erlangen MS. 555, written in 1445, is unknown; but its muddled text links it

⁴⁴ Thorndike, *History of Magic*, II, p. 847.

to the copies at Colmar and Karlsruhe. *Lumen A* also appears in the east, in a manuscript now at Kornik (MS. 116) written by Leonard z Szydłowa in 1447. Finally, as one might expect from the circulation of *Lumens B* and *C*, *Lumen A* can be found in Bavaria. The Cathedral Library of Konstanz (Stuttgart MS. HB I 84) owned a copy which can be dated 1437-1441 on the basis of the paper on which it is written. Another copy is the manuscript written by Johannes Kewrll of Tachau at Nabburg in 1449. At Sts. Ulrich and Afra (OSB) in Augsburg was found the latest manuscript of *Lumen A*, dated 1473 (Clm 4369; this is the manuscript from which Braun, and Cruel after him, quote the attribution to Berengar of Compostella)⁴⁵. *Lumen A* was printed in Augsburg in 1518 by Johannes Miller under the title *De eventibus rerum* (title page, "R. P. Berengarii Archiepiscopi Compostellani liber succinctus et mire succosus de eventibus rerum...") or *De eventibus in natura* ("Incipit prohemium super librum qui de eventibus in natura appellatur editum per... Berengarium Archiepiscopum Compostellanium"). This text is a witness to yet another manuscript, which evidently has not survived. The printed version is much abbreviated, containing only thirty-three chapters. Within the chapters, as well, there is abbreviation in varying degrees, and one finds extracts from two or more of the original chapters combined here under one rubric. For example, in chapter thirty-two *De beata virgine* there are selections from several, but not all, of Berengar's sixteen chapters of Marialia. The final chapter, entitled *De Christo*, is an extreme example of selection and compression; the chapter consists of two *exempla* from Berengar's chapter *De nativitate*, two from *De passione*, one from *De quiete*, two from *De trinitate*, and two from *De venustate*. Although Johannes Miller may himself have been the abbreviator, it is more likely that the printing is a fair representation of his manuscript exemplar. At any rate, collation of the prologue reveals that Miller's text could not have come from any of the known manuscripts of *A*.

Curiously, while *Lumen anime A* was a product of early fourteenth century Spain, and while it was patronized by an Avignon pope, the work did not circulate in southern Europe, then or later. One would have expected that Berengar's work, written "for the utility of my order", would appear in southern Dominican centers. In light of

⁴⁵ P. Braun, *Notitia historico-literaria de codicibus manuscriptis in bibliotheca... ad SS. Udalricum et Afram Augustae extantibus*, V (Augsburg, 1794), pp. 112-113; Cruel, p. 460.

John XXII's interest and support, one would have thought that a manuscript of *Lumen A* would appear in the papal library at Avignon. But there is in fact no evidence, either in surviving manuscripts or in library catalogs, of any such circulation. What Berengar did with his completed work remains a mystery. Our first evidence of its circulation is provided by *Lumen anime B*, which has borrowed from Berengar's work; this version, finished by 1332, proves that a copy of *A* was available in Austria no later than two years after Berengar's death—a fact which does not lessen the mystery, by any means, concerning Berengar's disposition of the work. Before 1357, perhaps several years before, the anonymous compiler of *Lumen anime C* likewise made use of a manuscript of *A*, presumably somewhere in Austria. The eleven surviving manuscripts of *Lumen A* are wholly fifteenth century and wholly of greater German provenance. It is possible that only one copy of *A* was ever made in the fourteenth century, that—upon Berengar's unexpected death—it was carried to Austria, and that this elusive manuscript was used in turn by the compiler of *B*, the compiler of *C*, and the scribe who wrote the first of the fifteenth century copies of *A*. This much, however, is sheer speculation. At any rate, we can affirm that the influence and circulation of the first *Lumen anime* are clearly distinct from its origin in Spain and are the results, rather, of the interest in natural history and in preaching which underlies the proliferation of versions, and the dissemination of manuscripts, of the *Lumen anime* in Central Europe during the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

* * *

The second work with this title, *Lumen anime B*, is available in four incunable editions, and for that reason it has been more frequently described and discussed by modern scholars. However, relying as they do upon printed rather than manuscripts sources, recent discussions have tended to treat this work in a vacuum, *sine anno, sine loco*. As a result, virtually everything which has been written concerning its date, authorship, localization, and relationship to other versions is filled with errors.

Lumen anime B can be dated in or before 1332, the year of the earliest surviving manuscript, Vorau Stiftsbibliothek MS. 130, according to its colophon: "Iste liber est scriptus et consumatus anno domini M^o CCC^o XXXII^o. Qui est rarissimus naturalis scienciosus et super omnes libros dulcissimus, ut patet in eo legentibus" ⁴⁶. The only clue

⁴⁶ Described in P. Fank, *Catalogus Voraviensis* (Graz, 1936), pp. 65-66.

to the authorship of *Lumen B* is provided by a note (see plate I) at the head of folio 1, also in the hand of the writer, which attributes the compilation of the *Lumen* to Godfrey, canon of the Augustinian house at Vorau: "Iste liber vocatur lumen anime quem dominus Gotfridus canonicus et confrater noster ecclesie nostre Vorowensi diligentissime ordinavit. Quem qui etiam abstulerit periculo anathematis cri-nietur (!)". Of this Godfrey nothing is known⁴⁷.

Collation of the prologue indicates that Vorau 130 could be the source of all the other surviving manuscripts of *Lumen B*⁴⁸. The other manuscripts contain individual mistakes not found in the Vorau prologue, while, on the contrary, the mistakes in the Vorau manuscript cause confusion throughout the tradition. For example, in Vorau 130 the word *meticuloso* contains an interlinear emendation, the word becomes *menticulose* (Wrocław IV F. 44), *melancoloso* (Stuttgart fol. 143) and *meduloso* (editio princeps). The phrase "vita et [in margine] moribus" (Vorau 130) is frequently "vita moribus" (Erlangen 613, Wrocław IV F. 44, Klosterneuburg 384). "Ex multorum [in margine] igitur... philosophorum assertionibus" (Vorau 130) appears without the correction, "Ex igitur..." (Klosterneuburg 384), and is variously emended: "Ex hiis..." (Praha Univ. 1811, Wrocław IV F. 44, Erfurt qu. 83), "Ex omnibus et multis..." (Tübingen 692), "Ex multis..." (Admont 213 and 322, Melk 814), and "Sex, igitur, ..." (Wien Nat. 1417 and 2310, Dominikanerkloster 165). The substitution of "de me" (Stuttgart fol. 143 et al.) for "divine" ultimately derives from the idiosyncratic abbreviation of the latter word which the writer of Vorau 130 employed.

⁴⁷ He may be the Godfredus referred to in Vorau MS. 407 ff. 1-9, "Mag. Jacobus libellus de penitentia abbreviatus a Godefredo", as the Vorau catalog suggests; however, MSS. 130 and 407 are written by two different hands. Hurter ascribes *Lumen B*, without explanation, to a Hermann de Gotschah, and then he proceeds to describe *Lumen B* from the 1477 edition; *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae*, II (Innsbruck, 1906), p. 614. The only similar name among the Vorau manuscripts is that of Hermannus de Gortsach who commissioned Ms. 185, a late thirteenth-early fourteenth century manuscript of Guilelmus Peraldus.

⁴⁸ Our collation has been selective rather than inclusive. The manuscripts employed were manuscripts of *Lumen B*: Admont 213, Klosterneuburg 384, Melk 814, Vorau 130, Wien 1417 and 2310 (i.e., all of the surviving s. xiv manuscripts save Clm 3850, s. xiv ex.), and Admont 322, Klagenfurt 164, Stuttgart theol. fol. 143, all fifteenth century; a manuscript of *Lumen C* with a B prologue, Tübingen 692; manuscripts of three different variants of *Lumen B*: Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83, Erlangen 613, Wien Dominikanerkloster 165; and manuscripts of combinations of B and C: Praha 1811, Wrocław IV F. 44.

Certainly, given its dependence on *Lumen A*, the date of composition of *Lumen anime B* cannot have been much earlier than 1332. In light of these facts it seems reasonable to accept the attribution in Vorau 130 at face value, and to consider that *Lumen B* was completed in 1332 by a certain Godfrey, canon of Vorau.

Lumen anime B has lengthy prefatory tables⁴⁹. First (f. 1) is the alphabetical table of chapters, each followed by the number of the folio on which the chapter begins; this information is necessary, because the chapters themselves are not in any thorough alphabetical arrangement. On the same folio is a brief table of cross-references, "Capitula equipollencia". Third (ff. 1^v-6^v, continued f. 162^{r-v}) is a "Tabula... collecta de paragrafis", an alphabetical index of perhaps 800 topics, with a reference to the folio and paragraph in which the subject is treated. On ff. 7-8 is the prologue. The body of *Lumen B* actually contains three separate parts: 1) ff. 8-105^v, natural *exempla* and ecclesiastical *auctoritates* arranged according to 76 topics; 2) ff. 106-111^v, an illustrated text on the virtues and vices; and 3) ff. 112-162, a collection of *auctoritates* grouped under 267 alphabetically arranged topics. Two points are immediately obvious—that *Lumen B* contains elements absent from *A*; and that *B*, even if we consider only part 1, is much larger than *A*.

The prologue of *Lumen B* is an elaborate expansion of the second prologue in *Lumen A*. While largely a fabrication, it does reveal a few facts about the genesis of *Lumen B*. The prologue begins with the same words as Berengar's prologue: "Summi michi pontificis favente gracia eius pariter ad instinctum...". Thereafter, Godfrey's prologue is often like, but never exactly like, Berengar's. His changes are usually "improvements", in the sense of adding either length or verisimilitude. Godfrey says that, originally, despite the urgings of friends, he left the work unfinished—until Pope John saw this half-finished draft and commanded that it be completed. Godfrey has presumably fabricated the papal letter which he purports to quote, as well as the supposed "bishop of Leon", Raymond, sent to him by the pope; there was no bishop of Leon by that name until 1354⁵⁰. Like Berengar, Godfrey mentions the three translators provided by the pope; but this time they have names, Leo, Amundus, Severinus, and are undoubted paragons—which does not deter Godfrey from claiming, later on, that it was he himself who did the translating from Greek to Latin. Whereas Berengar said he

⁴⁹ The folios refer to Vorau 130.

⁵⁰ Petrus Raimundi, 1354-1360; see Rose, Verzeichnis, II, p. 370.

had been working for thirty years—a round and, presumably, rough figure—Godfrey recasts this as “thirty years less one, day and night, without ceasing...”. Godfrey is obviously very proud of his book; he spends a great deal more time on this aspect than did Berengar, admitting without reluctance that his book is the best of its kind, and commenting at length upon the difficult and careful work he has done. In connection with the latter point, Godfrey gives a list of his major sources; actually, this impressive array of titles and authors has been culled from the text, as well as the prologue, of *Lumen anime* A, and does not really represent the sources cited in B, which are discussed below. Just as he enlarged the source-list from Berengar’s prologue, Godfrey also out-did his predecessor in describing the ways in which he acquired his sources. His description amounts to a fictitious *voyage littéraire*; it is one of the most elaborate of its kind for this era. One group of books, of unspecified origin, he translated from the Greek; a Jew gave him other books; books were brought to him from a German monastery, while he himself traveled to Cahors to seek others; some books came from farflung places to which he indicates, either implicitly or explicitly, that he has gone in search of them: Rome, Paris, Valencia, and “the gentile region” in Barcelona; and other books were contributed by doctors of medicine.

To this point in his narrative Godfrey has relied almost entirely on *Lumen* A, using his own inventions, elaborations and sheer verbiage to alter Berengar’s statement. Amusingly enough, he even repeats, in different words, Berengar’s claim that he has eschewed long-windedness and sought brevity—a claim quite inappropriate to either the prologue or the text of *Lumen anime* B. However, following that sentence, he gives us something of his own, a rambling statement of his purposes in compiling *Lumen* B: First, modern man admires novelty and disdains the wisdom of antiquity; as a corrective, Godfrey has compiled the wisdom of the ancients into a novel collection made in a novel style. Second, mankind is blind and cannot see the path to heaven; but it can be led via the “modest side-roads” of examples from nature. The human soul is forgetful of divine matters; but examples from nature are excellent devices to seize the memory in inescapable fashion. Therefore, he has composed a book about the order of created things, to fix men’s thoughts upon the Creator. (This last thought is a distinct echo from Berengar’s prologue.) Finally, natural *exempla* are indispensable for preachers. Not only do they serve to capture the attention, but such examples are more meaningful than mere exhortation.

In conclusion, he complains that his book, in its initial circulation, was given various titles, and was falsely claimed as their own work by other men. So to set the record straight, Godfrey reports that the book, at Pope John's request, is to be called *The Light of the Soul*.

What, if anything, of factual information can we find in the prologue of *Lumen B*? One is tempted to see a ghost of the truth in his story about the book's previous circulation. This could, of course, be merely one more bit of bombast which—along with his claims that people begged him to finish it, that the greatest men of the age strove desperately to acquire a copy—he employed to enhance the importance of his work. However, it is altogether likely that in his several references to an earlier circulation of his work Godfrey is, unintentionally, confirming the prior existence of *Lumen anime A*. In one instance he refers to an unfinished draft in circulation, the "cepta" supposedly seen by Pope John; this would tally with the fact that *Lumen A* is much smaller than *B*. Particularly, Godfrey's reference to a version of "his" work to which unspecified people have affixed their own names seems to be an allusion to *Lumen A*, with its prologue ending "Tandem ego frater Berengarius...". If anyone should wonder whether Godfrey is in fact telling the whole truth; whether, that is, *Lumen A* is indeed only a first draft of *B*, and the Berengar attribution a patent fraud, the answer is negative. For, in contrast to the close tie between their prologues, *Lumen A* and *Lumen B* internally are two separate and distinct works, as we shall see. One must conclude that Godfrey has deliberately attempted to discredit *Lumen anime A* by his intimation, first, that any *Lumen anime* shorter than *B* is merely an incomplete draft and, second, that the attribution of a *Lumen anime* to Berengar, as to anyone else, is an usurpation.

The first part of *Lumen anime B*, as it appears in Vorau 130, is the largest and most important. The material in it is grouped under roughly the same number of headings as are found in *Lumen A*; but Godfrey's seventy-six or so chapters require more than twice the space of Berengar's seventy-three chapters. Although there are similarities between the subjects treated in *A* and *B*, the number of headings which are actually identical is small; it is especially conspicuous that Godfrey devotes only token space to Mary, whereas Berengar has sixteen chapters of Marian *exempla*⁵¹. Godfrey's arrangement of topics is not strictly

⁵¹ However, much of the chapter *De sanctis* in *B* is devoted to Mary.

alphabetical. He first follows a logical arrangement, beginning with Christ (nativity, nature, etc.), the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, the Blessed Virgin, angels, apostles, and saints. Then he adopts a peculiar alphabetical scheme, following first-letter alphabetization from *A-D*, then recommencing *A-S*. There are repetitions from the first sequence within the second, and indeed there are repetitions within a sequence; for example, [ch. 13] *De abiectiōe*, [ch. 14] *De accensione*, [ch. 15] *De abiectiōe*. Another curious aspect of his alphabet is that, of the some sixty chapters in the alphabetized portions, thirty treat topics beginning with the letter *A*; there are no topics beginning with *F*, *G*, *K-R*, *T-Z*.

As for the materials which are presented in the chapters of *Lumen anime* B, we experience a familiar frustration in attempting to compare them with *Lumen anime* A, and must reach the familiar verdict: similar, but different. As we shall see, Godfrey cites many of the same sources from the realm of natural philosophy, works which are, frequently, outside the usual circle of medieval source books; and, in seeming emulation of Berengar, Godfrey provides for his *exempla* suggested application, usually introduced with some variant of the formula, "Et tunc applicetur sic": But, the passages which he extracts from the sources are not the same as the passages which Berengar has taken from the very same body of sources. Certainly, short of compiling an index for every entry in both A and B, one cannot discount the possibility that, say, an *exemplum* which appears under the topic *De ira* in A might be reproduced exactly in B under a remotely related or completely unrelated topic such as *De bonitate*. However, for the chapters in *Lumen* A and *Lumen* B which deal with the same topic, we have yet to note a single case of Godfrey's borrowing from Berengar. We have collated a few of the longer chapters, such as *De amore*, *De cecitate* and *De passione*, which appear in both A and B, because it simply did not seem plausible that Godfrey—citing sources which Berengar commonly cited, dealing with a topic which Berengar had treated, and evidently having a copy of Berengar's *Lumen anime* at his disposal—could avoid at some point repeating one of Berengar's *exempla*. But in those chapters of which we made a complete search, there was no repetition.

There is also a real, if hard to define, difference in the quality of materials presented in *Lumen* B. Judgements upon such matters are necessarily subjective; nevertheless, it has seemed to us that, compared with *Lumen* A and with contemporary works of a similar nature including *Lumen* C, Godfrey's moralizations are excessively naive, ludicrous

and sometimes crude. In this, *Lumen B* epitomizes the tendency toward the ridiculous which characterizes many fifteenth century popular sermons, particularly in Germany, the center of the *Lumen's* popularity. *Lumen anime B*, in fact, may well be the source of many late medieval moralizations, of doubtful taste but of definite entertainment value, employed by the popular preachers. This example (from ch. 1 *De nativitate Christi*) is, if anything, conservative by comparison with some of Godfrey's more elaborate efforts⁵². We chose it because it typifies, in quality, length, and complexity, the "average" *exemplum* in *Lumen B*:

Isidore in his *Natural History*: "Upon the coming of summer a certain worm is born, without the emission of semen, invisibly, without blood. It is hidden in the pavements, the walls, the trees and roofs. It dies in winter, but in spring it revives and flies, when there is fair weather". But then, the worm is Christ Himself, who said, through the psalmist's words, that He was not man but worm. "Now, every worm, when it is pricked, withdraws itself into its shell", as the Philosopher says in the sixth book *On Animals*. In the same way Christ, when He is pierced by blasphemous words, withdraws his infinite patience. The worm, therefore, is Christ. *Apply thusly*: Christ, thus, is born upon the coming of the fullness of time, without any

⁵² One might cite the example which aroused the indignation of the eighteenth century Anglican R. E. Raspe, who, after searching in vain through *Lumen B* for valid citations of Theophilus, gave the following exasperated characterization of the *Lumen* and its author: "In Tit. XXXV[II] Lit. D.C. Aristotle's *Natural History of Animals* is quoted, saying... 'The snout of animals is never dry; and their noses and bills are slippery and wet'. Upon this observation Farinator [whom Raspe takes to be the author] comments thus, 'The mouth, muzzle or snout is an image of confession; for as the muzzle ought not to be bound up in any animal according to *Simplicius in Praedicamenta*, in the same manner confession ought not to be denied to any man; which may be applied to the purpose, that no body should abstain from confession, and from freely accusing his guilt'. I am fully convinced my readers will own with me, they never expected to meet in Aristotle with so forcible an argument in favour of auricular confession; or in a Carmelite, professing chastity, with such indelicate similies, or moralities. Yet such they are, most part of them — and if Farinator's example could entitle me to a similar moralizing freedom, I should say, that Orpheus, who sung human and social virtues into the breasts of animals and savages, was a Saint; and that Carmelites, preaching nonsense into the minds of men, are the worst kind of beasts, and ought to have had their snouts and muzzles tied up in order to prevent the disgraceful change of sensible men into brutes". Raspe, *A Critical Essay on Oil-Painting...* (London, 1781), p. 129. It might be noted that the same quotation, with a different moral, appears in Tit. XLI *De dilectione* lit. X., attributed to "Philosophus in libro problematum".

emission of male semen, invisibly and in a manner incomprehensible to human as well as angelic understanding, without the blood of lust and sin. He is hidden from Jewish hearts, beneath the pavements of humility, because the pavement is trampled under foot; beneath the walls of human frailty, because just as a house is supported by a wall, so man's support is frailty; beneath the thorny trees of misery and pain, because the hard and rigid tree dies in the winter of the Passion. He is revived in the spring of the Resurrection. Finally, He will fly when the weather is fair, that is, on the Day of Judgment. Etc.⁵³

We can use this example also to observe the manner in which the material is organized in *Lumen anime* B. In *Lumen A*, we noted, Berengar adhered quite consistently to a three-stage pattern: (1) the *exemplum*; (2) the moralization; and (3) the *auctoritas* supporting the moralization. In B the first element, also an *exemplum*, is customarily longer and more complex than those found in A. Frequently B has one or more secondary quotations from natural history supporting or expounding this primary extract—e.g., the brief reference to *De animalibus*. Next, the primary quotation is dissected, with an explanation of the symbolic meaning of each part; in this particular passage the symbolism is succinct: "the worm... is Christ". Last comes the moralization, or application, as Godfrey often calls it, which is frequently lengthy and detailed.

As one can see, Godfrey does not employ *Lumen A*'s third stage, the *auctoritas* or statement from a Christian author which supports or reiterates the moral. However, he has not eliminated this element, but has simply divorced the *auctoritates* from a one-to-one relationship

⁵³ Vorau MS. 130 f. 8^v: Ysidorus in *hystoriis naturalium*: Vermis quidam circa adventum estatis sine proiacente semine invisibiliter nascitur sine sanguine, occultatur pavimentis parietibus arboribusque et tectis, moritur in hyeme, reviviscit in vere, et volat sereno aere existente. Sed tunc vermis est ipse Christus qui non hominem se sed vermen asseruit per psalmistam. Vermis etiam omnis cum pungitur contrahit se ad testam, ut ait Philosophus in sexto animalium libro. Sic et ipse Christus verbis compunctus blasphemie contractum fecit patientie infinite. Vermis igitur Christus est. Applica sic: Christus itaque circa adventum plenitudinis temporis nascitur, sine ullo virili proiacente semine, invisibiliter ac incomprehensibiliter a tam humana quam angelica ratione, sine sanguine fomitis et peccati. Occultatur iudaicis cordibus sub pavimentis humilitatis quia pavimentum pede teritur, sub parietibus humane fragilitatis quia sicut domus parieti sic homo fragilitati innititur, sub arboribus spinosis miserie et doloris quia arbor dura et rigida moritur in hyeme passionis. Reviviscitur in vere resurrectionis. Volabit tandem sereno facto aere, id est, in die iudicii etc.

with a specific moralization. Instead, *Lumen anime* B contains separate sections labeled *Auctoritates*, which are collections of brief excerpts relating to the topic in general (*De trinitate*, *De angelis*, etc.) rather than to individual *exempla* in particular. A preacher would use these *sententiae* not for the purpose of illustration or comparison, as he used the *exempla*, nor would he expound upon them. Rather he would simply quote them, as the name implies, as authoritative pronouncements on the topic at hand. On at least two occasions, [ch. 32] *De ascensione Christi* and [ch. 34] *De benignitate*, Godfrey gives *auctoritates* only, with no *exempla* for these topics. Normally, however, the section of *auctoritates* comes before, after, or in the midst of *exempla* which apply to the same topic. For example, on f. 12^r of Vorau 130 is the rubric, *De passione Christi*, followed by *exempla* attributed to the usual corps of largely Greek and Arab authors. On f. 12^v appears the rubric, *Auctoritates*, which introduces about thirty brief quotations, still on the subject of the Passion, attributed to such authors as Augustine, Ambrose, Eusebius, John Chrysostom, Cassiodorus, Gregory, Remigius, Bernard, Hugh of St. Victor, Richard of St. Victor. On f. 13^r is the rubric, *Exempla alia de passione Christi*, and we have two and a half more folios of *exempla* ascribed to Algazel, "Philosophus", Alfarabius, and the like.

The relationship between *Lumen A* and *Lumen B* can be more clearly seen through an examination of the sources cited in B, and a comparison of these with those cited in A. The problem of identifying the sources used in *Lumen B* is essentially the same as that encountered in *Lumen A*, namely, that the references to author and work are untrustworthy. This is further complicated by the fact that *Lumen B* borrowed already unreliable citations from A, and thus in many cases reflects error once removed.

As reported above, a comparison of chapters on similar topics failed to produce any indication that Godfrey borrowed *exempla* from *Lumen A*. Nevertheless, the recurrence in B of the more unusual sources cited in A is too prevalent to be explained by coincidence. We examined the *exempla* in both A and B attributed to a number of rarely cited authors, namely, "Varro in sententiis" (one citation in A, three in B), "Seneca in hercule furente" (two in A, one in B), "Belinus de garritu avium", "Bernardus in floribus", and "Durandus in tertio quodlibet suo", cited once in each work. There was no correspondence between the extracts attributed to these authors in *Lumen B* and those in *Lumen A*.

The same experience holds true for the *exempla* attributed to a fre-

quently cited author, "Theophilus in breviliquio diversarum artium". There are forty-two extracts attributed to Theophilus in *Lumen B*, just as there are forty-two in *Lumen A*; but only one of B's forty-two is taken from A ⁵⁴. On the basis of this limited but meaningful search from two different lines of approach, by subject and by author, it seems probable that a thorough indexing of the contents of both works would show that Godfrey borrowed an insignificant number of *exempla* from *Lumen A*.

The explanation for these discrepancies might seem, at first glance, to be self-evident—that Godfrey, rather than borrowing from his predecessor, has had recourse to the original texts that he cites. For example, in discussing *Lumen A* we reported that the extracts attributed there to Theophilus do not actually appear in the *De diversis artibus*; one might suppose, then, that the Theophilus attributions in *Lumen B* are authentic. However, as Dodwell has shown, they are not ⁵⁵. Likewise, the extract attributed in B to Seneca's *Hercules furens* has not been borrowed from the two with this attribution in A, and none of the three, in A and B together, actually comes from the source cited. Furthermore, one is faced with Godfrey's citation of some of the most unlikely of Berengar's muddled titles—for example, the hybrid of Pliny and Vincent of Beauvais which, in *Lumen B* just as in A, becomes "Plinius in speculo naturali". Also, *Lumen anime B* cites an impressive array of new and unknown works attributed to authors, some of them ghosts, who appear in *Lumen A*. Evidently, Godfrey has simply taken interesting titles and names from *Lumen A* and has applied them whole-

⁵⁴ We have chosen to examine the extracts attributed to Theophilus, in preference to those attributed to another author, simply because they have received a considerable amount of attention from students of Theophilus. They were first noticed in the *Lumen* by Josias Simmler in 1555. They have been extracted, printed and discussed by R. E. Raspe, pp. 123-148; J. M. Guichard in C. de l'Escalopier, Théophile prêtre et moine, Essai sur Divers Arts (Paris, 1843), pp. xxvii-xliv; A. Ilg, Theophilus Presbyter Schedula Diversarum Artium, Quellenschrift für Kunstgeschichte, VII (Vienna, 1874), pp. xxix-xli, and the appendix, pp. 360-371.

⁵⁵ Theophilus, ed. Dodwell, pp. xlv-liv. Dodwell suggests that the discrepancy is caused by an honest error on the part of the compiler of *Lumen B*, namely, that he found these extracts in texts which normally circulated with Theophilus such as the *Mappae clavicula*, though he has found no direct parallel. In actuality, there is no reason to assume that Godfrey drew all the extracts which he has attributed to Theophilus from the same source. There is little uniformity among the forty-two extracts in *Lumen B*. It appears more likely that Godfrey simply attributed extracts to Theophilus at random, regardless of their actual sources.

sale to other *exempla* in *Lumen anime* B. In the process, he managed to garble some of them, so that he cites, with impartial inaccuracy, both "Palemon in phisionomia Loxus" and "Loxus in phisionomia Palemonis"; Archita Tharentinus is coupled with "De eventibus in natura" and "De eventibus in futura"; and Pliny and Solinus alternate as author of *De speculo naturali*. Valentin Rose noted the interesting metamorphosis of a single extract repeated three times in *Lumen B*: first, the extract is attributed to Aristotle's *Problems*; second, the wording is altered somewhat and the quotation is attributed to Pliny's "Speculum naturale"; and last, it appears with the wording of the original usage, the attribution of the second usage, and a completely new moralization⁵⁶. There must be literally dozens of examples of the same basic quotation appearing under two or more subject headings⁵⁷. More often than not, the quotation is attributed to a different author each time. In sum, Godfrey has borrowed from *Lumen A* the names, only, of authors and works, and has applied them freely to *exempla* in *Lumen B*, with little or no regard to the real source of any given *exemplum*.

Godfrey's treatment of the authors and titles taken from *Lumen A* obviously casts doubt upon all the attributions in *Lumen anime* B, including those which are in no way derivative from the earlier work. It is, nonetheless, these non-derivative, additional attributions which interest us most. Godfrey's choice of additional authors and works for *Lumen B*, even if they are names misapplied, is revealing in itself⁵⁸. We must treat these attributions as we treated those in A, gleaning what information we can from these names as names. Godfrey's added citations reveal a closer association with the university than do the citations in A. For example, we see among the new references "Magister in sententiis", the sermons of John Belet, "Wilhelmus super sententiis", "Lincolniensis" (Grosseteste), "Henricus de Gandavo", "Guido in quodlibet", and Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles*. Part and parcel of this university influence is the pervasiveness of the Philosopher. The full range of Aristotle is mentioned, through known and unknown commentaries of Albertus Magnus, Avempace, Egidius, Anthonius orator, Averroes, and Themistius. The references to Aristotle in *Lumen anime* B, particularly to the *Problems*, are even more numerous than in

⁵⁶ Rose, Verzeichnis, II, p. 370.

⁵⁷ Thorndike, History of Magic, III, pp. 553, 556-557, notes a number of examples.

⁵⁸ The authors and works added in *Lumen B* are given in Appendix III.

Lumen A; if this does not mean that Godfrey actually quoted more from Aristotle, it at least signifies that he considered the name an impressive talisman. Godfrey's increased reference to standard patristic texts was predictable, because of his large and numerous sections of *auctoritates*, not to be found in A. The classical authors cited are more noteworthy, when compared with the lack-luster collection in *Lumen A*. In B, Godfrey has added the names of Agellius, Juvenal, Horace, Apuleius, Ovid, Persius, Petronius, Prudentius, Sedulius, Theophrastes, Terrence, Tully, Tibulius (!), Valerius, Vegetius and Virgil. Only in the field of medical authors does *Lumen anime B* not add greatly to the authors and texts cited in A.

After the some seventy-six chapters of *exempla* and *auctoritates* which comprise part 1 of *Lumen anime B*, the Vorau manuscript continues with two additional sections, namely, a brief illustrated tract on the combat of the virtues and vices, and a lengthy alphabetical *florilegium*. The logical connection between these three is obvious, since they all contain material useful to preachers; nevertheless, the collection of *exempla* from natural history, the tract on virtues and vices, and the *florilegium* are clearly individual works, and they circulated separately in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Hence, their textual relationship is unclear.

It has often been assumed by modern scholars that Matthias Farinator was responsible for adding the tract on the virtues and vices and the *florilegium* when he edited *Lumen anime B* for publication in 1477⁵⁹. However, the presence of all three texts in the Vorau manuscript proves that this was not the case. There is an indication in Vorau 130 that Godfrey himself was unclear about the relationship of part 1 to the latter parts of the manuscript. At the end of the collection of *exempla* is the rubric, "Explicit liber primus luminis anime...", which seems straightforward enough, until one searches in vain for any designation of a *Liber secundus*. The rubricated passage continues, "Sequitur tractatus moralis et bonus de septem vitiis et virtutibus qui non est de esse (!) libro, et primo de superbia". This raises the question of whether the tract on the virtues and vices is actually a part of the *Lumen anime*.

It is important in this context to note that the index at the beginning of the *Lumen*, the alphabetical table of "chapters of the following book", incorporates entries for the virtues and vices of the tract, with

⁵⁹ Cruel, p. 461; Welter, p. 341; Fournier, pp. 175-176.

the proper folio reference for each. Furthermore, the later manuscript tradition reveals a continuing association between parts 1 and 2 of *Lumen B*. Nevertheless, we are left with the fact that Vorau 130 seems to say, in garbled Latin, that the tract is somehow an alien element.

Godfrey probably referred to the treatise on the virtues and vices in a fashion distinct from sections one and three because he was not its author. The treatise is distinguished from the collection of *exempla* and the *florilegium* in that it is not a compilation. Parts 1 and 3 are derivative of other texts, particularly the latter; but both, nonetheless, received their present form through Godfrey's agency. The treatise, on the contrary, was probably incorporated without change. As to Godfrey's reason for entering it where he did, it is not too unrealistic to suggest that Godfrey knew of the treatise on virtues and vices, and simply added it here because the last chapter of the collection of *exempla* and the first chapter of the treatise both deal with *Superbia*.

The treatise begins (f. 106^r), "Misit rex Saul apparitores ut raperent David. 1^o reg. xix^o. David qui interpretatur desiderabilis...", and ends at the bottom of f. 111^v, "... modum et ordinem non habent. Explicit. Explicit de vitiis et virtutibus liber " ⁶⁰. It has no title in this manuscript, but elsewhere it is sometimes called *De septem apparitoribus*, *Etymachia*, *De vitiis et virtutibus*. The manuscript does not indicate who was the author of this work. Although the tract often circulated by itself in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we have not yet discovered any other text of the work which is as early as Godfrey's, in 1332 ⁶¹. The work is of interest because of its illustrations ⁶². Each vice and virtue is depicted, in vigorous pen and ink line drawings, as

⁶⁰ This tract was separately printed under the title *De septem peccatis mortalibus*, Strasbourg, ca 1473 (Hain-Copinger no. 13437). The best modern discussion of this work is Bloomfield, pp. 138-139; see also Otto Zöckler, *Das Lehrstück von den sieben Hauptsünden...*, *Biblische und kirchenhistorische Studien*, III (Munich, 1893), pp. 86-91 and table facing p. 118; idem, *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums...* (Gütersloh, 1904), pp. 249-250; M. Gothein, "Die Todsünden", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 10 (1907), 464-465; and Sister M. D. Barry, *The Mounted Vices and Virtues in Medieval Literature and the Fine Arts*, unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1964. We are grateful to Morton Bloomfield for this last reference, but have unfortunately been unable to see the thesis.

⁶¹ While fourteenth century manuscripts of the tract exist at Klagenfurt and Munich, the oldest dated manuscripts are Vorau 210, written in 1348 and possibly a copy of Vorau 130; and Vienna 4581, written in 1387.

⁶² See F. Saxl, "A Spiritual Encyclopaedia of the later Middle Ages", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 5 (1942), 104-105 and pl. 29a depicting

a mounted, mailed figure, whose mount, scutcheon, arms, etc., are intricately symbolic of the trait represented. To carry further the theme of combat, in Vorau 130 each of the warriors representing a vice is depicted charging toward the righthand side of the page, while in the virtuous section the warriors ride toward the left-hand side. In some later manuscripts the text has been rearranged; instead of presenting the seven vices, and then the seven virtues, the revised version presents vices and virtues alternately, each chapter on a given vice being followed by the chapter on its opposing virtue—*Superbia*, *Humilitas*; *Luxuria*, *Castitas*; *Avaricia*, *Largitas*; and so on. In these manuscripts, the artist occasionally seized the opportunity to depict the two opponents together, in a dramatic scene of individual combat. It is interesting to see the separation of the illustration and text traditions in later manuscripts, where the text says one thing and the illustration, driven by its own tradition and conventions, depicts another. This text was obviously intended to be illustrated, for the text describes the symbols in detail; but not all manuscripts in fact contain the illustrations. In some, space has been left for the drawings; in others, the thought that the virtues and vices were meant to be depicted has disappeared entirely. This is apparently the earliest illustrated tract on the combat of the virtues and the vices. It is born full grown; in Bloomfield's words, "No treatment of zoological sin symbolism in the middle ages can compare with that of [the *Etymachia* in *Lumen* B] either in scope or complexity"⁶³. Its influence on the iconography of the virtues and the vices in late medieval German art and literature is manifold⁶⁴.

The rest of Vorau 130 (ff. 112^r-162^r) is devoted to a *florilegium*, consisting of extracts from the fathers, doctors and philosophers, organized under 267 topics which are alphabetically arranged. The first topic is *Abiectio*, beginning "Athanasius in epistola ad Altisiodorum. Tunc in...". The extracts given under the first twelve topics (*abiectionis*, *abbas*, *abstinentia*, *amicitia*, *amaritudo*, *adolescencia*, *anxietas*,

Gula. The whole article is pertinent to an understanding of the milieu in which the *Lumen* flourished. Portions of the tract are reproduced from Vorau 130 in P. Buberl, *Die illuminierten Handschriften der Steiermark* (Leipzig, 1911), pt. 1, pp. 202-204, no. 261.

⁶³ Bloomfield, p. 139.

⁶⁴ Zöckler, *Lehrstück*, pp. 89-91, names among others the *Note wider den Teufel*, which is an appendix to the mystical tract *Der gebissen Spiegel* found in a Lambach manuscript written between 1360 and 1380; and the text in Göttweig MS. 308.

alacritas, anima, animum, asperitas, acceleratio) are attributed to basically the same body of authors and texts which appear in the sections labeled *auctoritates* in part 1 of *Lumen B*. This portion of the *florilegium*, thus, was doubtless compiled by Godfrey, since there are a number of distinctive citations common to parts 1 and 3⁶⁵. The remaining 255 topic headings, and the extracts ranged under them, are taken from the *Manipulus florum*, an alphabetical *florilegium* compiled at the Sorbonne in 1306 by Thomas of Ireland⁶⁶. Usually only a small portion of the material available on a given topic in the *Manipulus florum* is employed by Godfrey; on the other hand, he uses material from virtually every one of Thomas of Ireland's 265 subject-headings.

Unlike the tract on the virtues and vices, the *florilegium* is definitely represented in Vorau 130 as forming a part of *Lumen anime B*; but the relationship, as Godfrey states it, is confusing. Despite his clear acknowledgement that the *flores* are excerpts from the *Manipulus florum*, Godfrey consistently calls the *florilegium* the "registrum" of the *Lumen anime*; thus on folio 111^v, before the table of contents of the *florilegium*, "Hec tabula est registri libri sequentis"; on f. 112^v, "Explicit tabula sequentis libri registri. Incipit registrum"; on f. 162^r, at the conclusion of the *florilegium*, "Explicit registrum precedentis libri qui dicitur Lumen anime. Excerptum de Manipulo florum". Godfrey's use of the word *registrum* in this context is not consistent with the contemporary meaning and usage of the word, for in no sense is it a key to the contents of the "liber primus". Perhaps his rather vague meaning was that here, in the *florilegium*, one could find in methodical and alphabetical arrangement material pertaining to topics which were also treated, under different headings in many cases, in the "liber primus".

As we have indicated, the relationships between the three parts of *Lumen B* are of the most tenuous nature. This fact assumes major significance when we come to consider the circulation of *Lumen B* in manuscript. The three-part structure survives in only one other copy, Klosterneuburg 384, which appears to be a direct copy of Vorau 130: it is dated 1343. Matthias Farinator's edition, as we shall see below, is witness of a third manuscript of all three parts. Otherwise, the surviving manuscripts of the *Lumen B* tradition consist of a few texts of two of the parts in combination and many texts of one or another part

⁶⁵ For example, Ambrosius in libro prefatione; Eventinus; Johannes Mesue in prima practica; Plato in phedrone; Varro in sententiis.

⁶⁶ Concerning the *Manipulus florum* see note 31 above.

of *Lumen B* on its own. The first part, the natural *exempla* (B-1), enjoyed considerable popularity. It survives in twenty-one manuscripts, in seven of which it is accompanied by the treatise on virtues and vices (B-2). The latter was obviously the most popular of the three sections of *Lumen B*; it circulated apart from the other two sections in thirty-six surviving manuscripts. The alphabetical *florilegium* (B-3) was the least popular of the three, surviving apart from B-1 and B-2 in only three manuscripts—a number which suffices to confirm, however, that B-3 did have an independent tradition. In addition, there is one surviving manuscript which contains B-2 and B-3 together.

Chronologically and geographically, the circulation of the parts of *Lumen B* is not dissimilar from that of *Lumen A*. Of the twenty-one manuscripts, seven date from the fourteenth and fourteen from the fifteenth century. Godfrey's manuscript at the Augustinian house of Vorau, written in 1332, was copied in 1343 by someone from the Augustinian house at Klosterneuburg, seventy or so miles distant. Also in the fourteenth century, there were copies of B-1 at the Benedictine houses of Admont and Melk, with variants of the B text appearing in the archdiocese of Prague before the end of the century. While the text of B-1 (occasionally accompanied by B-2) continued to spread in Austria in the fifteenth century, with manuscripts at Admont (OSB), Zwettl (O. Cist.)—a B-C combination, St. Lambrecht (OSB), Vienna (OFP), and Klagenfurt, it moved as well into Bavaria, with manuscripts at Frauenzell (OSB), Regensburg, Roggenburg (O. Praemon.) and Munich (Aug. Hermits). It also flowed into the Rhineland, with manuscripts at the Dominican houses in Frankfurt and Rottweil and at the Benedictine house in Wurzburg. Two manuscripts of *Lumen B*-1 and a B-variant, all written in 1459-60, appeared among the Carthusians at Erfurt. The text reached the peak of its influence in the period 1438-60, to judge from surviving manuscripts; there are nine copies of the text and its variants which bear dates falling within this span.

The treatise on the virtues and vices achieved considerable popularity in its own right. Only five of the thirty-seven manuscripts of B-2 clearly date from the fourteenth century; the earliest of them presumably is that contained in Vorau 210, since the final text in that codex was written in 1348. It probably derives from Vorau 130. Fourteenth century copies also appeared at Klosterneuburg (CRSA), in the episcopal library of Klagenfurt, and at the Franciscan house in Munich; and another copy without provenance, now at Vienna, is dated 1387. The majority of the surviving fifteenth century manuscripts were found

in Bavaria—among the Friars Minor in Munich (three copies), and the Bamberg Carmelites (four copies), with individual copies at Augsburg (Sts. Ulrich and Afra, OSB), Ebersberg (OSB), Regensburg, Ranshofen (CRSA), Nuremberg, Polling (CRSA), Rebdorf (CRSA), and Tegernsee (OSB). With one exception, the dated B-2 manuscripts of the fifteenth century fall between 1437 and 1477; in other words, it reached the peak of its popularity at much the same time as *Lumen B-1* and *Lumen C*. However, it apparently did not circulate so widely across Central Europe as they did.

Lumen B-3, the *florilegium* compiled from the *Manipulus florum*, appeared at least once in tandem with B-2, and also circulated by itself. Klosterneuburg MS. 518 contains a late fourteenth century copy of B-2 and B-3; the texts were almost certainly copied from Klosterneuburg MS. 384, the text of B-1-2-3 which in turn had been copied in 1343 from Vorau 130. The three surviving manuscripts which contain *Lumen B-3* on its own all date from the second half of the fifteenth century, and all come from Augustinian houses. The earliest, written in 1460 at the apex of the *Lumen's* popularity, belonged to the canons of Ranshofen in Bavaria. The second manuscript of B-3 was copied from the edition of *Lumen B* printed at Strasbourg in 1482; the copy, dated 1483, was contained in a codex of the Augustinians in Zagan. The third surviving manuscript, which comes from the canons at Rebdorf in Bavaria, was written in 1495; it appears in a codex with the grandfather of medieval *florilegia*, the *Liber scintillarum*.

* * *

After the confusion of *Lumen anime B*, *Lumen anime C* seems a model of clarity and brevity. This anonymous work was written, probably in Austria, sometime after *Lumen B* (1332) and no later than 1357, the date of the earliest manuscript we have discovered⁶⁷. Manuscripts of *Lumen C* appear within a decade of each other in a number of not too distant places. The oldest dated manuscript, now Opava Statni Archiv

⁶⁷ Opava MS. 505 ff. 22-45, ending "Et sic est finis sub anno domini M^oCCCLVII^o sabbato in vigilia Processi et Martiniani martyrum per manus Thome de Nycolspurk". Mention must also be made of Wolfenbüttel MS. Guelf. 695 Helmstedt., which bears the date "Anno milleno trecento tercio sep. Elizabeth in vigilia completus est iste liber per manus [blank]". This has sometimes been emended as 1337. The hand of the manuscript, north German, could date from the mid-century, but we should rather put it at the end of the century. Burdach, p. 21, dates the text 1383, on grounds which he does not explain.

505, was written in 1357 by Thomas of Nycolspurk (Mikulov in Moravia, about forty miles north of Vienna). The next oldest dated manuscript comes from Prague, in 1367; but it contains materials relating to the diocese of Passau in Bavaria. Three manuscripts bear the date 1369, stemming from Erfurt, Chiemsee, and Wilhering (O. Cist.).

The strongest concentration of fourteenth century manuscripts is in Austria. Besides the Wilhering copy, undated manuscripts possibly older than those mentioned above appear at Admont, (OSB.) Lilienfeld, (O. Cist.) Neuberg (O. Cist.) and Klagenfurt. Combinations of *Lumen B* and *Lumen C* appear at the collegiate church in Glogow in 1374 and at the Dominican house in Breslau in 1375. Two other fourteenth century manuscripts of C are seen today at Erfurt and at Prague. Obviously, early circulation was confined to the southeast quadrant of the Empire; but it is equally obvious that the early manuscripts will not help us to be more specific than that. There is, however, other pertinent information which one should consider. *Lumen C* has drawn upon both of its predecessors, A and B; and so far as we know, a copy of *Lumen A* and copies of *Lumen B* were to be found only in Austria, even as late as 1357. This fact, along with the solid fourteenth century manuscript representation of C in Austria, would speak strongly in favor of Austria as the place of origin for *Lumen anime C*.

Lumen C at times traveled under the name *Parvum lumen anime* or *Minus lumen anime*, a designation which it acquired, no doubt, to distinguish it from the much larger *Lumen B*⁶⁸. In some manuscripts it is called *Speculum anime*⁶⁹, and, on at least one occasion, *Oculus theologie*⁷⁰. At least eleven manuscripts, including the earliest ones known, attribute *Lumen C* erroneously to Pope John XXII; this attribution probably reflects the prologue of *Lumen B*, which represented that pope as having been very closely associated with the making of the earlier *Lumen*⁷¹. The attribution in *Lumen C* is usually expressed in

⁶⁸ Frankfurt MS. Leonh. 6, "Lumen anime parvum"; Praha, Met. Kap. MS. 520, "Explicit minus Lumen anime"; Wien, Schottenkloster MS. 263, "Incipit Lumen anime minus".

⁶⁹ Berlin, theol. fol. 122; Graz, Univ. 1006; Clm 12296; Praha, Univ. 1846; Salzburg b. IX 1.

⁷⁰ Clm 3041, "Explicit liber iste nominus Oculus theologie...".

⁷¹ See manuscripts Admont 308, 649; Braunschweig 135; Erfurt Ampl. qu. 168; Leipzig 1667; Lilienfeld 127; Clm 5393, 18388; Opava 505; Strasbourg 86; Wien 4609. The tradition is strong enough to carry over to a portion of *Lumen B* in

such terms as these: "Iste liber est compositus ab apostolico Johanne moderniori ad utilitatem fidei..." (Opava 505), or "Expliciunt dicta domini apostolici Johannis modernioris anno MCCCLXIX", or "Incipit Lumen anime magistri Johannis apostolici modernioris". (Clm 18388). The wording varies slightly, but most of the statements retain the adjective "modernior", the meaning of which in this context is obscure. Some modern scholars have assumed this to be a patronym; Thorndike writes of "Johannes Modernior, whose name... [suggests] that he was a very up-to-date citizen"⁷². Perhaps the wording in a fifteenth century Braunschweig manuscript (MS. 135) gives a more valid clue to the sense of this expression: "Iste liber est compositus ab apostolico papa Iohanne moderno modo ad utilitatem fidei...". In other words, it is the *Lumen* itself which is modern—"composed in the modern manner". Its subject matter, its alphabetical arrangement and its combined emphasis on *exempla*, moralization, and substantiation have served to distinguish it from the non-preaching, encyclopedic, logically-arranged compendia as being modern.

Our description of *Lumen anime* C is based in general on Clm 5393 (A.D. 1369), the earliest readily accessible manuscript. *Lumen* C has no prologue, but opens directly with the first chapter *De altitudine* (*De altitudine mundana*, *De altitudine mundana glorie*), beginning "Philosophus in sexto libro animalium dicit: In cunctis quidem...". In some manuscripts of C a *Tabula capitulorum* precedes the work, in others the *tabula* follows the last chapter, and in still others, like Opava 505 and Munich 5393, there is no list of topics. The work is organized under some sixty topic headings, arranged by first-letter alphabetization from *De altitudine* to *De Xpto* (*Christo*)⁷³. As in *Lumen* A, the main chapter heading in *Lumen* C is customarily followed by several synonyms; thus, the second chapter begins, "In hec dicendum est de amore. Amor. Fervor, Dilectio, Caritas, Gratia spiritus sancti". Every topic in *Lumen* C is illustrated by a number of examples, each of which is normally a three-part unit consisting of an *exemplum*, a moral interpretation of the example introduced by some such phrase as "Cuius ratio est", and an extract from ecclesiastical authority supporting the

one case, namely the tract on the vices and virtues in Valenciennes 237 which bears the colophon "Expliciunt quedam excerpta de libro qui dicitur Lumen anime, dictatus a papa Johanne, naturalem philosophyam transferens ad veram sophyam spiritualem".

⁷² Thorndike, *Science and Thought*, p. 14.

⁷³ The topic headings are listed in Appendix II.

moral interpretation. The average preacher would doubtless have found it a mine of example, interpretation and quotation around which to build his sermon.

Lumen anime C is based heavily on *Lumen A*. In fact, one might justifiably consider C a revision of A; however, since C discards so much of A and adds so much that is new, it seems simpler to consider it a separate work. *Lumen anime* C has borrowed roughly half of its sixty chapter headings from *Lumen A*. Of the material within each chapter, the proportion borrowed from A seems to be considerably less than half. Furthermore, over half of the material on a given topic in A has not been used by the compiler of C. We should stress that these estimates are not based on a formal tabulation, but represent an impression formed in comparing a number of the lengthier chapters, such as *Altitudo*, *Amor*, *Cecitas* and *Celum* with their counterparts in A. Perhaps most apparent is the use, by the compiler of *Lumen C*, of a number of the more curious authors and titles which appear in A, such as *Alanus de dulcedine anime* or *Theofrastus de parte sensitiva*. Lastly, the manner of presenting material—the consistent three-part unit of *exemplum*, moralization and substantiation—is patterned directly upon *Lumen A*.

While the compiler of *Lumen C* borrowed much from A, he made many alterations in the borrowed material. Two extracts which are together — i.e., are parts of a single unit — in A, may be separate in C; and conversely, extracts may be combined in C which are not together in A. *Lumen C* borrows moralizations from A, but is quite apt to apply them to natural *exempla* different from those to which they were attached in A. But all this is mere tinkering, compared with the major alteration occurring in C. For roughly forty per cent, and possibly more, of the quotations which C borrowed, it changed the attribution of authorship. A few examples will indicate that these changes are not simply scribal errors. Taking the chapters *De amore* in A and C (chapters 1 and 2, respectively): a passage attributed in A to *Origines de ritu ecclesiarum* is attributed in C to *Augustinus in libro contra errores grecorum*; *Auicenna de quattuor diluviis* (A) becomes *Constantinus de naturis liquidorum* (C); *Theofrastus* (A) becomes *Simplicius* (C); a passage beginning "Carbo ignitus in manu absque lesione..." is attributed in A to *Fontinus in descriptionibus universi*, an author and work that are unknown, and in C to *Theophilus in brevilquoio diversarum artium*, although the passage does not appear in *Theophilus*. Among the materials which *Lumen C* has not derived from A—seemingly more than half the total—the compiler of C, like Godfrey before him, has made generous use of the

impressive-sounding authors and titles in *Lumen A* to serve as worthy "sources" for his *exempla*. The quotations attributed to Theophilus are again a striking example of this practice.

There are forty extracts in *Lumen C* attributed to *Theophilus* (*Theodorus*, *Theodolfus*) in *breviloquio diversarum artium*. Of these, five appear with the same attribution in *Lumen A*. Of the rest, some, at least, probably appear with different attributions in *Lumen A*—e.g., the "Carbo ignitus..." passage noted above. The remainder are added by the compiler of *C*; and, as usual, none of the extracts appears in Theophilus' *De diversis artibus*.

The compiler of *Lumen C* also drew on *Lumen anime B*, though not by any means to the degree that he used *Lumen A*. The following authors and titles in *C* are borrowed from *Lumen B*: *Ambrosius libro prefationum*, *Augustinus libro questionum*, *Auerroes super librum de plantis*, *Damascenus libro 8º*, *Egidius super librum quartum de diluviis Auicenne*, *Egidius super de plantis Aristotelis*, *Evax de eventibus in natura*, *Doctor in libro de oculis*, *Gregorius super Ezechielem*, *Plato in phedrone*. These authors are cited in *C* and *B* but not in *A*. It is apparent from this that the Egidius citations, in particular, come largely from *B*. We have not, however, found any indication that *C* borrowed *exempla* from *Lumen B*.

There are only a handful of citations which appear in *Lumen C* only, and which may, thus, represent new material: Ancient: *Vegetius de re militari*; Patristic: *Augustinus in epistola contra Julianum*, *libro decalogi preceptorum*; *Fortunatus in omelia super Marcum*; *Ysidorus in epistolari*; Natural history: *Albertus de septem essentialibus terre partibus*; *Commentator de fleumaticis*; *Egidius de longitudine et brevitate vite*. If these do represent additions on the part of *C*, rather than mere scribal error, it is clear that they fall primarily in the patristic field. All told, one is struck by the lack of departure from the basic group of authors and works cited in *Lumen A* and *Lumen B*.

One curious element in *Lumen C* may prove to be an indication that *C*'s compiler relied heavily on some other, unidentified, compendium for material, aside from *A* and *B*. This element consists of "cross-references", nearly 150 of them, which do not seem to refer to the contents of *Lumen C*—nor, let us add, are they pertinent to or derived from the texts of *Lumen A* or *Lumen B*. One is referred to chapters which do not exist—e.g., "Capitula de baculo", "Capitula de uirga", "Capitula de radio", "Ad capitulum de rei cognite". Furthermore, toward the end, particularly in *C*'s chapter *De trinitate*, there are nearly thirty references to chapters which are designated only by number.

This is curious, first of all, because *Lumen C* does not have (nor does B) a tradition of numbering its chapters; some later C manuscripts number the chapters, but the numbering even then never becomes standardized and the practice is clearly antedated by the "cross-references". It is strange, secondly, because one finds references such as "Capitulo cii^o", "Capitulo cx^o", and the like, up to the number 138; this would indicate a work with over twice the number of chapters found in *Lumen C*—and nearly twice that of A and B, as well. Even those cross-references which seem to be genuine have not proved to be so, in a random check, although some of the rest may well be authentic. We do not include, of course, the very generalized reference ("For further information, see..."), but rather the large number of cases in which one is referred to another chapter, which does exist in *Lumen C*, for the interpretation of a given *exemplum*. In such cases, following the *exemplum*, one finds a formula such as, "Cuius ratio tangetur in capitulo ...", or "Cuius ratio habita est in capitulo ...". There are some eighteen such references to the chapter *De Christo*, for example; it is one of the shortest chapters in *Lumen C* (one half-column in Clm 5393), which makes it doubtful on the surface of things that this chapter could keep its promises. Of the four or five references to this chapter which we attempted to verify, we found *rationes* for none. As a final example, there are six references of this type to the chapter *De ieiunio*. A check of all six produced nothing relevant in the chapter; and, strangest of all, one of these cross-references ("Recurrere ad capitulum de ieiunio.") appears, itself, in that very chapter. One possible explanation for this large body of irrelevant cross-references would be that the compiler of C borrowed *exempla* from some unknown source and that, along with the *exempla*, he copied the cross-references; the references, thus, would refer to chapters in this unknown source, and might eventually be helpful toward the identification of the source.

Lumen C had several advantages over *Lumen B*: it had a smaller, more manageable number of topics, each amply furnished with examples; and virtually every example was followed with a brief explanation or moralization and a quotation from authority. Added to its conciseness and lack of demand on the preacher's thought processes, it had the further advantage over B of clear alphabetic arrangement. For whatever reasons, *Lumen C* became considerably more popular than its two predecessors taken together.

Lumen C survives in at least sixty-eight manuscripts dating from the second half of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries and ranging

across Brabant, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia and southwest Poland. As we indicated previously, the fourteenth century manuscripts of *Lumen anime* C emanate from Austria and eastern Bavaria. From there it spread in the fifteenth century as far west as Brussels, Trier and St. Willibrord, and as far north as Krakow and Danzig. Most interesting to note is the movement of the *Lumen* from one area of religious activity to another, namely its leap from the Rhineland and Central Europe to a cluster of Augustinian houses in and around Brussels. While *Lumen* C thus breaks out of the geographical confines described below, it remains in the same religious environment; for the Augustinian houses of the Low Countries drew heavily upon the Carthusian reform spirit of Rhineland and Central Germany⁷⁴. At least fifty-eight of the eighty-two manuscripts of *Lumen* C (including variants and combinations with *Lumen* B) date from the fifteenth century. During that century its text underwent numerous permutations, and was also translated into German.

* * *

At this point, there are no doubt some who may wonder whether *Lumen* A might not, in actuality, have been compiled from *Lumen* B and *Lumen* C in Central Europe in the early fifteenth century. This is a convenient suggestion: It would explain the absence of fourteenth century manuscripts of A, and the absence of manuscripts of any date from Spain and south France. It would provide a uniform Central European background for the *Lumen* tradition, and it would relieve Berengar of his responsibility for *Lumen* A. However, while this is a convenient and even tempting argument, it is not a sound one. There are four major obstacles to overcome, should one attempt to regard *Lumen anime* A, not as the oldest member of the family and a native of Spain, but rather as the youngest of the three and, like them, of Germanic origin: (1) For this to be the case, the prologue of *Lumen* A would have

⁷⁴ The catalog of Rouge-cloître (CRSA), written in 1532 and based on an earlier catalog of 1487, is in effect a union catalog of libraries in the surrounding area. It refers to manuscripts of *Lumen* C at Groenendal (CRSA), at the Carmelite house in Brussels, at Eindhoven (CRSA) and at Rouge-cloître itself which also had a copy of the incunable edition of *Lumen* B. Unfortunately we have been unable to determine whether any of these survive. Portions of the catalog, now Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Series Nova MS. 12694, are edited by J. van Mierlo, "De Anonymi uit den Katalogus van Handschriften", *Ons Geestelijk Erf*, 4 (1930), 84-102, 316-357, esp. pp. 329-330. We are grateful to Albert Gruijs, University of Nijmegen, for this reference.

to derive from that of *Lumen* B, A's text from that of C, and A's source citations from a combination of B and C. While the act of combining such diverse elements is by no means impossible in itself, it is highly unlikely, if not impossible, that the concise and clear prologue of *Lumen* A could derive from the inflated and diffuse prologue of B. (2) If this were the case, *Lumen* B would inherit the role of progenitor of the family, and it is plainly not an "original" work; instead, it is basically derivative. The author borrowed the treatise on the virtues and vices en bloc for B-2 and built B-3 around the *Manipulus florum*. (3) For this to be the case, the attribution in *Lumen* A to Berengar would have to be a deliberate falsification; it is too long and personal a statement to be caused by a simple error. Nor, surely, would the name of an early fourteenth century Spanish archbishop be the most likely one to suggest itself to a fifteenth century German compiler seeking a name more illustrious than his own. (4) For this to be the case, one would have to overcome, aside from the attribution to Berengar, several other indications which tie the *Lumen* tradition to Spain. In the prologue of *Lumen* A, the author notes that a Jew brought him a number of books; and other books he says were found in the tomb of "a certain heathen" in Barcelona. That is the only reference to a place or region in the prologue of *Lumen* A. The writer of *Lumen* B, who mentions many places yet is aware that he is expanding on a work written in Spain, cannot resist implying a Spanish connection in his own version of the prologue. In B's prologue, it is a non-existent "bishop of Leon" who is sent to bring the author before the Pope; the author went to Cahors in search of books, and found other books, either in person or by emissary, at Barcelona and Valencia. Further, it might be noted that the latest work cited in *Lumen* A (and in *Lumen* B as well), the third quodlibet of Durandus of St. Pourçain (OFP) given in Avignon in December of 1314, survives whole only in two manuscripts, both of Spanish provenance⁷⁵. Not every one of the four objections, perhaps, is insuperable in itself; but collectively they present a serious obstacle which no amount of wishing will remove. In spite of the absence of contem-

⁷⁵ Tortosa Bibl. Cap. MS. 43 ff. 50^v-70^v and Madrid B. N. MS. 226 ff. 204-217. Incomplete texts survive in Toulouse MS. 744 ff. 51-63 and Vatican MS. lat. 1075 ff. 1-15, both lacking quaestio 3; and Münster Univ. MS. 175 ff. 216-217, quaestio 8 only. See P. Glorieux, *La Littérature quodlibétique*, II, *Bibliothèque Thomiste* XXI (Paris, 1935), pp. 72-73. The third quodlibet has been edited by P. T. Stella, *Magistri D. Durandi a Sancto Porciano, O.P., Quolibeta Avenionensia tria...*, *Textus et Studia in historiam scholasticae*, I (Zurich, 1965); not seen by us.

porary manuscripts, *Lumen anime* A must have been in existence by 1332; and it is attributed to Berengar of Landora in the fifteenth century manuscripts of the work. There is no evidence to suggest that these manuscripts were any different from that which Godfrey had used some seventy years before.

To summarize the story thus far: There are three works called *Lumen anime*. A, the earliest, is thus independent of the others. B, written by 1332, borrowed the prologue and many of the citations of sources from A, and presumably used it also as a model. C, completed by 1357, used A extensively as a source for citations and materials, but also borrowed a handful of citations from B. This outlines in simplest terms the chronology and the interrelationships of the three basic texts.

* * *

If this were the whole story, the problems of the *Lumen anime* texts would likely have been sorted out before now. In fact, at least 80 of the 150 some manuscripts (discounting fragments and manuscripts of one or other of the B addenda) do not contain one of these three basic texts, but variants of some sort. The processes of enlargement, of revision and rearrangement, of combination, and of translation, have left us not with three but with a dozen or so versions of the *Lumen anime*. We shall consider these processes in a general way, citing the manuscripts which exemplify one or another type of change; and we shall examine in some detail those variants which are significant, either by reason of the number of manuscripts involved or because of the confusion which a certain variant has given rise to in modern studies.

Of *Lumen anime* A there are no true variants, in the sense of conscious alteration or addition. But there is one curious sub-group, consisting of three manuscripts, in which whole blocks of chapters have been reversed and the group of Marialia chapters have been lost altogether (and this last might, after all, have been a deliberate omission). These manuscripts—Colmar 88 (222), Erlangen 555, Karlsruhe EM 407—are almost certainly derived from an exemplar in which the gatherings had somehow been assembled in the wrong order. The Karlsruhe text has suffered the further loss of most of the first block of chapters.

The three significant variants of *Lumen anime* B have a worthy purpose which one might well have expected: They each try to put Godfrey's hodge-podge into a rational order. They arrange his chapters in alphabetical order, and eliminate, by combination or omission, his repetitions of any given topic. All three preserve the original prologue.

Vienna, Dominikanerkloster MS. 165 (ff. 2-184), is an *unicum*, and the simplest of the three to describe; without additions or omissions, seemingly, it arranges the chapters of Godfrey's "liber primus" in complete (not just first-letter) alphabetical order, so that the text begins with *Abiectio*, "Plinius in speculo naturali. Cumque spina dorsi...". The second B variant exists in at least two manuscripts, Erlangen Univ. MS. 613 and Wrocław Bibl. uniw. MS. IV F. 45 (ff. 1-114^v). The chapters in this version are alphabetized only by first letter, beginning with the chapter *De abstinencia*, "Hugo de sancto victore. Miram sibi virtutem...". Two aspects of this text are worth noting: (1) The compiler has included material not only from Godfrey's "liber primus" but also select quotations from the so called "registrum", i.e., the *florilegium* which Godfrey constructed primarily from the *Manipulus florum*; (2) in addition to *Lumen anime* B, the compiler has used another source, probably a *florilegium*, to add patristic quotations on a given topic. The third variant of B is the most significant in number of manuscripts (seven); it warrants description for the additional reason that it has already been described in print, in a completely misleading fashion⁷⁶. The text begins with the chapter *Amor*, "Gregorius super Ezechielem. Anima sine amore...". There are approximately 250 chapters, *Amor*, *Altitudo*, *Auditus*, *Audacia*..., *Yris*, *Yerarchia*, *Zelus*. The compiler has rearranged Godfrey's chapters by first letter of the alphabet, without any internal revision of the material in a given chapter. In addition, he has supplied new chapters not found in *Lumen* B; these are numerous but very brief, and seem to be taken largely from patristic writings, probably by way of a *florilegium*.

In considering the significant variants of *Lumen* B, one might well include the edition of the *Lumen* published in 1477 by Anton Sorg, provided that we emphasize the word "significant" rather than "variant"⁷⁷. Sorg printed in Augsburg between 1475 and 1493; the *Lumen anime* was one of a number of moralistic compendia for the religious which he published in his early years⁷⁸. The work was edited for Sorg by a Viennese Carmelite, Matthias Farinator⁷⁹. Little is known about

⁷⁶ See below, p. 58. Manuscripts are Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83, Klagenfurt Studienbibl. 139, Praha Met. Kap. 507 and 524, Wolfenbüttel Guelf. 42. 12 Aug. fol., and Wrocław I Q. 15 and IV Q. 147.

⁷⁷ Hain 10329; Catalogue of Books printed in the XVth Century now in the British Museum (hereafter cited Cat. B.M.), II (London, 1912), p. 344, IB 5311.

⁷⁸ Concerning Sorg and his press see Cat. B.M. II, p. 341.

⁷⁹ Concerning Farinator see C. de Villiers, Biblioteca Carmelitana, II (Orleans,

him beyond that he was from Vienna, was a lector in theology, was at Erfurt, performed editorial work for one of the great printers of his day, and eventually became prior of Gosingen. He first appears in 1472, as the copyist of a manuscript of Thomas a Kempis' *Imitatio Christi*⁸⁰. He must have been employed by Sorg in the mid 1470's, for we see that he compiled a subject index or table to Johannes de Peckham *De oculo morali* which was published by Sorg at the monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra in 1476 and again by him at an unknown later date⁸¹.

In preparing the *Lumen* for Sorg, Farinator evidently used a manuscript which does not survive. Although the printed text compares well with that found in Vorau 130, it is still closer to the texts of Admont 213 and Melk 814 (both fourteenth century) and Admont 322 (fifteenth century), none of which contains all three parts of *Lumen B*. One may postulate that Farinator's exemplar was a direct copy of the complete text of either Vorau 130 or Klosterneuburg 384, and that the Admont-Melk texts were likewise derived from this exemplar. To the text which he used, Farinator added two extensive subject indexes of *naturalia* and of *moralia*. The former is taken in large part from Godfrey's own "table of paragraphs". Farinator prefaced the whole with a brief new prologue, beginning "Quamvis athenarum grecorumque multiplicata volumina miris odoriferisque fragrantia...", much of which is devoted to explaining his reference system for use of the indexes. However,

1752), cols. 410-413. Additional references to the early modern bio-bibliographic dictionaries can be found in U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age: Bio-Bibliographie*, I (Paris, 1905), col. 1461; see also Rose, *Verzeichnis*, II, pp. 369-370.

⁸⁰ The manuscript has caused some comment among the investigators of the authorship of the *Imitatio Christi*. Tradition has it that Farinator copied a manuscript of books 1-2 of the *Imitatio* in 1472; the manuscript became the property of the Carmelite house at Augsburg. This manuscript passed into the city library, where it is described by Elia Ehinger in his catalog of Augsburg manuscripts. Supposedly it disappeared from the library sometime between 1633 and 1645 and has not been known since; see P. Bonardi and T. Lupo, *L'Imitazione di Cristo e il suo autore*, II (Turin, 1964), pp. 171-173. The manuscript in question, however, can be identified with Clm 3586 (Aug. civ. 86); the *Imitatio* and a brief tract by Nicholas Lakman were removed from the codex sometime between 1633, the date of Ehinger's catalog, and 1791-96, the date of Braun's catalog. The manuscript thus did not receive an index-entry under the name of Thomas a Kempis in the Munich catalog, and has gone unnoticed as a result.

⁸¹ Hain 9427; IB 5845, Cat. B.M. II, p. 345; attributed to Pierre de Limoges, Glorieux, *Répertoire I*, p. 364. Sorg began printing at the Benedictine monastery.

the prologue also manages to imply (and later scholars have inferred) that Farinator carried out a significant reorganization of the text: "Cum autem adhuc informis esset, simplicioribusque rudis et obscurus appareret, ego frater Mathias..., ne lateret in obscuris...". But if one reads on, Farinator's specific claims are that he numbered the chapters and assigned a letter to each *exemplum* within the chapters, in order to construct his indexes. An examination of the text reveals that he, or his exemplar, eliminated or overlooked four of Godfrey's rubrics and added two more; so that, while the text is the same, the printed edition has seventy-four rather than seventy-six headings. Furthermore, he affixed the tract on vices and virtues as chapter, or "titulus", 75 to Godfrey's "liber primus"; and he treated the *florilegium* which begins "Athanasius in epistola ad Altisiodorum..." as book two. Otherwise his edition is basically equivalent to the text found in Vorau 130 one hundred forty-five years earlier. Nevertheless, it was Farinator's work on the *Lumen* alone which gained him a place in the biobibliographic dictionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Sometime between 1472 and 1478 Farinator was at the University of Erfurt. During those years he assembled the thirty-five texts found in Clm 3586⁸². They include Richard de Bury's *Philobiblon*, Thomas a Kempis *De imitatione Christi*, Theophrastus *De non ducenda uxore sapienti*, and Petrarch *Poetae ars punctuandi*. The manuscript, written at Erfurt, is in Farinator's own hand (see plate II). In 1480, Farinator, then prior of Gosingen, wrote an invocation upon the inception of John Carpenter as prior provincial, which was delivered by John Pauer at Vienna⁸³. This is the last known mention of him.

Three more editions of the *Lumen anime* were printed before 1500. Sorg's edition appeared on September 3, 1477. On December 31 of the same year Günther Zainer issued an edition of the *Lumen* set up from the Sorg edition⁸⁴. A third edition, apparently set up from Sorg's text, issued from the press of Michel Greyff at Reutlingen on 7 July 1479⁸⁵. On 22 March 1482 a fourth edition was produced in Strasbourg by the printer of the 1481 *Legenda aurea*⁸⁶. There are at least

⁸² See note 80 above.

⁸³ Clm 3590 (Aug. civ. 90) ff. 142-143^v (1480), among other fifteenth century sermons and orations. We have not identified Gosingen.

⁸⁴ Hain 10330; IB 5499, Cat. B.M. II, p. 325.

⁸⁵ Hain 10331; IB 10639, Cat. B.M. II, p. 576.

⁸⁶ Hain 10333; IB 1257, Cat. B.M. I, p. 97. Hain allocates 10332 to an edition sine loco, 1481, which he has not seen. We have found no evidence for its existence.

two manuscripts copied from printed editions: Wrocław (Breslau) MS. I O 19 ff. 221-393^v contains the *florilegium* or third part of *Lumen B*, copied from the edition of 1482; and Salzburg Universitätsbibliothek MS. M II 369 ff. 1-53 contains Farinator's prologue and tables only, and was written in 1479 for Bernhard von Rohr, Archbishop of Salzburg, from either the Sorg or the Zainer edition.

It is in a way ironic but perhaps inevitable that it is the relatively well-organized text of *Lumen anime C* which is the most frequently altered. Many manuscripts contain a brief note after the rubric *Altitudo*, which reads "Ad sequens capitulum infra scripta reducuntur capitula videlicet: de celsitudine, de mundana gloria, de sublimitate, de elatione, de superbia et timore. Philosophus in sexto...". This minor alteration is of significance because it changes the incipit of the work. The C text is at times provided with a prologue since it lacked one of its own. In four manuscripts *Lumen C* is supplied with a version of the prologue of *Lumen B*, thus adding to the confusion between B and C⁸⁷. Three manuscripts contain a brief prologue which explains the three-part presentation of material, *propositio*, *ratio*, *approbatio*, and concludes with an alphabetical list of selected authors⁸⁸.

There are many enlarged versions of the basic text of C and it is difficult to group these in families; their variety is such as to suggest that an unusually high percentage of these manuscripts are unique. The enlargements usually take the form of additional chapters (as opposed to insertions of added material within existing chapters). It is very rare that the new chapters are inserted into the pre-existing alphabetical structure. A variant family which contradicts both of these norms appears in at least four manuscripts, Clm 3775 and 18388, Cgm 663, Tübingen 692⁸⁹. This version contains a number of new chapters integrated with the original structure; e.g., four chapters, *Accidia*, *Apostoli*, *Auditus*, *Audacia*, have been inserted following the chapter *Abbas*. Also this text occasionally contains new materials added to the end of existing chapters; the most unusual example of this practice is the extension of the last chapter, *Christus*, with two or three folios' worth of moralized Biblical extracts, rather than extracts from works

⁸⁷ Clm 3775, 18388, Cgm 663, Tübingen 692; see note 89 below.

⁸⁸ Erfurt Ampl. qu. 168, Lilienfeld 127, and Wilhering IX 83.

⁸⁹ This family, furthermore, is characterized by the addition of the B prologue (abridged). We have not seen the Tübingen manuscript, to verify that it contains the added chapters; but it is probable that it does so.

of natural history. Normally, added material appears in a string of brief chapters tied onto the end. As a result, there are many manuscripts of the *Lumen anime* which begin with the original sixty chapters of C but which contain in all over 100 chapters ⁹⁰.

One of the variant versions of C, which exists in at least four manuscripts, is not only an enlargement but a revision and rearrangement ⁹¹. For example, chapters 1, 2 and 3 in this version are chapters 2, 1 and 7 in C. The text begins with the chapter *De amore*, beg. "Ptolomeus almagesti primo ignis quidem regionis etheree...". The chapters continue, *De altitudine*, *De abbate*, *De aquis*, *De angelis sanctis*, etc., ending like C with the chapters *De venustate*, *De vilitate*, *De Xpo* (Christo). Many of the chapters contain added material, usually from an unidentified source, occasionally from *Lumen B*. The purpose for the rearrangement of topics is quite baffling—certainly it is no closer to complete alphabetization than C's order. This version requires special mention because of the fact that it begins differently from other versions of C. Any change in incipit such as this—or such as the prefixing of the prologue "Summi michi..." or of the passage beginning "Ad sequens..." noted above—has the effect of disguising a text's identity, since texts are normally identified by incipit.

Within the general trend toward enlargement—often individualistic enlargement—of C, one specific movement that demands comment is the evolution of the *Lumen anime beate marie*. Some of the forms of this work develop, in two separate steps, from the C text. First, there are the manuscripts which have lifted the body of *Mary-exempla*, nine or ten chapters, from its place under the letter *M* and have put it at the end of the C text, adding to it numerous new chapters of *Marialia* at the end, frequently to the point that the section on Mary is larger

⁹⁰ See, for example, Frankfurt Leonh. 6, Erfurt Ampl. qu. 156, and the manuscripts related to them, in Appendix IV.

⁹¹ The text of this version is unstable but the manuscripts do, at least, have a common incipit and strong family resemblances: Frankfurt MS. Praed. 22, MS. Barth. 140; Linz MS. XI 114 (also contains a standard C text); Mainz MS. I 228; Praha Met. Kap. 1042; Vatican MS. lat. 1112; Wilhering MS. IX 83 (also contains a standard C text). One or perhaps two other copies are seen in the Admont catalog of 1380: "Item lumen anime, incipit 'Palma gesti' [a corruption of P(tolomeus) almagesti]. Idem in papiro", indicating that this version of C was in existence before 1380 and suggesting that it, also, may originate in Austria; see G. Möser-Mersky, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs*, III. Steiermark (Graz, Vienna, Köln, 1961), p. 57.

than the remainder of the C text ⁹². Secondly, the logical conclusion, there are manuscripts which contain only this enlarged Mary section (C chapters plus new chapters), divorced from the *Lumen anime* proper and entitled *Lumen anime b. m.*, *Lumen anime b. v. m.*, etc., or, as an additional confusion, simply *Lumen anime* ⁹³. As our list of manuscripts makes clear, the *Lumens* of Marialia are quite diverse, ranging in size from a few folios to almost 200, and there is no assurance that all or even most of the versions grew out of the pattern just described. One can, however, observe that all the versions contain as a nucleus the original chapters of Marialia from *Lumen anime* C, rather than those from A ⁹⁴. This is not surprising, in view of C's greater availability.

When we consider the additions to *Lumen anime* C, additions which are almost infinite in their variety from one manuscript to another and which are often impressive in quantity, it is difficult to generalize meaningfully on the nature of the added materials. The actual sources for these additions are perhaps as varied as the different versions themselves; but, following a now-familiar pattern, the various enlargers have attributed these new materials to the same "scientific" *corpus* cited in *Lumens* A, B, and C. Furthermore, with respect to the *exempla* which are borrowed from *Lumen anime* C, the enlarged versions are quite apt to alter the attributions. Let us take as an illustration one of the commoner versions of a Mary-*Lumen*, Wrocław (Breslau) Bibl. Uniw. I Q. 469, which has borrowed heavily from *Lumen anime* C. In chapter 2, *De firmamento*, the first extract is attributed in the Breslau manuscript to "Affrabicius", and the same extract in the corresponding chapter of C is attributed to Philosophus; the second extract, Ignatius (Breslau) and Anastius (C); the third, Ptolomaeus (Breslau) and Alkabicius (C); in the chapter *De celo* Breslau reads Sidonius for C's Eusebius, Archita Tharentinus for Fontinus; and so on. If we add *Lumen anime* A to this comparison, we may even find a three-way variation; for example, in the chapter *De celo* again, the same extract is ascribed variously to Ptolomaeus (Breslau), Avicebron (A) and Alkabicius (C), and another extract to Fontinus (Breslau), Ptolomaeus (A) and Simplicius (C). Given this curious disregard for consistent attribution; and given as well the

⁹² Clm 3041, 8970, 5976, 21075, 26694.

⁹³ For example, Wrocław MSS. I F. 52, I Q. 412, and probably all of the Mary-*Lumens* which begin with the chapter Celum.

⁹⁴ As noted above, in *Lumen B* the material devoted to Mary was not divided into such chapters.

fact that some of the names cited in A, B and C are unidentifiable—possibly fictitious, probably erroneous, certainly unlikely to have been widely available—it is reasonable to suppose that the hundreds of additional *exempla* seemingly taken from the same body of works that are cited in A, B and C, have not come from them in reality.

The last version to be considered in our discussion of the enlargements of *Lumen C* is the translation of C, the *Licht der Seele*, made by Ulrich Putsch in 1426⁹⁵. Ulrich was born about 1360 in Donauwörth (Bavaria), the son of Jacob Putsch, a burger. He began his studies for the priesthood in Augsburg with his kinsman John and his brother Henry (later abbot of Wilten). On completion of their studies they went south to Tirol. Ulrich held several lesser ecclesiastical positions and commissions in the dioceses of Chur, Trent, and Brixen. He became secretary and in 1413 chancellor to Frederick duke of Tirol; in this capacity he carried out a number of diplomatic and administrative functions which took him among other places to the Council of Constance and to the court of anti-pope Benedict XIII in France. At the death of Berthold, bishop of Brixen, on 4 November 1427, Ulrich was elevated to that see. In his *Diary*, his only written remains besides the translation of the *Lumen*, Ulrich says that he brought approximately one hundred manuscripts to his Cathedral where previously there were none⁹⁶. He remained bishop of Brixen until his death in 1437.

⁹⁵ Concerning Ulrich and the German translation of *Lumen C*, see J. V. Zingerle, "Ulrich Putsch", *Germania*, 21 (1876), 41-46 (Zingerle first identified Ulrich as author, from the Wilten manuscript); K. Burdach, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-21 and 145-147; *idem*, *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation*, I (1893), pp. 19-21 (a reprint of the preceding), 22 n. 7, 131-133; Anton Naegele, "Ulrich Putsch aus Donauwörth...", *Veröffentlichungen des Museums Ferdinandeum*, 18 (1939), 282-322; *idem*, "Deutsche Handschriften des vom Tiroler Kanzler Ulrich Putsch übersetzten 'Lumen animae'", *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 60 (1940), 257-269; *idem*, "Der gereimte Prolog des *Lumen animae* in der altdeutschen Übersetzung des Tiroler Pfarrers und Kanzlers Ulrich Putsch und sein Schriftstellerkatalog", *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 61 (1941), 227-249; *Stammmler, Verfasserlexikon*, III, cols. 949-950 and V, col. 926. Naegele has investigated Ulrich's translation as an interesting example of Middle High German. He has not examined the Latin text being translated, and is thus to a certain degree handicapped. This is particularly true in his effort to identify the authors and works referred to in Ulrich's prologue. For the biographical data and the list of manuscripts we are largely dependent on his studies. We might also reiterate from Naegele ("Deutsche Handschriften..." p. 269) that the text printed under the title *Licht der Seele*, Lübeck, B. Ghotan, 1484 and Hamburg, 1502, is an illustrated catechism which has nothing to do with the work translated by Ulrich.

⁹⁶ The diary has been published with an introduction concerning Ulrich's

Ulrich translated the *Lumen* in 1426, his last year in Duke Frederick's household. The translation begins with a rhymed invocation to God and the Virgin Mary, "Von Himmel sennd mir, Herr, dein krafft...". The first letter of the lines are an acrostic which spells out vertically, "Ulrikh Bfarrer ze Tyrol". The rhymed foreword continues with a resumé of the prologue of *Lumen B* to the end of the list of authors, "Es fügt sich, das ain Bapst was, / Benannt Johannes, als ich las, / Der zwenundzwaintzigist also genannt..."⁹⁷. In all there are sixty-eight rhymed couplets, with three or four stresses to the line. The large portion of the B prologue in which the author attempted to explain the purpose of his work is omitted here, probably because its meaning eluded Ulrich as it does us today. The first chapter of the text begins, "Der naturleich meister spricht in den sechsten von den tyerenn. In allen totten...". The source of this vernacular version has puzzled scholars. J. Klapper (Stammler, cols. 949-950) notes that Ulrich has employed the prologue of the *Magnum lumen anime* (another variant, see below) but that the text begins like the *Parvum lumen anime* (that is, C)⁹⁸. In actuality, Ulrich was not himself responsible for assembling elements from different *Lumens*; he merely happened to translate one of the enlarged versions of C. His model was a manuscript which contained the B prologue—an accretion to C, as we have seen—and a version of the C text itself very similar to that which is found in Clm 3041 and 8970; that is, the *Licht der Seele* and the Latin texts have the chapters on Mary transferred from the center to the end of the basic C text, with numerous added chapters of Marialia, concluding with three non-Mary additions, *De fortuna*, *De carne*, *De certamine*, 103 chapters in all.

There are seven known manuscripts of the work. According to Naegele, the best and oldest of these is apparently Innsbruck MS. FB 1064⁹⁹. One should like to know if this was Ulrich's own copy.

life and work by Viktor Schaller, "Ulrich II Putsch, Bischof von Brixen, und sein Tagebuch 1427-37", *Zeitschrift des Ferdinandeums für Tirol und Vorarlberg*, 36 (1892), 227-322 and "Nachtrag" pp. 568-572, esp. pp. 286-287.

⁹⁷ Taken from Naegele's printing of the prologue of the Innsbruck text ("Der gereimte Prolog...", p. 230).

⁹⁸ Naegele ignores the problem that the Latin manuscripts of C normally do not have prologues and that the incunable text of *Lumen B*, while containing the prologue, has a different text. For Klapper, see Stammler, *Verfasserlexikon*, III, cols. 949-950.

⁹⁹ See his "Deutsche Handschriften...". One should note that the manuscript

The manuscript at the Praemonstratensian house of Wilten, written by Johann Wetzler, may well have been commissioned by Ulrich for his brother Henry, who was abbot of Wilten 1413-28; it would, in that case, date from between 1426 and 1428. Three other early copies were written in 1429 by Michael Pechlinger in Nuremberg (this manuscript later belonged to Hartmann Schedel, 1440-1514); in 1430 by Nicolaus Stein of Augsburg; and ca 1430, in the South Tyrol. Other fifteenth century manuscripts are seen at Tegernsee, OSB, and at Erfurt St. Peter's, OSB. In this last instance the translation acquires one of the alternate names of *Lumen C* and is called the *Spyegel der Sell*.

To sum up the variations based on *Lumen C*, one finds an expanded version with the prologue of *Lumen B*, enlarged and revised versions, a vernacular translation, and even "new" works, the various texts of a *Lumen anime beate marie*.

Finally, along with the variations on B and C, there are the versions of the *Lumen anime* which result from a combination of parts of B and C. Since so many manuscripts of both B and C were in circulation, it was not unusual for a man who was copying the shorter, C, to assume that his text must be defective and to borrow, often haphazardly, from the larger work¹⁰⁰. One of these combined versions is quite significant, in that it appears in five codices and in that it has been given a quite misleading description in print¹⁰¹. This version begins with the B prologue, the first chapter being *De amore*, "Avicenna in lib. 4^o de di-luviis. In profundo igitur fonte...". It is this work which Klapper called the *Magnum lumen anime*, which aptly describes its size. But he unfortunately chose to consider the *Magnum lumen* as the original, treating all other versions as abbreviations of it. In addition, he states that the version beginning "Gregorius super Ezechielem. Anima sine amore..." (a revision of B, described above) is identical with *Magnum lumen*, save that it has dropped the initial quotation from Avicenna. This is simply not true; there is no need to repeat here the description of the work beginning "Gregorius...", but we might add, in passing,

which Naegele (p. 267) describes, from Ludwig Rosenthal Antiquariats Katalog 155 item 426 p. 71, as untraced, is identifiable with Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. Ger. fol. 1313.

¹⁰⁰ The best example is Salzburg MS. a. II 22; it is basically a C text, with the B prologue, with excerpts from chapters in B added to the corresponding C chapters, and with whole chapters from B added to the end of the work, making 113 chapters in all.

¹⁰¹ Klapper, in Stammler, Verfasserlexikon, III, cols. 197-198.

that the Gregory quotation does not appear, in second place or any place, in *Magnum's* chapter *De amore*. Finally, he gives a purported list of manuscripts of the *Magnum lumen*, but roughly two-thirds of those which he lists contain some other version of the *Lumen anime*.

Frankly, it is easier to point out the errors in Klapper's description than to formulate a precise description of our own, the reason being that we have yet to see any two manuscripts of the *Magnum lumen* which agree in their contents. Common elements are these: (1) The chapters are arranged in first-letter alphabetical order; (2) the basic source for the chapter headings was evidently C, virtually all of whose topics are included, with other topics having been added from B and elsewhere; (3) the first chapter is invariably *De amore*, beginning with "Avicenna in lib. 4^o..."; and (4) the contents are drawn, in large verbatim blocks, from both B and C, in an obvious attempt to combine all the material from each into one unified framework. As an example of this last, let us take *Magnum's* lengthy chapter *De adventu*, chosen because this chapter is at least roughly uniform in contents among the various manuscripts of *Magnum lumen*; it contains, first, all of the material given under this heading in B, followed by all of the material given under this heading in C, interspersed with material (comprising perhaps 5% of the total) from one or more unidentified sources. The earliest dated manuscript of the *Magnum lumen* comes from the collegiate library of Głogów, 1374. The largest version, surely, is that represented by Clm 3044, a fifteenth century manuscript which, by the end of its 227 folios, has completed only those chapters that begin with the first seven letters of the alphabet: "Explicit liber septimus secundum ordinem alphabeti in G. Incipit liber octavus secundum ordinem alphabeti, scilicet H, in uno alio volumine". This second volume has not been discovered.

* * *

We have so far examined the *Lumen* family by family. In the concluding section of this study, we shall consider those matters which pertain to the *Lumen anime* tradition as a whole, its texts and their circulation.

The writers of about half of the manuscripts have noted their names, and where and when they wrote. The majority of *Lumen* manuscripts were probably written by their owners, rather than commissioned to be written for them. In general, they were copied for personal rather than for corporate use, eventually finding their way to institutional libraries

through gift or bequest. Few bear indications that they were commissioned for institutions, and most bear marks of personal use, e.g., marginal notes, supplementary indexes, added *exempla*. This meant, in other words, that the nature of the *Lumen*'s use was conducive to the mutability of its text. Among its writers and owners, urban parish priests, Augustinian canons, Dominicans, Carthusians and Benedictines stand out—though a burger of Munich and a soldier in Bavaria also record their names.

About half of the *Lumen* manuscripts are well written in book hands, in two columns, with a decorated initial and slashed capitals, and in rather large format. The other half are relatively scruffy copies in cursive hands, undecorated and in single column. Naturally the majority are written on paper, parchment manuscripts of the *Lumen* being in fact rare. An occasional writer's colophon reflects somewhat the disheartening task which confronted many of them. Michael Irste, chaplain at Nossyn and the copyist of a *Mary-Lumen* finished in 1415 (Wrocław I Q. 469), notes "Et peto correctionem, quod exemplar fuit maxime incorrectum in aliquibus locis". Another writer tells us that he has compiled his text of the *Lumen* "ex tribus libris" (*Lumen* C, Göttingen 126). One finds the usual stock jokes—"Finitus est per manus et non per pedes", and, occasionally, a more original touch, like the colophon of Wrocław IV F. 45 where the scribe signs his name upside down: "Expliciunt excerpta libri luminis anime per wærrpuv duci henrici...". However, the commonest colophons are conventional requests for prayers on behalf of the writer. The *Lumen* often circulated with other texts, since only *Lumen* B-1-2-3 ordinarily was large enough to fill up a volume. If any texts stand out in frequency of appearance with the *Lumen*, they are the *Sophilogium* of Jacobus Magnus (d. 1414-15) and the *Compendium biblie* and the *Compendium morale* of Antonius Rampegolus (d. after 1423)¹⁰². In very general terms, the *Lumen*'s companion texts, naturally, are apt to be works used by preachers.

¹⁰² Concerning Jacobus Magnus and the *Sophilogium* see A. Coville, *De Jacobi Magni vita et operibus* (Paris, 1889); A. Combes, "Jacques Legrand et Alfred Coville et le *Sophilogium*", *Augustiniana*, 7-8 (1957-58), 1-81; and A. Zumkeller, "Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremitenordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken, Cassiciacum, XX (Würzburg, 1966), pp. 205-209, esp. item 431. Concerning Antonius Rampegolus de Janua see Zumkeller, *Manuskripte...*, pp. 62-66, esp. items 115, 117. The works of Antonius have not yet been studied in depth.

A survey of the localized manuscripts of the *Lumen* texts shows that important urban centers and ecclesiastical houses in Central Europe, particularly among the Benedictines, possessed more than one copy and often more than one version of the *Lumen*. The Benedictine house of Admont, for example, had two manuscripts of *Lumen* B, two of C, one or two C-variants¹⁰³, and a *Lumen* M. St. Lambrecht, OSB, had a copy of B and two of C. At Vienna there were evidently two private copies of *Lumen* B, and a B and B-variant (items L 13 and N 56 in the catalog of 1513) at the Dominican house, where the *Lumen* heads a list of the books to be read at meals, along with Gregory's *Moralia* and other standard patristic works¹⁰⁴. The library of St. Peter's in Salzburg (OSB) had a manuscript of *Lumen* C, a B-2, and a hybrid of B and C. In Bavaria, the Benedictines of Tegernsee had manuscripts of B-2, C, and the Putsch translation. The Franciscans of Munich had two manuscripts of *Lumen* C and three of B-2, and the local Augustinian Hermits owned a copy of B. In Augsburg, where the *Lumen* was printed, the Carmelites of St. Anne owned two *Lumens*; the library of Sts. Ulrich and Afra, OSB, in Augsburg possessed manuscripts of *Lumen* A, B-2, and C; and copies of B (after 1524) and C were at the cathedral library in the city. Two copies of *Lumen* B were commissioned for Regensburg clerics; a copy of B-2 was written by a Regensburg cleric; and the Augustinian canons of Regensburg owned a *Lumen* C. Two manuscripts of the *Lumen anime* (probably a B and a C) and a *Mary-Lumen* are noted in the catalog of the library of St. Ägidien, OSB, in Nuremberg, and two more Nuremberg *Lumens* were at the Pfarrkirche of St. Sebald and the Ratsbibliothek¹⁰⁵; a copy of B-2 was made at Nuremberg, and eventually given to the Carthusians there¹⁰⁶. The Carthusians at Buxheim owned three *Lumens*¹⁰⁷. The cathedral library in Olmutz contained three manuscripts of *Lumen* C, including the earliest known. Two *Mary-Lumens* and a copy of B-3 are found with the Augustinian canons of Żagań in Silesia. In Breslau, the Dominicans had a *Lumen* M

¹⁰³ See note 91 above.

¹⁰⁴ Th. Gottlieb, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs* (Wien, 1915), p. 442. The provenance of Wien MSS. 1417 and 2310 is unknown; however, 2310 was copied from 1417, and Wien Dominikanerkloster 165, a B-variant, was based upon one or the other of those two.

¹⁰⁵ P. Ruf, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, III (Munich, 1932-62), pp. 25, 26.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 451, 459, 489, 538, 699, 777.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 84, 92, 93.

and a combination of B and C, while the library of Corpus Christi Church possessed a B-variant. In Frankfurt, manuscripts of *Lumen A*, *Lumen B*, and a C-variant could be found at the Dominican house; a *Lumen C* at St. Leonhard's; and a C-variant at St. Bartholomew's. The Carthusians at Mainz owned one *Lumen C* and part of a second, as well as a C-variant.

The heaviest concentration of the *Lumen* and the major focal point of interest in it in the mid-fifteenth century was at Erfurt. There are references to nine manuscripts of the *Lumen* in catalogs of Erfurt houses; the existence of a tenth is known from its survival; and five other manuscripts are known to have been written in Erfurt. Of the cataloged manuscripts, seven are at the Charterhouse of Salvatorberg and one each at the University of Erfurt and at the Marienkechkloster¹⁰⁸. The Carthusians owned two *Lumen B*'s: Halle MS. Yc. fol. 11(a) (item A 31 in the catalog of Salvatorberg, s. xv ex.) which was written at Zwickau by Bartholomew Lodwig between 1459 and 1462 and given to Salvatorberg; and Oxford MS. Hamilton 30 (item J 18) which was written in 1460 by Jodocus Cristen, a preacher at Gera, and given to the house in 1465. A *Lumen* in Berlin MS. lat. fol. 706, s. xv, can be identified with item A 19, and another in Dresden MS. fol. 7 is item L 76. The other manuscripts listed in the catalog are not known to have survived, nor can they be classified; they are item C 46, "Orosius super cantica, Lumen anime abbreviatum"; item H 33, *Lumen anime* lacking the beginning and the end; and item O 88, "Lumen anime, liber Alexandri magni, sermones de tempore incip. 'Sicut in die', tractatus de ordinandis, [etc.]"'. Besides the *Lumens* at the university and the Marienkechkloster, the library of St. Peter's, OSB, had a copy of Putsch's translation of *Lumen C*, now Berlin MS. ger. fol. 1313. At least five other manuscripts were written in Erfurt. A B-variant and a Mary-*Lumen*, now in Erfurt Ampl. Q 83, were copied there by Nicolaus de Campis in 1460. A C-variant enlarged by almost fifty chapters, Paris MS. lat. 3497, was written at the end of the fourteenth century by an anonymous monk of Salvatorberg. It was probably copied from Erfurt Ampl. Q 156, dated 1369, the only other manuscript containing this version. Another variant version of C, Frankfurt MS. Praed. 22, was written in Erfurt between 1465 and 1467. Lastly, a Mary-*Lumen* written

¹⁰⁸ P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, II (Munich, 1928), Salvatorberg: pp. 246 (C 46, O 88), 253 (A 19), 255 (A 31), 285 (C 46), 390 (H 33), 435 (J 18), 462 (L 76), 503 (O 88); University: p. 187; Marienkechkloster: p. 598.

in 1425, Wrocław I Q. 412, contains enough material relating to Erfurt to suggest strongly that it was copied there. For Carthusian houses with copies of the *Lumen*, such as Mainz (three *Lumens*), Buxheim (three *Lumens*), or Aggsbach (two *Lumens*), Erfurt must have been an important source of supply. One cannot help wondering whether Farinator did not first meet the *Lumen anime* during his sojourn there.

We have indicated that the text of the *Lumen anime*, whatever version, was subject to change—it was enlarged, reduced, or combined with other versions. This is all the more striking if we compare the fluidity of the *Lumen's* text with the stability of the text of the manual for preachers incorporated as part three of *Lumen B*, the *Manipulus florum*¹⁰⁹. The *Manipulus*, as we noted above, was a collection of some 3000 or more extracts from the Fathers entered under 265 alphabetically arranged topics, compiled by Thomas of Ireland at the Sorbonne in 1306. The *Manipulus* survives in approximately 185 manuscripts; the text remains basically the same in all 185. It was not imitated or enlarged until the end of the manuscript period. The *Manipulus* may have tended to remain more constant because it was published by the Parisian stationers. Similarly, the text of the *Liber Pharetra*—a logically organized collection of extracts written before 1261, which was circulated privately and by the Parisian stationers and which survives in over 120 manuscripts—remained reasonably stable¹¹⁰. No major variant was produced until the incunable period.

The important factor in the case of the *Lumen anime* is that one has three different works in circulation (if one includes A's fifteenth century renaissance) which bear the same name, cite the same sources, and present the same type of material for the same sort of employment, and which often are found in the same library. This fact led inevitably, and very early, to the assumption on the part of those who used *Lumen* texts that a given manuscript—say, a C text—was defective because it did not contain everything which was to be found in other texts. Hence,

¹⁰⁹ For bibliographic references see note 31 above.

¹¹⁰ The *Pharetra* is erroneously attributed to a number of authors, St. Bonaventure, Gilbert of Tournai, William of Fourmenterie, and Albert of Cologne. It is probably Franciscan in origin. It is printed among the works of Bonaventure, Opera... (Vatican, 1588-96), VI, pp. 102-208. See Opera omnia (Quaracchi 1882-1902), VIII, p. cxv; E. Longpré, Tractatus de pace, auctore fr. Gilberto de Tornaco (Quaracchi, 1925), pp. xxiv-xxviii; and Glorieux, Répertoire, II, nos. 305 bk and 311 t. We have a study of the manuscripts of the *Pharetra* in progress.

we find texts which combine all or parts of B and C, in an attempt to repair the lapse; hence, also, we find enlargements of C, in an attempt to make it "as long as it ought to be". Or, a man who has a copy of *Lumen B* sees, or hears of, a *Lumen anime* which is alphabetically arranged throughout (C or A); hence, he produces a version of B which is alphabetized. With the multiplication—and the frequent concentration—of different versions in circulation, we eventually reach a point in time when *Lumen anime* no longer means a specific text, but a *modus operandi*; and so the various *Lumen marie* texts are written, employing only a little of the matter of the original works but adopting wholesale their idea of exemplification from nature.

In the end, however, one must return to the perplexing first cause: why there should have been first one (B), then another (C) separate work written on the model of the original (A). On this basis, when one compares the textual stability of the *Manipulus florum* and the *Pharetra* with the *Lumen*'s lack of it, the contrast is simply a reminder that each work has its own unique textual history, determined more often than not by largely fortuitous and inexplicable circumstances.

Finally, in our consideration of all the various *Lumens* as an entity, there is the very intriguing fact that its circulation was confined within rather well-defined chronological and geographic limits.

The *Lumen anime*, from the standpoint of circulation, is clearly a fifteenth century phenomenon. Of the approximately 195 surviving manuscripts, 160 date from the fifteenth century; of these, sixty-one are dated. Only thirty-five manuscripts, of which eleven bear dates, were written in the fourteenth century. Certainly, the arrival of *Lumen anime A* on the fourteenth century scene aroused much interest, witnessed by the production of *Lumen B* and *Lumen C*, as well as a number of variant versions, but the flood reached its crest in the next century. To judge from surviving manuscripts, the heaviest concentration of interest in the *Lumen anime* was in the period 1430-1465. Virtually no year passed between 1400 and 1480 without some form of *Lumen* being copied somewhere in Central Europe.

Geographically, the *Lumen anime* texts, with the exception of the cluster in Brabant, circulated in a rectangular area bordered on the west by Strasbourg, the Rhine and Trier; on the north by Frankfurt, Hanover and Berlin; on the east by Breslau, Olmutz and Vienna; and on the south by Klagenfurt, Innsbruck and the Alps. One can understand why, for example, 112 of the 114 surviving manuscripts of Higden's *Polychronicon* are of English provenance, since the action of natural

boundaries in this case is obvious¹¹¹. More difficult to understand is the reason why the *Lumen's* circulation should be confined to this small area of the continent in the fifteenth century, and the reason why this collection of *exempla* from natural history should be so popular in this area and period. While no fully satisfactory explanation can be provided, the cultural unity of the area, the Benedictine reform movement of the fifteenth century, the emphasis on the sermon and preaching in religious life, and the interest in natural history prevalent in Germany, together go a long way toward answering these questions.

The area of the *Lumen's* circulation, as described above, has a recognized physical, political, ecclesiastical and cultural unity which explains in part the boundaries of the *Lumen's* influence. Topographically the *Lumen's* home is the great upland area to the south of the north German plain—the foothills and mountains of Central Europe. The *Lumen* spread from the neighborhood of Vienna (Vorau to the south, Klosterneuburg and Herzogenburg to the north and west) along well-traveled routes. It flowed west up the valley of the Danube past Lilienfeld, Melk and St. Florian to Regensburg and Nuremburg, or to Munich and Augsburg via Salzburg, Chiemsee and Tegernsee. To the north it was carried to the intellectual and ecclesiastical centers of Prague and Breslau. Politically speaking, this is the central Holy Roman Empire of the fifteenth century. It lay under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the archbishops of Mainz, Magdeburg, Prague and Salzburg, and of the bishop of Breslau. To the east, the borders of the archdioceses of Salzburg and Prague and the border of the Empire apparently formed a significant frontier, for few manuscripts of the *Lumen anime* come from the late medieval kingdoms of Poland and Hungary. To the south, the Alps and Mediterranean culture formed the clearest barrier. The Rhine, and the eastern borders of the Empire and of the archdiocese of Mainz, seem also to have effectively contained the *Lumen*, for it did not penetrate into Burgundy or Champagne. Only in North Germany is the line of demarcation blurred, as a result of the northward thrust of the archdioceses of Mainz and Magdeburg, and the concentration of interest in the *Lumen* in fifteenth century Erfurt.

Given that physical, political, cultural and ecclesiastical borders all played some role in limiting the spread of the *Lumen anime*, we are

¹¹¹ Concerning the manuscripts of the Polychronicon see J. Taylor, *The Universal Chronicle of Ranulf Higden* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 152-159, and the review of it by R. Rouse in *Speculum*, 42 (1967), 191-194, with additions to the list.

still compelled to ask why the *Lumen* was so popular within these borders in the fifteenth century. What factors explain its popularity and multiplication in this rather small area and short span of time?

Part of the answer must lie in the movement, or movements, of monastic reform which revitalized German Benedictine houses in the fifteenth century¹¹². The movement, which began with Abbot Otto Nortweiner's reform of Kastl around 1380, spread through and beyond Bavaria in the fifteenth century to some twenty-five houses, among them St. Ägidien in Nuremberg, St. Emmeram in Regensburg and Donauwörth. Two later movements were of even greater moment. The first of these, an outgrowth of the Council of Constance (1414-18), had, as well, the combined support of the secular authority, Duke Albert of Austria, and of the University of Vienna in the person of its rector, Nicholas von Dinkelsbühl. Austrian monks who had had their training at Subiaco were "repatriated" in 1418 to reform the monasteries of Austria, beginning with the monastery of Melk. Along with ascetic observance of the rule, the Melk reform emphasized renewal of the intellectual life of the monks, with increased attention to study and to writing. From Melk the reform spread through all of the region of the *Lumen anime's* most intensive circulation—Austria, Bavaria and Swabia, extending northward as far as Nuremberg, Bamberg and Erfurt. Among others, the monks at Melk reformed such important houses as Wiblingen, Sts. Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg, and Tegernsee. The Council of Basel (1431-1449) gave a renewed encouragement to German reform; this movement, beginning in 1434 under Abbot John Dederoth of Bursfeld, spread through the houses of north and west Germany. Before the end of the century, nearly 200 reformed houses were included in the Union of Bursfeld. As with Melk, so the region of the Bursfeld reform also, especially its southern and eastern limits, coincided with the area of the *Lumen's* circulation; and the work could be found at Bursfeld and in a number of the houses it reformed. The Benedictine reform itself doubtless served in many instances as the *Lumen's* vehicle of dissemination. The basic instrument of the reform was visitation. Furthermore, monks from reformed houses frequently

¹¹² Concerning the reform movement, see Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît, III* (Maredsous, 1948), pp. 175-201; also J. Heldwein, *Klöster Bayerns am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1913), and E. Delaruelle, E.-R. Labande, P. Ourliac, *L'Eglise au temps du Grand Schisme et de la crise conciliaire (1378-1449)*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, XIV, pt. 2 (Paris, 1964), pp. 885-1105.

traveled to the "mother house" or center of the reform to spend extended periods of training; this was particularly the case with Melk. It was via these comings and goings that the *Lumen* was carried from one house to another. There is little question that the *Lumen* was swept up in the wave of intellectual activity in Augustinian, Carthusian, and Cistercian houses which accompanied Benedictine reform.

These waves of reform, Benedictine to be sure, were related—whether as impetus, as result, or simply as a concomitant—to the notable increase in popular preaching which took place during the same period. Both movements could be represented in a single life. During his years as Cardinal-Legate in Germany (1451-52) Nicholas of Cusa was one of the greatest friends and supporters of monastic reform; but he was also noted during his lifetime as a popular preacher, who delivered sermons in the vernacular throughout Germany. The emphasis on the sermon, and the role of the sermon in leading the faithful to salvation, is reflected in the observation by the noted fifteenth century preacher Geiler von Kaysersberg that mass without a sermon was much more injurious to a congregation's faith than a sermon without mass¹¹³. In Seidlmayer's words, "Sermons, above all moral sermons, had become the main activity of the church" in fifteenth century Germany¹¹⁴. As one might expect, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries likewise produced many and varied "aids to preachers" and moralized texts. Collections of model sermons for the calendar year, subject indexes, collections of *exempla* and flowers abound. The scriptures as well as ancient and patristic authors are subjected to moralization¹¹⁵. The

¹¹³ Cited from M. Seidlmayer, *Currents of Mediaeval Thought with special reference to Germany*, tr. D. Barker (Oxford, 1960), p. 137. This viewpoint was widely discussed and disputed in the fifteenth century; see E. J. D. Douglass, *Justification in Late Medieval Preaching* (Leiden, 1966), pp. 82-91.

¹¹⁴ Seidlmayer, p. 137. Concerning the work of the German preacher see F. W. Oediger, *Über die Bildung der Geistlichen im späten Mittelalter* (Leiden-Köln, 1953), pp. 98-120. Basel MS. A VIII 13 shows us a *Lumen anime* swept up in this flood of sermonizing. The maker of this series of brief extracts has left exaggerated lower and outer margins; in these he entered scores of notes which point out—sometimes for virtually every *exemplum* on the page—the Sunday or feast day for which the extracts would provide good sermon material. Frequently the notes include suggestions as to how he might organize such a sermon, added themes which might be tied in, etc.

¹¹⁵ See the bibliography given in note 30 above. Concerning the emphasis on moralization, see Welter, pp. 335-341, esp. 335 n. 1; the moralizing work of the

Lumen anime stands with the best of these moralizing works. It was, in fact, recommended for use in the compilation of sermons in the anonymous late fourteenth-century German *Ars predicandi*, often ascribed to Henry of Hesse¹¹⁶. As supplementary books to aid in the composition of sermons, the author lists six works: "Concordantie auctoritatum biblie; auctoritas decreti; lumen anime per ordinem alphabeti; similitudinum liber; compendium theologie veritatis; summe sancti Thome". It is interesting to note that he draws attention to the *Lumen's* alphabetical arrangement. The *Lumen* in this list appears in illustrious and certainly select company. Such a recommendation, in a German preacher's manual, doubtless served to increase the *Lumen's* popularity in Germany¹¹⁷.

fourteenth century friars is also well described throughout B. Smalley, *English Friars...*

¹¹⁶ Printed and translated by H. Caplan, "'Henry of Hesse' on the Art of Preaching", *PMLA*, 48 (1933), 340-361. M. Th. Charland, *Artes praedicandi*, Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales d'Ottawa, VII (Paris-Ottawa, 1936), pp. 43-44, lists thirteen manuscripts, all but one of which are in German libraries. To the list can be added Zurich Zentralbibliothek MS. ZV 703 ff. 35^v-39^v (1466, Erfurt). On the authority of the 'Hesse' tract, Johann Surgant (1450-1503) includes the *Lumen* in the list of works he recommends for preachers in the *Manuale curatorum*. Concerning Surgant see D. Roth, *Die mittelalterliche Predigttheorie und das Manuale Curatorum des Johann Ulrich Surgant* (Basel, 1956).

¹¹⁷ While we have not made any effort to track down the use of the *Lumen anime* in fifteenth century sermons, a Tegernsee manuscript (Clm 18141) demonstrates the variety of such use. On ff. 148-207^v, entitled "Proprietates rerum naturalium adaptatae sermonibus de tempore", are a series of sermon outlines for the year; quotations from the *Lumen anime* are not merely incorporated, frequently, into the sketches, but for 123 of the 159 sermons a quotation from the *Lumen*—rather than a biblical or patristic quotation—serves as "text" or "theme" for the day. As a supplement to this, the detailed descriptions of Valentin Rose afford an interesting picture of the use of the *Lumen* in sermon literature in and around fifteenth century Brandenburg. The following sermon collections cite the *Lumen* or contain brief extracts from it: Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. lat. theol. fol. 28, Rose 495 (1411; belonged to Nicolaus Hopfgarten who in 1404 was master of arts in Erfurt; Franciscans, Brandenburg), contains on ff. 248-49^v a sermon on *Castitas* which cites the *Lumen*. MS. lat. theol. fol. 240, Rose 484 (s. xv; Leubüs, Silesia), contains on ff. 231-233 the same sermon as in theol. fol. 28; this manuscript also contains the *De similitudinibus rerum* of John of San Gimignano and a *Lumen C*. MS. lat. theol. fol. 292, Rose 531 (s. xv in.; written by Arnold von Soest; Brandenburg Cathedral), contains the *Sermones de tempore* (1398-1402) of Thidericus de Arnevelde, OFM, which cite sources cited in the *Lumen*; cf. f. 3^v, "Fontinus in descriptcionibus universi..." MS. lat. theol. fol. 296¹, Rose 595 (s. xv; Brandenburg

There remains one further and fundamental factor concerning the circulation of the *Lumen anime*, and that is the specific interest in moralized *exempla* taken from nature or the interest in natural history *per se* exhibited in fifteenth century Germany¹¹⁸. There are a number of works besides the *Lumen* texts which reflect a lively interest in natural history in Germany at this time. The most similar to the *Lumen* is another collection of natural history *exempla*, the *Liber de exemplis et similitudinibus rerum*, written in the first decade of the fourteenth century by John of San Gimignano¹¹⁹. It circulated primarily in Germany in the fifteenth century. Of the twenty surviving manuscripts only four (Italian) are not from Central Europe; and at least fourteen of the twenty date from the fifteenth century. Riding on the interest in this type of material, the *Liber de exemplis* became John's most popular work. It is noteworthy, too, that of the six works recommended by "Henry of Hesse", two, the *Liber de exemplis* and the *Lumen*, are devoted specifically to natural examples. Conrad of Halberstadt's *Liber similitudinum naturalium* was written in imitation of the *Liber de exemplis*, and the only surviving manuscript is, as one might expect, of German provenance¹²⁰. One should also mention Conrad's *Responsorium curiosorum* or compendium of table talk devoted to natural history, which was printed in Lubeck in 1476. In the realm of straightforward natural history, as opposed to moralized *exempla*, Lawn records a heavily Germanic circulation (nineteen of twenty-one surviving manuscripts) for an anonymous but probably German collection of natural

Cathedral) contains an *Opus de tempore* which cites sources cited in the *Lumen*; cf. f. 10 ff., "Fontinus in descriptionibus universi..." MS. lat. theol. qu. 23, Rose 404 (s. xv; belonged to Arnold Kade, "altariste in Czyeser [Ziesar]"; Franciscans, Brandenburg), contains on ff. 138^v-139^v notes from the *Lumen anime*. MS. lat. theol. qu. 79, Rose 485 (1468; Franciscans, Brandenburg), contains *Sermones de diversis* which cite sources cited in the *Lumen*; cf. f. 75, "Fontinus in descriptionibus universi..." MS. lat. theol. qu. 115, Rose 847 (s. xv; Franciscans, Brandenburg?), a *collectanea spiritualia*, contains brief notes from the *Lumen* on ff. 43 and 107^v-115. MS. lat. theol. oct. 38, Rose 605 (s. xv) contains *Sermones de tempore* which cite the *Lumen*; cf. f. 6^v, "Hec in libro *Lumen anime* intitulatur".

¹¹⁸ This phenomenon has not to our knowledge been studied. Our assessment is based heavily on the evidence supplied by B. Lawn, pp. 99-107.

¹¹⁹ Concerning John of San Gimignano, see A. Dondaine, "La vie et les œuvres de Jean de San Gimignano," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 9 (1939), 128-183.

¹²⁰ Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. lat. theol. fol. 315 (Rose 502); the work is described by Rose, *Verzeichnis*, II, pp. 373-375, Welter, pp. 344-345, and Lawn, p. 106.

questions known by its incipit as the *Omnes homines*¹²¹. The twenty-one known manuscripts all date from the fifteenth century. It was also translated into German and went through twenty Latin and six German printed editions before 1500. The oldest known manuscript, of Bohemian origin, was completed in 1408. The appearance in the *Omnes homines* of quotations ascribed to Theophilus and Themistius suggests that its author may have known the *Lumen anime*. Admittedly Central Europe is not the only area that experienced an interest in natural history *exempla* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as is indicated by the *Reductorium* of Pierre Bersuire, the *Septiformis de moralitatibus rerum naturalium* (1281-91) written in Italy, and the use of natural *exempla* in sermons by preachers across western Europe¹²². Speaking in relative terms, however, the number of titles in this field and the multiplication of manuscripts and printed texts does suggest that Central Europe was more receptive to and interested in examples from natural history than were the Atlantic and Mediterranean worlds.

If there is some special German attachment to examples taken from nature among the preachers and common people of the parish in the fifteenth century one would want to know the reason for it. What is the significance of the fact that Christian moral and dogmatic points are more meaningful in fifteenth century Germany if they are made in a context of natural history? In what way is the *Lumen anime* different from the compendia of natural history which preceded it?

Natural history had been described for centuries in the *Physiologus*, the lapidaries, the encyclopedias on the properties of things. In these, as to some degree in the *Lumen*, it is assumed that God created the earth and its lesser creatures for man's moral edification, so that man might learn of Him through his creations. The entities were simply reflections of God. The lion was of interest not as an animal but as a symbol of strength. The *Lumen anime* texts are traditional in that they use nature in symbolic fashion and in that they resort to authority rather than observation to make a point: One learns about the properties of stones by reading Marbode, rather than by examining stones. It is

¹²¹ Lawn, pp. 99-103.

¹²² Concerning the *Reductorium*, see Welter, pp. 345-349, and the article by C. Samaran in *Histoire littéraire*, XXXIX (1962), pp. 259-450; for the *Septiformis*, see Delisle, *Histoire littéraire*, XXX, pp. 334-353, and Thorndike, *Science and Thought*, pp. 14-15. On the use of *exempla* from natural history see the studies cited in note 37 above; also, Welter, pp. 335-375, and G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 184-209.

fair to say, we think, that on average the natural phenomena retailed by the various *Lumen* texts display more sophistication and less credulity—despite obvious lapses—than the *Physiologus* literature. But the *Lumen*'s clearest break with tradition is the fact that it is specifically intended, and admirably designed, to provide natural examples for preaching—to enable the preacher to use what were, in many cases, everyday common observable phenomena to illustrate and drive home moral and dogmatic precepts. With the increase of popular preaching, the formality of the monastic or university sermon with its reliance upon patristic and biblical authority to make its point was unsuitable. In the fourteenth and fifteenth century, *exempla* from natural history and from everyday life were increasingly employed in sermons. The Church speaks to the faithful best when it speaks in terms they understand, in their idiom and frame of reference. The fifteenth century preacher tried very hard to do this, at times descending to the ludicrous. Thus Geiler von Kaysersberg, for example, explained the Passion in terms of baking a cake; and he symbolized the good Christian in the hare, whose lips tremble in fear of God and whose ears are long to hear His words¹²³.

The use of *exempla* from natural history must have been simply the Church's adaptation to the requirements of the age. Seidlmayer describes the period of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in Germany as a time of tension, of political chaos and of religious insecurity¹²⁴. There was a fervent desire for salvation, for an assurance of salvation, for tangible, visible, finite signs of spiritual and infinite verities. The quest for spiritual security manifested itself in a number of ways. There was, for example, increased emphasis on relics, and on devotion to the saints and the Virgin who, because of their humanity, are more approachable than the Trinity. The prevalence of *exempla* in popular sermons, as a means of reducing the bewildering abstractions of the faith to realities which could be touched, seen, and held is one aspect of this phenomenon. The abstract virtues and vices become warriors challenging each other in combat; one's need for the love of God is likened to the new seed nourished by the sun. It is evident that the *Lumen anime* would prove to be quite a serviceable tool, for the preacher to such a society.

Obviously, this does not adequately explain the interest in natural

¹²³ Cited from Seidlmayer, p. 139.

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 123-131.

history in Germany in the fifteenth century. Seidlmayer's description of the "end of an age" *malaise* in late medieval Germany has many parallels in Huizinga's description of the same period in northern France and the Low Countries. Indeed, the combination of factors which have been discussed, as causes for the *Lumen's* popularity and for the time and place of that popularity, may prove to be only a partial explanation, side-effects of a causation as yet undiscerned. These various possibilities need to be weighed, and the more promising ones pursued, in order to find the reason or combination of reasons for the considerable popularity of the *Lumen anime* texts within such a sharply delimited area.

The exploration and unraveling of the *Lumen's* major problems cannot come within the scope of the present study. It is our hope, however, to have facilitated the task of anyone who may wish to address himself directly to the problems of the *Lumen anime*, by having isolated and discussed specifically the three different basic texts, A, B, and C; and by having described in more general fashion the types of permutation which the basic texts underwent.

APPENDIX I¹

Lumen anime A. Prologus.

Summi michi pontificis favente gratia, eius pariter ad instinctum, hunc animatus librum adii compilandum. Porro, cum invisibilia Dei per ea que facta sunt intellecta conspiciantur, in hoc quoque humanus delectetur animus ut eventibus atque effectibus naturalis ordinis in cognitionem manuductus veniat conditoris. Ideo librum eventuum in natura decrevi construere cuius disertione et serie doctrinam que de Deo est variam valeam luculentius exornare. Presertim, cum et in ipsis naturarum vestigiis doctrina inseratur firmiter universis, eo enim quod per exemplorum demonstrationem cognoscitur, nullus oblivione quantolibet destituitur aut orbat. Triginta itaque annis huic compilando insistens opusculo, de cunctis libris, tractatibus, summulis, opusculis, voluminibus et commentis quod dulcius, pulchrius et utilius reperi hoc presenti interserendum libro voluminique excerptsi. Prolixitatem habens contemptui, brevitati autem me totis conatibus conformavi. Gaudeo denique quod, licet in hoc opusculo pauca sit utilitas, nulla tamen umquam falsitas reperitur, tum quia sanctissimus pater summusque michi cooperatus apostolicus tres michi in subsidium translatore contulit qui libros antiquorum naturalium de greco transponerent in latinum. Nunquam ergo michi penosum rodi ab insciis, dummodo labor prelibati operis potiorum placeat oculis universis. Rudes siquidem et inertes, discoli quoque pariter et ignavi id quod numquam in natura viderant vituperant procul dubio et condempnant. Horum autem sola michi placuere volumina eo quod veritate digna extiterint universa, libri videlicet Hermetis *de mutabilitatibus entium*, item Algazel *de forma speculi* et *de quattuor transcendentibus*, item Palemon *de signis naturalium*, Morigenes *de signis naturarum*, Belinus *de inventione artium*, Publius Celsus *de mirabilibus nature*, item Centobius *de gyro orbis*, qui quidem libri reperti sunt in sepulchro cuiusdam gentilis Barzinone. Preterea et hos libros dominus Albertus ad lucem produxit, quorum primus erat Evax *de sigillis lapidum*, Aristes *de dimensionibus terre*, Nestorius *de oceani circulo*, Ptol-

¹ The text of the prologue of *Lumen A* is based on Marseilles MS. 389 as emended by a collation of the other six surviving manuscripts of the prologue, and the prologue of the edition of 1518.

The text of the prologue of *Lumen B* is an emended version of the text in Vorau 130, which we presume to be a fair copy of the author's own work. Passages borrowed from the prologue of *Lumen A* are underlined.

We are grateful to Professor Bengt Löfstedt, University of California, Los Angeles, and in particular to Professor André Vernet for their help with the texts printed here.

meus *Almagesti*, Alkabitus in *perspectiva scientia*. Item Alkorak in *theorica planetarum*. Item infrascriptos libros michi iudeus quidam obtulit, Fontinum, Evenum, Pandolfum, Calcidium, Avicbron et Johannitium. Tandem ego frater Berengarius, quondam magister ordinis fratrum predicatorum, nunc autem quamvis indignus Compostellis archiepiscopus, hunc sic fundatus librum edidi ad utilitatem mei ordinis ac ad edificationem hominibus universis.

Lumen anime B. Prologus.

Summi michi pontificis favente gratia, eius pariter ad instinctum, hunc decrevi ad laudem dei ac in salutem proximi compilare edereque tractatum eumque quem sic non frustra condidi, cunctis per cuncta orbis climata fidelibus amoris divini destinavi stimulo agitatus. Super prefato nimirum rennisssem opusculo edito, timens prorsus omnino de meis humano generi ingeniis artibusque prodesse, nisi hii quorum presens votum ad rem deventum aures oblectat michi meticoloso inquam et timido audaciam et animam in domino incussissent. Cum enim quidam (quibus hoc ipsum circa quod presens iam versatur nostra intentio, opusculum [innotuit]², timens, veritus presumptionis divine confidentie quia pusillanimi ac inbecillis animi publicari) me denique essent salubriter exhortati, ut eum quem conceperam atque inceperam intentum, producerem ad effectum, eorum tandem adhuc ego ipse non acquiescens consilio, diffidens quam plurimum de me ipso, hunc ultro volui palliare quodam simulationis velamine obtegereque tractatum, atque ipsum ob hoc reliqui imperfectum. Revoluto interea duorum temporum aut annorum circulo cum summus pontifex quadam die tranquillus in se quietus placidusque effectus, cepta predicti, adhuc tamen incompleti operis aspexisset, veritatem quoque et diversitatem mirabilium effectuum in natura, quos in hoc brevi perstringam stilo opusculo et tractatu, mentis armatus et scrutatus oculo intuitusque fuisset, cepit diligenter inquirere unde aut a quo opifice seu auctore ortum prelibatus liber atque initium habuisset. Comperto autem eo multis multum sermonem coram eo volventibus hinc et inde, qui causa predicti exstiterat et origo operis preclari, Remundo ad me episcopo Legunense litteris destinato asscitum me sic ad se accersivit sue ut astarem presentie in hunc modum: « Johannes, servus servorum dei, salutem tibi, et apostolicam benedictionem. Non decet lumen candoris fidei quisquis fueris sub modio positum non lucere; librum revera quendam, quem *lumen anime*, precipio tibi sub virtute sancte obedientie, qui et tibi ut comperi ascribitur, presentie mee offeras sine excusatione propria in persona ». Cetera que predicta sanctissimi patris summi pontificis continebat epistola causa obmisimus brevitatis. Ad hocque deventum est, ut tribus michi datis in auxi-

² addit editio princeps.

lium, Leone, Amundo, Severino, triplici lingua peritissimis, vita et moribus floridis, scientia fulgidis, providis et honestis, qui libros quosdam de naturarum ordine, de greco in latinum nondum translatos, diligenter celeriterque transferent, quorum animatus solacio predictum tota compilandum virtute librum sive et opusculum hoc aggressus. Triginta itaque annis, minus uno, sine intermissione die et nocte, huic complendo insistens operi, studio inestimabili, iugi diligentia, multis variisque laboribus insudando, multa legens, multa audiens, per me ipsum diversa auditu quamdigna experiens et discernens, et si quid fide dignum erat interserui, quod autem falsitatem habuit annexam aliquam, repuli et obmisi. Gaudeo nichilominus vehementer, quia licet sit utilitatis modice, est tamen falsitatis minime liber iste omni dignus studio et amore. In cuius rei evidentiam potiores viri et elegantissimi et gratia divina qui presentem in tempore iam existunt, hunc librum velud meliorem factis, quamvis fortassis non faciendis, tota anhelantes virtute appetunt et acquirunt. Preterea sunt et quedam volumina, in quibus multa veritatis continetur agnitio. In hoc autem opusculo, maior curiositas et delectatio invenitur. Et si nulla in eo utilitas alia cernitur, omni tamen pulchritudine cuiuscumque artis et scientie ex hoc volumine mens ipsa hominis exornatur. Nucleus etenim atque id quod dulcius in cunctis libris reperi, volumini interseritur pretaxato. Nullique ambiguum, quin maior utilitas quam estimari valeat ex hoc nobis volumine elucescat. Miraque voluptas et declaratio rationis industrieque humane sapienti ex hoc libro homini ridiculum autem ignoranti. Presertim cum ex cunctis que habere potui summulis, libris, opusculis, sermonibus et voluminibus universis quod melius, verius, dulcius quoque et utilius fuerat, hoc excerpsi. Nullius quicquam interserens aut miscens, quod aut non declaraverim aut confirmare non possim rationibus validis et vividis argumentis. Ex multorum igitur in unum collectis numerum philosophorum assertionibus variis venatus sum undique mira circumspexit sollicitudine et cautela que in hoc opusculo continentur. Oblatus est tandem liber Hermetis de corporibus transmutandis; item liber quidam laude dignus de quattuor transcendentibus Algasel; Palemon autem de signis naturarum; et Morienes de zonis et clymatibus mundi; Belinus quoque de inventione artium; qui nondum translati erant, quos de greco proprio labore transtuli in latinum. In delato^a secundo hii reperti sunt libri quodam tradente iudeo, videlicet Publius Celsus de mirabilibus nature; Centobius de gyro orbis; Evax de sigillis lapidum; Aristes de dimensionibus terre; Nestorius de oceani circulo. Sed et de quodam monasterio Alymanie quidam michi libri delati sunt, videlicet Archita Therentius de eventibus in natura; Alkabitus in perspectivis; Theophilus in breviario diversarum artium; Fontinus in descriptionibus universi. Procedente vero tempore quidam michi retulit quosdam in Cathurco latitare libros voluminaque nature. Illuc igitur deveniens predicta exsolui volumina pro predicto construendo opere ubi

^a delete: cod.

reperitus est in uno volumine Constantius *de naturis liquidorum* cuncta includens accidentia et effectus aque, vini, olei, nivis, roris, pluvie et pruine; natura non obmissa fontium, maris, fluvii, stagni, paludis, cuiuslibet liquoris. Item *Evenus de contentibus orbis* Rome inventus est qui totam naturam perstringit celestium regionum, ea que sub concava sunt orbis lune edisserens luculenter. Item in gentilica⁴ regione in Persinona quidam liber Amphites videlicet in *edictis philosophorum*. Item *Pandulfus de meatibus terre* qui cunctas venas, meatus atque aditus subterraneos, conflexiones, specus, antra et interiora latibula cavernulasque terrarum, porositates, profunditates concavitatesque totius seculi materialis et ambitus, subtilis terram enumerat sigillatim. Hos etiam libros nequaquam duximus obmittendos, videlicet Ysidorum in *historiis naturalibus*; Solinum *de problematibus rerum*; Avicennam in *libro mineralium* et *de quattuor diluviis*. De gratia autem et favore quorundam medicorum hii michi libri oblati sunt scilicet Johannes Mesue in *prima et secunda practica*; Phylaretus *de naturis febrium*; item Plinius in *speculo naturali*. Eo etiam tempore floruerunt Parisius libri hii: Theophrastus videlicet *de parte sensitiva*; Alfarabius *de differentia regionum*; Albertus commentator *de impressionibus aeris*. Commentator Averrois Arabs erat, nam floruit in Arabia qui et commentatus est libros Aristotelis universos. Inveni insuper quendam librum Palencie que *summa* Themistii dicta est *naturalium entium*, ubi etiam entia distinguuntur naturalia ab entibus incorruptibilibus et supernis. *Commenta* etiam michi allata sunt Simplicii et Zenonis *problemata* tunc philosophi; famosa erant et gratiosa universaliter toto orbe. In quibus cunctorum effectuum et eventuum in natura cause explicantur atque principia singillatim. Ypocras et ipse michi placuit dictis suis, maxime in eo quem fecit *epythimeorum libro*, una cum Joannitio collega suo. Super omnia autem magis huic operi est congruus *Calcidius de natura quinte essentie* et maxime in *thymeo*. Predictorum igitur doctorum quosdam obmisi non immerito libros pariter et commenta quibus modica inesse videbatur utilitas. Solos vero hos qui in usu erant tunc temporis libros, volumina quoque varia et diversa, ad quorum manu ductus cognoscendam veritatem eorundem, nullo ambiguo dubioque reperto, verius siquidem sum aut dulcius arbitratus, horum insinuatione facta laudabili tenore multimode veritatis notitiam ut plerumque luculentius ut potero impartiar universa et *veritus quidem omnem longitudinem*, solam eam que modernos delectat appetens *brevitatem*. Vidi consequenter conditionem humanam tot et tantis fore incommodis vanitatibusque corruptam ut nil quidem veterum se utpote esse satagant perspectores, solas vero velint et diligant novitates. Quam ob rem eiusque rei intuitu et conatu struem novam, stilo novo efficiam ex vetustis veterum oblivioni datis iam homini variis rudimentis. Vidi nichilominus humanorum cecutientem fore velamine vanitatis obtectam varie obnubilamque naturam umbrosis adeo aspectibus obumbra-

⁴ anglica: cod.

tam, ut iam in limpida luce anime, mortis stet caligine, ut ita dicam, penitus palliata omni interioris iocundi solatio destituta. Et siquidem fructuose iam in agnitione imbui debeat veritatis, urgens et necessarium est ut sibi via ostendatur regni celestis verbis quidem et diverticulis modicis, pluribus vero naturarum effectibus et exemplis. Unde et exemplorum librum edidi per quem humana imbecillitas in lumine valeat vere agnitionis crebrius reformari. Constat denique affectiones hominum iam eo quod mundus in maligno positus sit vinculo esse oblivionis varie infelicitate mancipatas. Mundanis enim nunc humanus tam avidè intentus animus divinorum statum ac sui ipsius pariter et salutis inscius oblivione valida ignorantiaque oppressus. Ut igitur deitatis propriæque salutis memorari rite et congrue ipse [se] habere valeat atque oblivionis dementiam abiciat et repellat, congruum est ut in naturalia que quidem difficulter labuntur a memoria oculum mentis figat. Naturalia igitur in hoc se exempla offerunt que oblivionem mentis omnem auferunt, memoriam vero inferunt et inducunt. Ad hocque iam deventum est ut iam tanta inoluerit ac increbuerit humana fragilitas qua homo fastidit et lassescit auditor esse verbi Dei, nisi ipse qui verbum Dei predicat aliquid quod audientibus delectabile et gratum fuerit inserat et inducat quod audientes alliciat ut corde obtemperent humerosque submittant. Hoc autem a cunctis esse creditur similitudo et conformitas exemplorum que cor maxime alliciunt et attrahunt humanum. Operam autem ad hoc dare necesse est predicatorem quemque verbi Dei ac seminatorem boni operis, qui Christum parit in auribus auditoris ut plantet et irradiet et instirpet cognitionem eterni luminis, puta omnium creatoris in corde uniuscuiusque hominis; cognitio autem conditoris ex earum dependet quas creavit rerum ordine et natura. Salubre itaque ydoneumque hominibus et conveniens universis quendam de naturarum librum condidi ordine, mediante quo fragilitas conditionis humane oculum valeat mentis figere in ipsius divinitatis lumine et candore. Re vera convenientius quidem predicatur opere quam sermone, eo quod videantur tacere verba, loqui vero opera. Sic nimirum per omnem modum magis edificat sermo noster inductione divinorum in natura operum seu inductione naturalium exemplorum, quam sermonibus exhortationum quarumlibet seu verborum. Qua propter librum quendam de creaturarum et naturarum vigore compilare arbitror, quo creaturarum menti nostre infulgeat irradietque creator. Contestor autem coram Deo quia huius editor libri exstiti ob nullam michi impendendam vanam gloriam et honorem, sed salutis proximi ob desiderium et amorem. Laborem autem quem habui in presenti volumine compilando cunctos legentes ad hoc coniuro, pertraho et astringo, ut si ex eo in se et in aliis quod seminant ubertatis anime et ipsi rogent me dignum celica esse inesse. Quidam autem ex eis ad quos presens scriptum primum devenerat quia titulo carebat imposito [a] me quidem prorsus nescio nomen sibi ad placitum imponebant. Tum quia auctor libri non aderat, tum quia qui ediderat estimationis minime apparebat, tunc et ipsum sibi, utpote a se factum usurpantes, quidam ob laudem vanam et frivolum ascribebant. Et quia humiliter

me recognoscendo indignum hoc libro tam faciendo quam facto censui, ideo non gloriando dico merui ut summus pontifex Johannes hunc librum vellet *lumen anime* nuncupari.

Lumen anime A. Prologue. Translation

Moved by the favoring grace of the Supreme Pontiff, and equally at his instigation, I undertook the compilation of this book. Furthermore, since the invisible matters of God may be perceived through an understanding of those things which He has made, in this way also the human spirit may be enticed so that it may come to a knowledge of the Creator, guided by the events and effects of the natural order. Therefore I decided to construct a book of the events in nature, by the explanation and order of which I might be able to embellish more excellently the manifold doctrine which concerns God. Moreover, since theology is solidly implanted in all the works of nature, because it is known through the presentation of examples, no one is deprived or bereft of it by any forgetfulness whatsoever. Applying myself, therefore, for thirty years to the compiling of this work, I extracted from all books, tracts, summas, works, volumes and commentaries whatever I found to be the more pleasant, more beautiful and more useful, for including in this present book and volume. Holding prolixity in contempt, I adapted myself to brevity in all my efforts. And then, I rejoice that, though its usefulness may be small, at least in this book no falsehood is ever found; for the Most Holy, Supreme and Apostolic Father, who supported my work, gave as an aid to me three translators to translate books of ancient natural philosophy from Greek into Latin. Never therefore will I find it painful to be slandered by the ignorant, so long as the labor of the aforesaid work is pleasing to the eyes of all abler men; since indeed the crude and the indolent, the surly as well as the slothful, no doubt vituperate and condemn that which they never saw in nature. However, only the volumes of these men pleased me because they stood out as worthy representatives of the Universal Truth: namely, Hermes' book *On the Mutabilities of Things*; also Algazel, *On the Form of the Mirror* and *Concerning the Four Transcendencies*; also Palemon, *On the Signs of Nature*; Morigenes, *On the Signs of Nature*; Belinus, *On the Invention of the Arts*; Publius Celsus, *On the Wonders of Nature*; also Centobius, *On the Whirl of the Orb*; which books, indeed, were found in the tomb of a certain heathen at Barcelona. And beyond this, dominus Albertus brought these books to light, of which the first was Evax, *On Seals in Stones*; Aristes, *On the Dimensions of the Earth*; Nestorius, *On the Circle of the Ocean*; Ptolomeus, the *Almagest*; Alkabitus, *On the Perspective Science*; also Alkorak, *On the Theory of the Planets*. Also, a certain Jew offered me the following books: Fontinus, Evenus, Pandolfus, Calcidius, Avicbron and Johannitius. Finally, I, Brother

Berengar, sometime Master of the Order of Friars Preachers, but now, although unworthy, Archbishop of Compostella, thus instructed, produced this book for the utility of my order, and to all men, for their edification.

Lumen anime B. Prologue. Translation.

The grace of the Supreme Pontiff encouraging me, and equally at his instigation, I decided, for the glory of God and for the good of my neighbor, to compile and publish this tract, which I thus have not produced in vain, and which, moved by the stimulus of divine love, I have destined for all the faithful in all climes of the world. Certainly I would have refused to publish the aforesaid work, fearing above all to attempt to benefit mankind by my own talents and arts, if it had not been that those persons whose ears are delighted by the fact that their present wish has been fulfilled had inspired in me, who am anxious and timid, boldness and strength in the Lord. When some people (to whom it was known that I feared to publish this little work to which my current activity is devoted, because I was reluctant to seem presumptuous in trusting in God, for my spirit is cowardly and weak) had rightly exhorted me to convert into act that which I had conceived and begun in intent, finally, without following their advice completely because of an extreme lack of confidence in myself, I wished moreover to hide and to cover the tract with a veil of dissimulation, and for that reason I left it unfinished. Meanwhile, the circle of two years had revolved when on a certain day the Supreme Pontiff, tranquilly quiet within himself and calm in his purpose, had looked upon the beginnings of the aforesaid unfinished work. Well-equipped in mind and searching of eye, he had understood the truth and variety of the miraculous effects in nature which I could draw together in brief style in this little work or tract. He began diligently to inquire from whence or from what maker or author the aforementioned book had had its origin and its beginning. When he learned, from much talk in his presence by many people who were traveling from one place and another, who was the cause and origin of the aforesaid excellent work, then via Raymond, Bishop of Leon, who was sent to me with a letter, he summoned me whom he had asked for to appear in his presence, in this fashion: "John, servant of the servants of God, sends you greeting and apostolic blessing. Whoever you might be, it is not fitting that a light of radiance of the faith be placed under a bushel and not shine. I command you, under the power of holy obedience, to bring before my presence, in person and without excuse, that book which they call *The Light of the Soul* which, as I have learned, is to be ascribed to you". For the sake of brevity, we have omitted the rest which the aforesaid letter of the Most Holy Father and Supreme Pontiff contained. And it came about that three men were given to help me, Leo, Amundus, Severinus, unusually skilled in three languages, distinguished in life and conduct, brilliant in knowledge,

prudent and honest, who should diligently and quickly translate for me certain books on natural philosophy which were not yet translated from Greek into Latin. Encouraged by the relief which they provided, I undertook with all my strength the compiling of this book or little work. For thirty years less one, day and night without interruption, I pressed on toward the completion of this work, with inestimable study, with inexhaustible diligence, sweating at many and various labors, reading much, hearing much, experiencing and discerning for myself how worthy were the diverse matters which I heard. And if something was worthy of belief, I included it; but whatever had any falsehood connected with it, I rejected and omitted. I rejoice greatly, nonetheless, because even should it be only moderately useful, this book, worthy of all study and affection, contains the least possible degree of falsehood. In evidence of this fact, very able men, the most distinguished who by divine grace still exist in the present age, eagerly pursuing it with all their might, strive for and acquire this book because it is better than others which have been made—though, perhaps, it is not better than other books which could be made in future. There are volumes besides this one in which much knowledge of the truth is contained. However, in this little work, greater curiosity and pleasure are found. And even if no other usefulness is discerned in it, nevertheless from this volume the very mind of man is supplied with all the excellence of every sort of art and science. The kernel, indeed, and also that which I found pleasing in all the books, are included in the aforesaid volume. And it cannot be doubtful to anyone, that there shines forth to us from this volume a greater utility than can be estimated. And extraordinary enjoyment and an exposition of human reason and industry proceed from this book to the wise, but to the ignorant man, ridicule—particularly since I extracted from all the summas, books, works, sermons and volumes that I could get that which was better, truer, more pleasing and more useful, including and intermingling nothing from anybody which I had not expounded or could not confirm by valid reasoning and vigorous argumentation. Therefore I, being circumspect, with care and caution sought on every hand, from the various assertions of many philosophers which have been collected into one body, the wonders which are contained in this work. Finally, Hermes' book, *On the Transmuting of Bodies* was offered; also, a certain praiseworthy book, Algazel, *Concerning the Four Transcendencies*; moreover, Palemon, *On the Signs of Nature*; and Morienes, *On the Zones and Climates of the World*; also Belinus, *On the Invention of the Arts*; which had not yet been translated and which I, by my own labor, translated from Greek into Latin. In the second offering were found these books, a certain Jew handing them over, namely Publius Celsus, *On the Wonders of Nature*; Centobius, *On the Whirl of the Orb*; Evax, *On Seals in Stones*; Aristes, *On the Dimensions of the Earth*; Nestorius, *On the Circle of the Ocean*. But also from a certain monastery in Germany some books were offered to me, namely Archita Tharentinus, *On Events in Nature*; Alkabitus, *On Perspectives*; Theophilus, in the abbreviated *Divers*

Arts; Fontinus, *On Descriptions of the Universe*. At a later time, someone reported to me that some books and volumes of nature-lore lay hidden at Cahors. Going there, therefore, I acquired the said volumes for constructing the aforementioned work; there was found in one volume Constantius, *Concerning the Natures of Liquids*, including all the accidents and effects of water, wine, oil, snow, dew, rain and frost, not omitting the nature of springs, sea, river, pond, swamp, or of any fluid whatsoever. Also, at Rome was found Evenus, *On the Contents of the Orb*, which deals with the whole nature of the celestial regions, explaining excellently those things which are under the arches of the moon's orb. Also, in the gentile region in Barcelona, a certain book of Amphites, namely, *On the Edicts of the Philosophers*; also, Pandulfus, *Concerning the Earth's Passages*, which enumerates one by one all the veins, passages, and subterranean entrances, the windings, caves, grottoes and internal dens and caverns of earth, the porosities, profundities and concavities of all the material age and of the whole circumference underneath the earth. We were not by any means inclined to omit these books also, namely, Isidore, *On Natural Histories*; Solinus, *Of the Problems of Things*; Avicenna, in *The Book of Minerals* and *Concerning the Four Floods*. Moreover by the grace and favor of certain doctors these books were presented to me, namely, Johannes Mesue in his first and second *Practica*; Phylaretus, *On the Natures of Fevers*; also Pliny, in his *Natural Mirror*. Also at that time these books flourished at Paris, namely Theophrastus, *On the Sensitive Part*; Alpharabius, *Concerning the Differences of Regions*; Albertus the Commentator, *On the Impressions of the Air*. Averroes was an Arab commentator; for certainly he flourished in Arabia and commented on all the books of Aristotle. Moreover, I found at Valencia a certain book which is called 'Themistius' *Summa of Natural Entities*, wherein also the natural entities are distinguished from the incorruptible and supernal entities. There were brought to me also the Commentaries of Simplicius and of Zeno on the *Problems* of the Philosopher; these commentaries were famous and highly regarded universally throughout the world; in them the causes and origins of all the effects and events in nature were explained one by one. I was pleased with the sayings of Hippocrates, most of all in that book which he made on *Epidemics*, along with his colleague Johannitius. Above all, however, Calcidius is suitable for the present work, especially *On the Nature of the Fifth Essence* and most of all *On Timaeus*. I omitted, therefore, not without reason, certain books of the aforesaid doctors along with commentaries which seemed to be only moderately useful. [I included] truly only those books which were in use at that time, and various and diverse volumes whose truth I had been led to know, nothing ambiguous or doubtful having been found, if I judged them to be especially true and pleasing. The inclusion of these was made with the laudable purpose that I might impart to the world, as well (for the most part) as I may, the knowledge of manifold truth. And fearing all lengthiness, indeed, I sought only that brevity which pleases the moderns. I saw consequently that the human

condition is corrupted by so many and so great troubles and vanities, that men do not take the trouble any more even to look at anything old, and that they wish and desire only novelties. Accordingly, with regard for this fact and with an effort, I have made a new collection in a new style from various ancient rudiments of antiquity which have till now been given over to the forgetfulness of men. I saw, nevertheless, that the blindness of humans is hidden by a veil of manifold vanity, and their clouded nature is overshadowed by truly cloudy vision so that, even now while it is still in the limpid light of the soul, [their nature] stands in the cloaked darkness of death, as I must say, completely destitute of any solace of internal joy. And if truly [human nature] is to be imbued with a knowledge of fruitful truth, it is urgent and necessary that the way to the heavenly kingdom be shown to it, by words indeed and by the many modest sideroads in the effects and examples of nature. For this reason, I published a book of examples, by means of which human weakness may be abundantly reformed in the light of true knowledge. Finally, it is well known that the affections of men are unhappily slaves of manifold forgetfulness, to the point that the world is placed in wicked fetters. How avidly is the human soul intent now upon mundane matters, and how ignorant both of divine affairs and of its own salvation, oppressed by forgetfulness and powerful ignorance. Therefore, in order that it may be able to remember fitly the deity and its own salvation, and to comport itself properly, and to cast out and repel the folly of forgetfulness, it is fitting that the soul fix its mind's eye upon natural things, which are certainly hard to forget. Natural things, thus, offer themselves as examples in this respect, because they remove all forgetfulness of mind; truly, they rather cause and induce memory. We have already reached the point that human frailty will have ingrown and increased so much that man disdains and grows weary to be a hearer of the word of God, unless he who preaches God's word introduces something which would be pleasing and agreeable to his listeners, and brings in what attracts his hearers, so that they comply from the heart and bow down. However, it is generally believed to be the similitude and conformity of examples which most draws and attracts the human heart. It is necessary that any preacher of God's word and sower of good work, who produces Christ in the ears of a listener, give attention to this fact, so that he may plant and root deeply and implant in the heart of any man whatsoever a knowledge of eternal light, namely, of everything of the Creator's; however, a knowledge of the Creator derives from the order and nature of those things which he has created. Thus I composed a book concerning the order of natural things, beneficial and suitable for mankind and universally appropriate, by means of which the weakness of the human condition may manage to fix its mind's eye on the light and splendor of divinity itself. In fact, something may be more aptly preached by means of a work than by a sermon, because words may seem to say nothing, while works may truly seem to speak. Thus without doubt our sermon edifies more, in every way, by our introducing the divine

works in nature or by our bringing in natural examples, than by our sermonizing with any exhortations or words whatever. Because of this fact, I have decided to compile a book concerning the vigor of natural and created things, by means of which the Creator of created things may enlighten and illumine our mind. However, I call on God to witness that I was the maker of this book from no motive of vainglory and worldly pride, but from desire and love for the salvation of my neighbor. By virtue of the labor which I spent in compiling the present volume, I conjure, adjure and oblige all my readers that, if from this book they sow, in themselves and in others, seeds of the soul's fruitfulness, they pray that I may be considered worthy to belong to the kingdom of heaven. However, certain of those to whom the present writing first appeared—because it lacked a title given by me—did straightway impose I know not what name at their own pleasure. Either because the author of the book was not apparent, or because the person who published it seemed to be worthy of little regard, then certain people, pretending to have made it, attributed it to themselves from motives of vain and foolish praise. And because I humbly considered myself unworthy, in recalling this book both in the making and in the finished state, therefore it is not with boasting that I say, I was rewarded by the fact that the Supreme Pontiff, John, wished this book to be called *The Light of the Soul*.

APPENDIX II

The chapters of *Lumen anime* A, taken from the text of Marseilles Bibliothèque municipale MS. 389 ff. 80-132.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. De amore. | 18. De delitiis. |
| 2. De altitudine mundi. | 19. De eukaristia. |
| 3. De affluentia. | 20. De elemosina. |
| 4. De animabus. | 21. De fine. |
| 5. De benignitate. | 22. De casu. |
| 6. De beatitudine. | 23. De gratia. |
| 7. De castitate. | 24. De gustu. |
| 8. De cruce. | 25. De gaudio. |
| 9. De consolatione. | 26. De gradu. |
| 10. De carne. | 27. De honore. |
| 11. De conflictu. | 28. De hilaritate. |
| 12. De capite. | 29. De humilitate. |
| 13. De cogitatione. | 30. De habundantia. |
| 14. De confessione. | 31. De ieiunio. |
| 15. De cecitate. | 32. De ira. |
| 16. De dulcedine. | 33. De iustitia. |
| 17. De dilectione. | 34. De iudicio. |

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 35. De iuventute. | 55. — rori. |
| 36. De ianua. | 56. — fonti. |
| 37. De iugo. | 57. — litori. |
| 38. De incendio. | 58. — soli. |
| 39. De iactantia. | 59. — lune. |
| 40. De ihesu. | 60. — ymbre. |
| 41. De iubilo. | 61. — monti. |
| 42. De celesti iherusalem. | 62. — fulmini. |
| 43. De karitate. | 63. — lumini. |
| 44. De lumine. | 64. De nativitate. |
| 45. De laude. | 65. De oratione. |
| 46. De lacrima. | 66. De passione. |
| 47. De mortuis. | 67. De quiete. |
| 48. De sancta virgine. | 68. De resurrectione. |
| 49. Quomodo Maria comparatur stelle. | 69. De sanctis. |
| 50. — speculo. | 70. In quo sanctis comparantur avibus. |
| 51. — umbre. | 71. De trinitate. |
| 52. — nubi. | 72. De venustate. |
| 53. — orto. | 73. De vilitate. |
| 54. — arbori. | |

The chapters of *Lumen anime* B, taken from the text of Vorau Stiftsbibliothek MS. 130.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. De nativitate Christi. | 15. De abiectioe. |
| 2. De nomine ihesu. | 16. De accidia. |
| 3. De passione Christi. Auctoritates. Exempla alia de passione Christi. | 17. De attinctioe. |
| 4. De eukaristia. | 18. De adolescentia. |
| 5. De sancto spiritu. | 19. De adulatione. |
| 6. De trinitate auctoritates. Exempla de trinitate. | 20. De adventu spiritus sancti. |
| 7. De sancta Maria. | 21. De adventu iudicis. |
| 8. De sanctis et misericordia dei et hominum. | 22. De adventu dyaboli. |
| 9. De angelis auctoritates. Exempla de angelis. | 23. De [adventu] christi. |
| 10. De apostolis. | 24. De affluentia mundana. |
| 11. De sanctis. | 25. De amaritudine. |
| 12. De abstinentia. | 26. De amissione. |
| 13. De abiectioe. | 27. De appropinquatione. |
| 14. De accensione. | 28. De alacritate exempla. |
| | 29. De affectione exempla. |
| | 30. De affectu exempla. |
| | 31. De aggressione. |
| | 32. De ascensione christi auctoritates. |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 33. De bonitate. | 54. De audacia auctoritates. Exempla. |
| 34. De benignitate auctoritates. | 55. De avaritia auctoritates. Exempla. |
| 35. De caritate exempla. | 56. De abiectiōe exempla. |
| 36. De castitate exempla. | 57. De beatitudine. Exempla. |
| 37. De casu exempla. | 58. De dormitiōe. |
| 38. De cecitate cordis. | 59. De elemosina. |
| 39. De confessione. | 60. De estu. |
| 40. De contemplatione. | 61. De exercitio. |
| 41. De culpa. | 62. De humilitate exempla. |
| 42. De cupiditate exempla. | 63. De iubilo exempla. |
| 43. De detractiōe exempla. | 64. De sanctitate. |
| 44. De dilectione exempla. | 65. De sapientia. |
| 45. De dulcedine divina. | 66. De sedulitate. |
| 46. De aggregatiōe. | 67. De semine. |
| 47. De amore mundi auctoritates. | 68. De separatione. |
| 48. De amore sui auctoritates. | 69. De serenitate. |
| 49. De amore dei auctoritates. | 70. De securitate. |
| 50. De amore mundi. Exempla. | 71. De sanitate. |
| Exempla de amore. Exempla de | 72. De statu vite presentis. |
| amore dei [etc.]. | 73. De silentio. |
| 51. De corpore christi. | 74. De sompno. |
| 52. De altitudine divina auctoritates. | 75. De sopore. |
| Exempla. | 76. De superbia. |
| 53. De auditu auctoritates. Exempla. | |

The chapters of *Lumen anime* C, taken primarily from München Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 5393 ff. 102-137.

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. De altitudine. | 17. De cruce. |
| 2. De amore. | 18. De desiderio. |
| 3. De affluentia. | 19. De divitiis. |
| 4. De adventu. | 20. De dulcedine. |
| 5. De accessu. | 21. De delitiis. |
| 6. De angelis. | 22. De defunctis. |
| 7. De abbate. | 23. De eukaristia. |
| 8. De beatitudine. | 24. De errore. |
| 9. De benignitate. | 25. De exemplo. |
| 10. De castitate. | 26. De elemosina. |
| 11. De confessione. | 27. De fortuna. |
| 12. De celsitudine. | 28. De fine. |
| 13. De continentia. | 29. De felicitate. |
| 14. De cecitate. | 30. De gustu. |
| 15. De carne. | 31. De gaudio. |
| 16. De certamine. | 32. De gratia spiritus sancti. |

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 33. De honore. | 47. — gladio. |
| 34. De humilitate. | 48. — paradyso. |
| 35. De ira. | 49. — fluvio. |
| 36. De ieiunio. | 50. De nativitate christi. |
| 37. De karitate. | 51. De oratione. |
| 38. De labore. | 52. De passione. |
| 39. De lacrima. | 53. De penitentia. |
| 40. De laude. | 54. De quiete. |
| 41. Maria comparatur celo. | 55. De resurrectione. |
| 42. — firmamento. | 56. De spiritu sancto. |
| 43. — speculo. | 57. De trinitate. |
| 44. — lylio. | 58. De venustate. |
| 45. — balsamo. | 59. De vilitate. |
| 46. — tonitruo. | 60. De Xpto [Christo]. |

APPENDIX III

Authors and titles cited

The following is a composite list of the authors and titles cited in *Lumens* A, B and C. The list is given (1) to supplement our discussion of the authors and works cited, in the body of the article; (2) to indicate the relationship between the texts of *Lumens* A, B and C from the standpoint of the "sources" each cites, the extent of their borrowing, and the manner of their alteration of titles borrowed; and (3) to provide a searchable list of "*Lumen* titles" for reference purposes, so that one might easily determine whether or not a given author or title cited in another work might derive from a version of the *Lumen anime*. The names of the authors and works are given in the form in which they are cited in the manuscripts from which the lists were compiled (MSS. Marseilles 389, Vraux 130, Clm 5393). No effort has been made to correct or to identify the possible titles referred to, since, as we indicated above, the task of identification must proceed from the extracts themselves. We stress once again that this is a list of titles cited in the *Lumen* and not a list of the actual sources from which the *Lumen* was compiled.

Adamantius super Josue, B

Affricanus in libro de commendationibus Scipionis, B

Agellius in cronicis romanorum, A

Alanus de brevitae vite, B

— *de dulcedine anime*, A, C

— *in libro de planctu mortis*, A

Albertus (or: *Commentator*) *in libro de impressionibus aeris* (see *Alpharabius*), A,

B (Prologue and text), C

— *commentator super librum mineralium Avicenne*, B

- *in libro de natura locorum*, B
- *super de nutrimento et nutribili*, B
- *de septem essentialibus terre partibus*, C
- *summa naturalium*, B
- *in tractatu de viis nature et artis*, B
- Albinus in dyalogo ad Karolum*, B
- *in epistola ad Karolum*, B
- Alexander* (or: *Commentator Alexander*) *super librum metheorum*, A, B
- Algazel de forma speculi*, A (prologue and text), B
- *de quattuor transcendentibus*, A (prologue only), B (prologue only)
- Alkabitius in tractatu de motibus astrorum*, B
- *in perspectiva scientia*, A (prologue and text), B (prologue only)
- *in rethorica sua*, B
- *in theorica planetarum*, A, B, C
- Alkorak in theorica planetarum*, A (prologue only)
- Alpharabius* (or: *Alphorabius*) *in libro de differentia regionum* (or: *de regionibus*), A, B (prologue only), C
- *in tractatu de impressionibus aeris* (see *Albertus*), B
- *in tractatu de mixtione elementorum* (or: *de mixtibilibus atque mixtis*), B
- *in tractatu de parte sensitiva* (see *Theophrastus*) A, B
- Alphisicus*, B
- Altisiodorus in epistola ad Policarpum*, B
- Ambrosius in exameron*, A, B, C
- *super Johannem*, B
- *de officiis*, B
- *in libro prefationum*, B, C
- *in libro de virginitate*, A, C
- Amphites in tractatu de commemoratione antiquorum*, B
- *in edictis philosophorum*, B (prologue only)
- *in libro medicinalium*, B
- Anshelmus in sermone*, A, B
- Anthonyus orator super rethoricam*, B
- *super librum politice*, B
- Apolonius in libro de compositionibus rerum*, B
- Apuleius de morte Platonis*, B
- *platonicus in libro de politico et civili*, B
- *in libro de qualitate vite eterne*, B
- Archita Tharentinus in libro de eventibus in natura* (see *Tharentinus*), A, B (prologue and text), C
- Archyleus*, B
- Aristes de dimensionibus terre*, A (prologue only), B (prologue only)
- Aristoteles* (or: *Philosophus*) *in libro animalium* (or: *de animalibus*), A, B, C
- *in libro ethicorum*, B
- *in libro generationum*, A

- *in libro de impressionibus aeris*, B
- *in libro physicorum*, B
- *in libro politicorum*, B
- *in libro posteriorum*, B
- *in problematibus*, A, B, C
- *in libro de regimine principum*, A, B
- *in libro rethorice*, A
- Athanasius, A, B (*A. pater noster in sermone*), C
- Auctor *in libro de causis*, B
- Augustinus *in libro contra errores grecorum* (see *Damascenus*), C
- *contra Faustum*, A, C
- *de civitate dei*, B
- *in libro confessionum*, B
- *in libro decalogi preceptorum*, C
- *in epistola contra Julianum*, C
- *in epistola ad Paulam et Eustochium* (see *Jeronimus*), C
- *in epistola ad Policarpum*, A
- *in epistola ad Volusianum* (see *Jeronimus*) A, B, C
- *de fide ad Petrum*, A, B, C
- *super Johannem*, B
- *in libro de 1^a (quingaginta?) duabus questionibus*, B, C (*libro questionum*)
- *in libro de natura et gratia*, A
- *super psalmos*, B
- *in libro retractationum*, A, B, C
- *in libro soliloquiorum*, A
- *de trinitate*, B
- *de victoria christiana*, B
- Averroes (or: *Commentator Averroes*) *super librum metheorum*, B
- *super librum philosophorum*, B
- *super librum de plantis Aristotelis*, B, C
- *super librum de sompno et vigilia*, B
- Avicbron *in libro fontis vite*, A (prologue and text), B, C
- Avicenna *in libro medicinalium* (or: *de medicinis*), A, B (prologue and text), C
- *in libro mineralium*, A, B (prologue and text)
- *de quattuor diluviis*, A, B
- Avenpice commentator *in libro de celo et mundo*, B
- (*Avenprice*) *super libro physicorum*, B
- Bartholomeus *in practica*, A, B
- Basilius *in regula*, B
- *in libro de vita bona et mala*, A
- Beda *in libro fidei et erroris*, A
- *in libro de ritu fidelium*, B
- *super illud Jeremiam*, B
- *super Mattheum*, A

- *in omelia super Marcum*, B
- *in omelia super Lucam*, A
- *super actus apostolorum*, B
- Belinus in libro de garritu avium*, A, B
- *de inventione artium*, A (prologue only), B (prologue only)
- *in tractatu de indiciis futurorum*, B
- *in libro de sygillis lapidum* (see *Evax*), B
- *in libro de virtutibus lapidum*, B
- Bernardus* (or: *Bernhardus*) *in libro de consideratione*, B
- *super cantica canticorum*, A, B
- *in epistola ad Karolum* (see *Albinus*), B
- *in floribus*, A, B
- *in sermone*, B
- Boetius de consolatione*, B
- *in epistola ad reginam virginem*, A, B
- *in libro suo de trinitate*, B
- Calcidius de natura quinte essentie* (see *Ptolomeus*), B (prologue only)
- *super Platonem*, A (prologue, cited as *Calcidius* only, and text)
- *in thymeo* (or: *super thimeum*) *Platonis*, B (prologue and text), C
- Cassianus in libro collationum sanctorum patrum*, A, B, C
- Cassiodorus in historia tripartita*, A, B, C
- *super psalmos*, B
- Celestinus papa in sermone*, A
- Centobius in libro de gyro orbis*, A (prologue and text), B (prologue only), C
- Chrysostomus super Mattheum*, A, B
- *in libro de illustribus viris* (see *Jeronimus*), A
- *in sermone*, A
- Clemens*, A
- Commentator*—see *Albertus*, *Alexander*, *Averroes*, *Themistius*
- Commentator super librum de anima*, A, B
- *in celo et mundo*, B
- *super librum ethicorum*, B
- *de fleumaticis*, C
- *de generatione et corruptione*, B
- *super librum de pomo Aristotelis*, B
- Concordia ewangelistarum*, B
- Constantinus* (or: *Constantius*) *in libro medicinalium*, B
- *in libro de melancolia*, A, B
- *in tractatu de naturis liquidorum*, A, B (prologue only), C
- *in libro de naturis morborum*, B
- *in summa de regimine sanitatis*, B
- *in libro de ypocundriaca passione*, B
- Cyprianus in arte de monastica vita*, A, C
- *in libro de duodecim abusioibus seculi*, A

- Damascenus*, B, C (*D. in libro*)
 — *in libro contra errores grecorum* (see *Augustinus*), A
 — *papa in distinctione decem*, A
 — *papa in sermo*, A
Didimus in epistola ad Alexandrum, B
Dionysius de celesti ierarchia, A, B, C
 — *de divinis nominibus*, A, B
Doctor in libro de oculis (see *Galienus*), C
Durandus (Expositor Durandus) super librum de sompno et vigilia (see *Egidius*), B
 — *in tertio quodlibet*, A, B
Egidius super librum de diluviis Avicenne, B, C (or: *super lib. Avicenne*)
 — *in commento elencorum*, B
 — *super librum de essentia et fato*, B
 — *super librum de longitudine et brevitate vite*, C
 — *super librum de plantis* (or: *placitis*) *Aristotelis*, B, C
 — *expositor super librum de sompno et vigilia*, B
 — *expositor super librum de substantia* (?) *mundanorum Aristotelis*, B
 — *in thymeo*, B
Ennodius, B
Esicius super ecclesiastica, B
Eudoxus in libro de gestis philosophorum, B
 — *in zizimento*, B
Eusebius in sermone, A, B, C (*Eusebius* only)
Evax in libro de effectibus in natura, B
 — *in tractatu de eventibus in natura*, B, C
 — *de sigillis lapidum* (see *Belinus*), A (prologue only), B (prologue only), C
 — *de virtutibus liquidorum*, B
 — *et Arron de oculis nature*, B
Eventinus in tractatu de naturis liquidorum, B
Evenus in libro de contentibus orbis, A (prologue, as *Evenus* only, and text), B (prologue only)
 — *in libro de effectibus sompniorum*, B
Eymes Temagistus (see *Hermes*) *ad contemplum*, B
Fontinus in descriptionibus universi, A (prologue, as *Fontinus* only, and text), B (prologue only), C
 — *in tractatu de matheria mundi*, B
 — *in tractatu de mixtionibus elementorum* (see *Alpharabius*), B
 — *in libro de vicissitudine naturalia*, B
Fortunatus in omelia, A, C (or: *om. super Marcum*)
Fulgentius in libro mythologiarum, A, B (or: *mirthologiarum*), C
Galienus in antidotario veteri, A, B, C (*Galienus* only)
 — *in libro oculi* (see *Doctor*), B
 — *in libro secreto secretorum*, B

- Galtherus in Alexandro*, B
Gilbertus in prima practica, B
 — *in libro de secretis naturalium*, B
Gratianus in apparatu iuris, A, B (*in corpore iur.*), C
Gregorius in libro dialogorum, B
 — *super Ezechielem*, B, C
 — *super Johannem*, B
 — *in moralia*, B
 — *in registro*, A, B, C
Gregorius Nazayenus in libro suo apologeticum, B
Gwido in tertio quodlibet (see *Durandus*), B
 — *in sermone*, A (*in sermonum opusculo*), B, C
Haymo super actus apostolorum, A, B, C
 — *super apocalypsin*, A, C
Hegissipus (or: *Egysippus*) *in libro super Jeronimum*, A; *in Jeronimi libro de vestigiis nature*, B
Henricus (*Magister H.*) *de Gandavo*, B
Hermes de corporibus transmutandis, B (prologue only)
 — *de mutabilibus entium*, A (prologue only)
Hilarius super psalmos, B
 — *super Mattheum*, A, B, C
 — *super Johannem*, A
 — *in sermonem*, A
 — *in libro suo de trinitate*, B
Hugo de sancto Victore in didascalicon, A, B, C (*Hugo de s. V.* only)
 — *de sacramentis*, B
Ignatius in epistola ad beatam virginem, A
Jeronimus in apocalypsin, A
 — *in libro de illustribus viris* (see *Chrysostomus*), C
 — *contra Jovinianum*, B
 — *ad Nepotianum*, A, B, C
 — *in epistola ad Paulam et Eustochium* (see *Augustinus*), A, B
 — *in epistola ad Pelagium*, B
 — *super [libros] regum*, B
 — *in epistola ad Volusianum* (see *Augustinus*), B
Johannes Beletth in libro sermonum, B
Johannes Mesue in tractatu aridorum et liquidorum, B
 — *in tractatu de dietis*, B
 — *in tractatu de liquidis medicine*, B
 — *in libro perspective*, B
 — *in practica sua*, A, B (prologue and text), C
Johannitius, A (prologue only), B (prologue only)
 — *ysagoge in libro de organisatione corporis humani*, A, B (J. *ysagoge* only), C
 — *ysagoge in libro de regimine sanitatis*, C

- Josephus*, B
Julius Celsus in libro de gestis antiquorum, B
Juvenalis, B
Leo papa in sermone, A
Lincolniensis, B
Loxus in phisionomia Palemonis (see *Palemon*), A, B
Macrobius in libro de sompno Scipionis, B
Magister in primo sententiarum, B
Morigenes de signis naturarum, A (prologue only)
 — (*Morienes*) *de zonis et climatibus mundi*, B (prologue only)
Nestorius de oceani circulo, A (prologue and text), B (prologue only)
Oratius in carmine, B
Origines in decalogo preceptorum, B
 — *in libro de obscurantia mandatorum*, B
 — *in libro de ritu ecclesiarum*, A, C
 — *in libro de veritate doctrine*, B
 — *super Ysaïam*, B
Orosius super cantica, A, B, C
Ovidus de ponto, B
Palemon in phisionomia Loxus (see *Loxus*), B
 — *de signis naturarum*, A (prologue and text), B (prologue only)
Pandes in libro de tribus regnis, B
Pandulphus in libro de meatibus terre, A (prologue, cited as *Pandulphus* only, and text), B (prologue only)
Papias in libro sexto, B
Persius in amphitrione, B
Petronius, B
Philaretus in quodam tractatu, C
 — *in tractatu de crisi*, A, B, C
 — *in tractatu de dietis*, A
 — *in elucidario* (see *Platearius*), A
 — *in tractatu de indiciis* (or: *naturis*) *februm*, B (prologue and text).
 — *in tractatu de naturis morborum*, A, C
 — *in summa de regimine sanitatis*, B
Platearius in libro, B, C
 — *in elucidario* (see *Philaretus*), A
Plato de immortalitate anime, B
 — *in libro de origine universi*, B
 — *in phedrone*, B, C
Plinius in mappa mundi, B
 — *de mirabilibus mundi*, B
 — *in phisionomia*, B
 — *in speculo naturali* (see *Solinus*), A, B (prologue and text), C
Prosper in libro epigramatum, B

- Prudentius de conflictu vitiorum et virtutum*, B
Ptolomeus Almaiesti (or: *Almagesti*), A (prologue and text), B
 — *in libro quinte essentie* (see *Calcidius*), A
 — *in libro tertio de [illeg.] planetarum*, B
Publius Celsus de mirabilibus nature, A (prologue only), B (prologue only, *de mir. mundi*)
Rabanus super genesim, A, B
 — *in omelia*, A
Remigius super Mattheum, A, B
 — *super Johannem*, B
Richardus de sancto Victore, A, B, C
Salustius (C: *Salustinus*) *in Jugurtino*, A, B, C
Sarbius, B
Sardinus in oraculis divinatorum, B
Sedulius in carmine, B
Seneca in libro de clementia, A, B
 — *in epistola ad Lucillum*, B
 — *in epistola ad Neronem*, B
 — *in Hercule furente*, A, B
Simplicius et Zeno super probleumata, B (prologue only)
Simplicius in commento de aliqua, B
Socrates in libro de virtutum ordine, B
Solinus de probleumatibus, B (prologue only)
 — *in libro rerum*, A, B, C (*Solinus* only)
 — *in speculo naturali* (see *Plinius*), B
Strabo super genesim ad litteram, B
Sydonius in epistolari (see *Ysidorus*), A, C
Syxtus pythagoricus (or: *S. philosophus*), B
Tertullianus in libro de humanis actibus, A
Tharentinus (see *Archita Tharentinus*) *in libro de eventibus in natura* (or: *in futura*), B
 — *in libro de machina mundiali*, B
 — *in libro veritatis et fidelitatis*, B
Themistius commentator super libro de anima, B
 — *super libro Aristotelis de cardinibus celi*, B
 — *commentator super librum de generatione et corruptione*, B
 — *commentator in tractatu de gradibus formarum*, B
 — *in summa naturalium entium*, A, B (prologue only), C
 — *in digressionem super septimo posteriorum*, B
Theodotius in libro de etatibus mundi, A, C
Theophilus in breviluquio diversarum artium, A, B (prologue and text), C
Theophrastus in libro commentorum, B
 — *in libro de distinctionibus elementorum*, B
 — *de parte sensitiva*, A, B (prologue only), C

- Therentius in adelphis*, B
 — *in andria*, B
Thomas in primo physicorum, B
 — *in summa contra gentiles*, B
 — *in secunda secunde*, B
Tullius, A
 — *contra Kathennam*, B
 — *in phylippa decima*, B
 — *in rethorica*, B
 — *contra Salustinum*, B
Tundalus in libro revelationum (C: *visionum*), A, C
Tybulius in libro de actionibus animatorum, B
 — *de moribus sancte vite*, B
 — *in tractatu viarum vite*, B
 — *in libro de vivendi modo*, B
Valerius, B
Varro in sententiis, A, B
Vegetius in libro de partibus mirabilibus, B
 — *in libro de re militari*, C
Virgilius in buccolicis, B
 — *in eneyd*, B
Wilhelmus (Magister Wilhelmus) in summa super sententiis, B
Ypocras in libro epythimorum (or: *epithimeorum*, or.: Y. *in epythimiis, epydimiis*), A, B (prologue and text), C
 — *in prognostice* (C: *pronosticis*), A, B, C
Ysidorus in libro de actionibus, B
 — *in epistolari* (see *Sydonius*), C
 — *in libro ethimologiarum*, B
 — *in historia naturali*, A, B (prologue and text), C
 — *de summo bono*, A
 — *in synodochis*, A
Zeno super probleumata, B (prologue only)
Zenocrates in libro de natura celesti, B

APPENDIX IV

Manuscripts

Lumen anime A.

Prologue I, beg. «Promptuarium eorum plenum id est Maria...». Prologue II, beg. «Summi michi pontificis favente gratia eius pariter ad instinctum hunc animatus librum...». Text, beg. «*De amore*. Archita Tharentinus in libro de eventibus in natura: Incendio grandi facto rubescit...», ends «*De*

vilitate... Cetera de vilitate requirantur in capitulo de cognitione sui et de humilitate etc. ».

Colmar, Bibliothèque municipale MS. 88 (222) ff. 130-157 (s. xv; Dominicans, Guebwiller?). No prologues. Contains chapters 1-13, 45, 43, 44, 47, 46, 23-42, 14-22, 64-73, in that order; omits chs. 48-63, the Marian *exempla*. The same version appears in Erlangen 555 and, with further omissions, in Karlsruhe EM 407. MS. seen.

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 555 ff. 1-30^v (s. xv; f. 115^v, 1445). No prologues. Rearranged and slightly abbreviated. Cf. Colmar 88 (222). Seen on film.

Frankfurt a. M., Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS. Praed. 44 ff. 206^v-229 (1438; Dominicans, Frankfurt). No prologues. Also contains *Lumen anime* B, ff. 114-189^v.

Herzogenburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 38 ff. 158^v-188 (s. xiv ex.-xv in.; the second item in this codex bears the date 1396; « Hunc librum comparavit Dominus Urbanus canonicus in Hertzogenburg... »; Herzogenburg, CRSA). Contains one column of additional *exempla*, ff. 187^{vb}-188^{ra}, ends « ... homini contra hominem cuiuslibet moliendo etc. ». The note on f. 204, « Explicit liber lumen anime per manus Petri de sancto monte », is misplaced. Seen on film.

Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek MS. EM 407 ff. 126-137 (s. xv). No prologues. Contains only chapters 1, 23-42, 14-22, 64-73. Cf. Colmar 88 (222). Seen on film.

Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 382 ff. 1-23^v (1449; written at Naburg by Johannes Kewrll of Tachau; Klosterneuburg, CRSA, s. xvi). Incomplete, ends in chapter *Quomodo Maria comparatur ymbre*, « Johannis Ysagoge libro quarto: Ymber sompnum... reddit finaliter menti nostri ». Portions seen on film.

Kórník, Biblioteka Kórnicka MS. 116 ff. 299^v-357 (1446/47; written by Leonard z Szydłowa; Polish). Seen on film.

Marseilles, Bibliothèque municipale MS. 389 ff. 80-132 (1407; St. Martin, OSB, Trier). Seen on film.

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 4369 ff. 27-58^v (1473; Sts. Ulrich and Afra, OSB, Augsburg). Omits prologue I. MS. seen.

Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek MS. HB I 84 ff. 12-47^v (1437-41; Dombibliothek, Konstanz; Weingarten, OSB, 1630). Portions seen on film.

— MS. theol. fol. 288 ff. 108-149 (1448; St. Mauritius, OSB, Ehingen [Rotenburg/Neckar]). Portions seen on film.

See also:

Variants of *Lumen anime* B,

Wien, Dominikanerkloster MS. 165.

Lumen anime B.

Part 1. Prologue, beg. « Summi michi pontificis favente gratia eius pariter ad instinctum hunc decrevi ad laudem... ». Text, beg. « *De nativitate Christi*. Plinius libro de mirabilibus mundi: Hoc etiam inquit unum... », ends « *De superbia*... et qui se humiliat exaltabitur ». Part 2, *Tractatus de vitiis et virtutibus*, and Part 3, *florilegium*, see below.

Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 213 ff. 1-114^v (s. xiv; Admont, OSB). Parts 1 and 2. Seen on film.

— MS. 322 ff. 37-238^v (1411; written by Andreas Mansit, Admont, OSB). Part 1. The explicit, « ... valeat accusando in die iudicii latrare », is that of *De sopore*; *De superbia* appears as the third chapter from the end, and other chapters have been shifted, but there is apparently no addition or omission. The same version appears in Graz 221 and Melk 814. Seen on film.

Eichstätt, Staats- und Seminarbibliothek MS. 447 ff. 54-198^v (s. xv; Dominicans, Eichstätt). Part 1.

Frankfurt a. M., Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS. Praed. 44 ff. 114-189^v (ca 1440; Dominicans, Frankfurt). Part 1; incomplete, ends « *De confessione*... calida exsiccant, expulsiva exterminant confortativa ». Also contains *Lumen anime A*, ff. 206^v-229.

Graz, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 221 ff. 1-164^v (s. xv; St. Lambrecht, OSB). Parts 1 and 2. Part 1 ends, « ... in die iudicii latrare ». Cf. Admont 322. Additional natural history *exempla* appear on ff. 164^v-168.

Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek MS. Yc. fol. 11 (a) ff. 2-155^v (1459-62; written by Bartholomeus Lodwig in Zwickau; Carthusians, Erfurt). Part 1.

Klagenfurt, Studienbibliothek MS. 164 ff. 1-127^v (1440; written by « Valentinus magister claravallensis »; s. xvii pressmark, Viktring). Parts 1 and 2. First folio lacking; begins in the middle of the prologue, « ... eo etiam tempore floruerunt Parisius... ». Seen on film.

Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 384 ff. 1-179 (1343; written by « Heynricus de Zetavia »; Klosterneuburg, CRSA). Parts 1, 2, 3. Probably a copy of Vorau 130. Seen on film.

Melk, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 814 pp. 1-214 (s. xiv; Melk, OSB). Parts 1 and 2. Part 1 ends « ... in die iudicii latrare ». Cf. Admont 322. Pp. 214-220 contain additional natural history *exempla*. Seen on film.

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 3850 ff. 1-167 (s. xiv ex.; Cathedral Library, Augsburg, since 1524). Parts 1 and 2. MS. seen.

— MS. 6180 ff. 1^v-144 (1446; written by « Johannes Faust de Amebach »; Frauenzell, OSB). Part 1. MS. seen.

— MS. 8337 ff. 37-285^v (s. xv; Augustinian Hermits, Munich). Part 1; incomplete, ends « *De sompno*... Macrobius libro tertio de sompno... ». MS. seen.

- MS. 9203 pp. 1-360 (1451; « scripsit Laurentius Wschierobecz de precepto Johannis dicti Praentel Ratisponensis predicatoris »; Jesuit College, Munich). Part 1. MS. seen.
- MS. 15311 ff. 1-108 (s. xv; Praemonstratensians, Roggenburg). Part 1; incomplete, ends with the chapter *De avaritia*. MS. seen.
- Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Hamilton 30 (S.C. 24460) ff. 214-382^v (1460; « compilatus per me Jodocum Cristen pro tempore illo existens predicator in Gera »; given by Cristen to Carthusians, Erfurt, in 1465). Part 1. MS. seen.
- Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek MS. theol. fol. 143 ff. 153-320^v (s. xv; Dominicans, Rottweil). Part 1. Portions seen on film.
- Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 130 ff. 1-162^v (1332; Vorau, CRSA). Parts 1, 2, 3. Seen on film.
- Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek MS. 1417 ff. 1-95^v (s. xiv; belonged to Johannes Fabri, bp. of Vienna, d. 1541). Part 1. Portions seen on film.
- MS. 2310 ff. 49-140 (s. xiv; belonged to Sebastian Tengnagel, d. 1636). Part 1. Omits most of the final *exemplum*; ends, bottom of f. 140, « ... humiliorque creditur ipsa altior quam ad rei veritatem et exuntiam comprobetur ». Probably copied from Wien MS. 1417. Portions seen on film.
- Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. ch. f. 178 ff. 1-117^v (s. xv; St. Stephen, OSB, Würzburg). Part 1. Following the standard ending, f. 117, there are two additional columns of *sententiae*, also dealing with *Superbia*, ending « ... magis fastigia oblivione fragilitatis humane collapsa sunt. etc. ». Portions seen on film.
- M. ch. f. 275 ff. 1-179^v (1415; written by Conrad Slüpfel for Sighard Astaler, presbyter of Regensburg; Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Landau). Part 1. Portions seen on film.

See also:

Lumen anime C,

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 3775, etc.

Variants of *Lumen anime* B.

Variants of *Lumen anime* C,

Linz, Stiftsbibliothek St. Florian MS. XI 114, etc.

Combinations of B and C.

Extracts and fragments,

Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS. A VIII 13.

Melk, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 1840.

Praha, Universitni knihovna MS. 702.

Part 2. *Tractatus de vitiis et virtutibus*, beg. « *Superbia*. Misit rex Saul apparitores ut raperent David. 1^o reg. xix. David qui interpretatur desiderabilis... », ends « *Abstinencia*... sunt quia modum et ordinem non habent ».

[Note: Normally this tract treats the seven vices (superbia, luxuria, etc.) followed by the seven virtues (humilitas, castitas, etc.). In a common variation the two are interspersed (superbia, humilitas; luxuria, castitas; etc.); this does not alter the opening and closing words].

Bamberg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek MS. theol. 36 ff. 127-135 (1445-47; Carmelites, Bamberg).

— MS. theol. 39 ff. 9-20 (s. xv; Carmelites, Bamberg).

— MS. theol. 101 ff. 249-256 (s. xv; bequeathed, « anno 96 », by « Johannes plebanus in Lwiesendorff » to the Carmelites, Bamberg).

— MS. theol. 216 ff. 45-61 (s. xv; Carmelites, Bamberg).

Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS. A X 135 ff. 72-77^v (s. xv med.; Dominicans, Basel). Ends, « ... non eligit dominum nec spernit servum ».

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. theol. qu. 78 (Rose 420) ff. 299-307 (1454/5: written by Johann Krul, OFM).

Columbus, Ohio State University MS. lat. 3 ff. 170^v-186^v (s. xv; Austrian).

Fribourg, Couvent des Cordeliers MS. 95 ff. 111^v-119^v (ca 1400; belonged to Fredericus de Amberg, d. 1432).

Klagenfurt, Bischöfliche Bibliothek MS. XXIX e 2 ff. 48-55^v (s. xiv; Klagenfurt). Incomplete, ends « *Ira...* suscitāt furorem de sis-... ». Seen on film.

Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 518 ff. 119-194^v (s. xiv; Klosterneuburg, CRSA). Parts 2, 3. Seen on film.

London, British Museum MS. Add. 15693 ff. 3-33^v (1438; written by Andreas Drutwyn; German). MS. seen.

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 4368 ff. 44^v-56^v (s. xv; final text in codex, 1463; Sts. Ulrich and Afra, OSB, Augsburg). MS. seen.

— MS. 5921 ff. 266-279^v (s. xv; Ebersberg, OSB). MS. seen.

— MS. 9019 ff. 254-265 (s. xv; Franciscans, Munich). MS. seen.

— MS. 9020 ff. 180-190^v (s. xiv ex.; Franciscans, Munich). Incomplete, ends « *Devotio...* in tunica fermi (?) aven-... ». MS. seen.

— MS. 9024 ff. 165-176^v (s. xiv-xv; Franciscans, Munich). MS. seen.

— MS. 11448 ff. 196-207 (s. xv; Polling, CRSA). MS. seen.

— MS. 12700 ff. 253-262^v (s. xv; written by Laurentius de Eschenbach; St. Pancras, CRSA, Ranshofen). MS. seen.

— MS. 15139 ff. 260^v-269^v (s. xv; Augustinian Canons, Rebdorf). MS. seen.

— MS. 18141 ff. 369-382^v (s. xv; Tegernsee, OSB). MS. seen.

— MS. 23833 ff. 50-61 (1474; written by « Paulus Zwickhel presbyter Ratisbonensis diocesis »). MS. seen.

— MS. 23956 ff. 1-15 (s. xv). MS. seen.

— MS. 28453 ff. 1-6^v (s. xv; German). MS. seen.

Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek MS. Cent. I 79 ff. 68-73 (1457; written by Matthias Zollner in Nuremberg, and given by him in 1462 to the Carthusians, Nuremberg).

- MS. Cent. VII 99 ff. 176-192^v (s. xv in.).
 Praha, Universitní knihovna MS. 1278 ff. 206-214 (1437-38; Bavaria).
 Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek St. Peter MS. b. IX 1 ff. 95-113^v (s. xv; St. Peter, OSB, Salzburg). Also contains *Lumen anime* C, ff. 120-157^v; the foliation is that of the codex, but there are no pages between 113^v and 120^r. Seen on film.
 Schlägl, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 122 ff. 189-198^v (s. xv; Schlägl, O. Praem.). Ends « *Abstinentia... devotorum diligentium suos proximos finis* ».
 Třeboň, Statní Archiv MS. A 18 ff. 34-45^v (s. xv).
 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale MS. 237 ff. 78^v-90 (ca 1410; German). Attributed to Pope John. MS. seen.
 Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS. Pal. lat. 1726 ff. 25-31^v (s. xv; belonged to Johannes Spenlin).
 Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 210 ff. 146-160^v (s. xiv; portions of MS. dated 1348-49; Vorau, CRSA). Seen on film.
 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek MS. 4581 ff. 203-213 (1387).
 — MS. 4728 ff. 20^v-33^v (s. xv).
 — MS. 4910 ff. 58-65 (s. xiv-xv). Ends « ... vitam eternam nobis tribuat ».
 — Schottenkloster MS. 51 ff. 59-66^v (1477; belonged to « Dominus Leonardus Dienhoffer de Aschbach », 1499).
 Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek MS. M. ch. q. 66 ff. 162-173^v (s. xv in.; Dominicans, Würzburg).

See also:

Lumen anime B, Part 1,

- Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 213
 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 221
 Klagenfurt, Studienbibliothek MS. 164
 Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 384
 Melk, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 814
 München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 3850
 Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 130.

Part 3, *florilegium*, beg. « *De abiectioe*. Athanasius in epistola ad Altisiodorum: Tunc in dei veraciter accendi... », ends « *De Xpo... inferre alteri quod sibi ipsi perpeti sit molestum* ».

- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 12727 ff. 194-220^v (1460; Augustinian Canons, Ranshofen).
 — MS. 15185 ff. 82-150 (1495; written by Johann Gaza and Wolfgang Aygelspeck; Augustinian Canons, Rebdorf). MS. seen.
 Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka MS. I O 19 ff. 221-393^v (1483; written by Michael Prutenus; Augustinian Canons, Żagań?).

See also:

Lumen anime B, Part 1,

Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 384

Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 130.

—, Part 2,

Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 518.

Lumen anime C.

Beg. « *Altitudo*. Philosophus in sexto libro animalium dicit: In cunctis quidem mortuis pectus altius solito elevatur... », ends « *Xptus*... se ipsum ultra omnes celos divinitatis resiliit in abyssum ».

[To avoid endless subdivision, this list includes as well all of those C-variants which are basically enlargements, rather than reorganizations, of the C text].

Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 308 ff. 406-441 (s. xv; Admont, OSB). Attributed to Pope John. Has mistakes in rubrication very similar to Clm 5393. Also contains a *Lumen anime* M, ff. 442-448. Seen on film.

— MS. 649 ff. 1-35^v (s. xiv; Admont, OSB). Attributed to Pope John. Contains a brief prefatory statement beginning « Ad sequens itaque capitulum infra scripta reducuntur capitula... »; this appears also in MSS. Gdańsk Mar. F. 253, Mainz I 206, Opava 505, Strasbourg 86, Wolfenbüttel Guelf 695 Helmst. Seen on film.

Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek MS. qu. 3 ff. 53-102^v (s. xv; last work in this codex dated 1431; Sts. Ulrich and Afra, OSB, Augsburg). Beg. « Aristotiles libro sexto de animalibus... ». Contains one additional extract, ending « ... in abyssum. Augustinus contra Faustum... continuus negant intrasse ». Portions seen on film.

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. theol. fol. 122 (Rose 297) ff. 298-321 (1424-1428).

— MS. theol. fol. 240 (Rose 484) ff. 125-142 (s. xv in.; Leubüs, Silesia). Ends, « *Hic homo comparatur arbori... sine fructu perpetue felicitatis ut pretaxatum est etc ba (!)* ». A similar version appears also in Praha Univ. 48, 413, and 2522.

Braunschweig, Stadtbibliothek MS. 135 ff. 81-110^v (s. xv; belonged to Fr. Jacobus de Peyna; Geistliches Ministerium, Braunschweig). Attributed to Pope John.

— MS. 164 ff. 46-84^v (s. xiv-xv; Franciscans, Braunschweig; Geistliches Ministerium, Braunschweig). Incomplete, ends « *De vilitate... dum propriam vilitatem aspiciat abiciat universam, unde Salustinus...* ».

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt MS. Amplon. qu. 156 ff. 60-105 (1369; Carthusians, Erfurt?). Enlarged, containing 104 chapters; ends « *De fundamento... convenit fundamentum, respice in de fide Christi* ».

hucusque sufficiunt ». The same version appears in Paris 3497. Seen on film.

- MS. Amplon. qu. 168 ff. 184-200 (s. xiv ex.). Attributed to Pope John. Contains a one-column prologue, beginning « Iste liber qui dicitur lumen anime compilatus est a papa Johanne... »; a version of this prologue appears also in Lilienfeld 127 and in Wilhering IX 83 (a C-variant). Text incomplete, ends « *Cruux...* prosperam celestis gaudii ». Seen on film.

Frankfurt a M., Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS. Leonh. 6 ff. 176-221^v (1453-54; St. Leonhard, Frankfurt). Enlarged, with an enlarged Marialia section and other added chapters at the end, concluding « *Certamen...* sola erit celestis desiderii et amoris ». This version appears in Clm 3041, 8970; similar versions appear in Clm 5976 (q.v.), in Graz 1006, and in Praha 469.

Gdańsk, Biblioteka Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk MS. Mar. F 253 ff. 1-38 (s. xv in.; Church of Our Lady Mary, Gdańsk). Beg. « Ad sequens... Philosophus in sexto... »; cf. Admont 649. Incomplete, ends « *De quiete...* vide ante de quiete ibi invenies omnia etc. ».

Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek MS. theol. 51 ff. 215-261 (s. xv; Schoeber'schen Bibliothek, Gera, 1779). Enlarged, containing 166 chapters, ending « ... ad refrigerandum in nobis estu concupiscentie universe etc. ». Portions seen on film.

- MS. theol. 126 ff. 2-66 (s. xiv-xv; bequeathed by Johannes Krage in 1501 to St. John's Church, Göttingen). Ends « ... nube pluviam non descendit. Require de trinitate. Explicit lumen anime conscriptum ex tribus libris ». Portions seen on film.

- MS. theol. 127 ff. 1-11^v (1481; written by « Rodolphus [Becker, CRSA] montis sancti Georgii »). Incomplete, ending in a chapter on *Maria*, « ... in aere plenus nubibus. De hac quere in de voluntate. Et fundamentum Maria... ». Portions seen on film.

Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 307 ff. 1-38^v (s. xv; Göttweig, OSB). Contains one additional *exemplum*, ending « ... in abyssum. Isydorus libro primo... quod ait Matth. ultimo: Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem seculi ». Seen on film.

Graz, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 247 ff. 137-170 (1416-17; St. Lambrecht, OSB). Ends, « ... in abyssum cuncta prospiciens etc. ».

- MS. 586 ff. 59^v-60^v (s. xv; St. Lambrecht, OSB). Fragment, beginning of a C text.

- MS. 1006 ff. 1-184 (s. xiv; bears the name of Henry abbot of Neuberg, 1388; Cistercians, Neuberg). Enlarged, with enlarged Marialia at the end, ff. 81^v-184. Ends « *De valle...* mons exclaruit divinitatis excelse ». Probably similar to Frankfurt Leonh. 6.

Klagenfurt, Bischöfliche Bibliothek MS. XXX b. 15 ff. 145-181 (s. xiv-xv; Klagenfurt). Seen on film.

- Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska MS. 2082 ff. 200-309 (s. xv in.; belonged either to Mikołaj Oszkowski z Oszkowiec, d. 1434, or to Jan Oszkowski z Dobrej, d. 1447; Collegium Maius, Krakow University). Enlarged, containing 81 chapters; ends « *De confessione... in via salutis mentes redemit universe* ».
- Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 1667 ff. 1-48^v (s. xv in.). Attributed to Pope John. Portions seen on film.
- Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 127 ff. 1-34^v (s. xiv; Lilienfeld, O. Cist.). Attributed to Pope John. Begins « *Iste liber qui... Philosophus...* »; cf. Erfurt 168. Incomplete, ends « *De spiritu sancto... Avicbron libro fontis vite. In regionem siccam et aridam quam nullam...* ». Seen on film.
- Linz, Stiftsbibliothek St. Florian MS. XI 114 ff. 106^v-160 (s. xv; St. Florian, CRSA). Following the standard ending, f. 156, there are two added extracts and three added chapters: *Ydolatria*, a repetition of *Vilitas*, and *Virginitas*, ending « *... virginitatis corde et fidei semper incorrupta que est omnium Christi fidelium* ». This same version, without the last two chapters, appears in Wilhering IX 83. Also contains a C-variant, ff. 1-106, which likewise appears in Wilhering IX 83. Portions seen on film.
- London, British Museum MS. Arundel 384 ff. 95-135^v (s. xv med.; not English, as in catalog). Enlarged, containing 129 chapters; ends « *De carne... qui carnem et humanitatem nostram ad dextram patris collocavit* ». MS. seen.
- Wellcome Historical Medical Library MS. 508 ff. 64-178^v (s. xv med.; German). Enlarged, containing 96 chapters; ends « *... fuerat mox sentitur. De hoc require in capitula de gratia* »; a similar version appears in Clm 5976. MS. seen.
- Luxembourg, Bibliothèque de Luxembourg MS. 40 pt. 1 ff. 1-176^v (1443; written by Conrad Nydensteyn; St. Willibrord, OSB). Enlarged, containing 170 chapters.
- Mainz, Stadtbibliothek MS. I 206 ff. 153-279^v (s. xv; Carthusians, Mainz). Begins « *Ad sequens... Philosophus...* ». Cf. Admont 649. Ends « *De cruce... tormentum et molestia principis infernalis. Hec hucusque de cruce et de aliis dicta actaque sufficiant quo ad presens recurre* ». A similar version appears in Praha 948. Portions seen on film.
- Marburg, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 51 ff. 217-296 (s. xv; codex contains texts written 1430-65; St. Thomas, OSB, Bursfeld). Contains two additional columns of *exempla*, ending « *... prius cognito valeamus intueri quod nobis prestat sacrum flamen in secula seculorum* ». The same text appears in Wolfenbüttel Guelf. 77. 9 Aug. fol. Portions seen on film.
- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 3041 ff. 133-179 (1436; written by Johann Schreiber; St. Nicholas, OSB, Andechs, 1486). Enlarged, ends « *... sola erit celestis desiderii et amoris deo gratias etc.* ». Cf. Frankfurt Leonh. 6. MS. seen.

- MS. 3775 ff. 1-96^v (ca 1449-1466; Cathedral, Augsburg). Beg. « Summi michi pontificis... (prologue of *Lumen B*). Philosophus in sexto... ». Enlarged; the order of the chapters has been slightly rearranged, and new chapters have been inserted, e.g. *Accidia*, *Apostoli*, *Auditus*, *Audacia*, after *Abbas*. Ends « *Christus... Castigo corpus meum et in servitutem redigo* ». The same version appears in Clm 18388, Cgm 663, Tübingen Gb. 692. MS. seen.
- MS. 5393 ff. 102-137 (1369; Cathedral, Chiemsee). Attributed to Pope John. MS. seen.
- MS. 5976 ff. 1-81^v (s. xv; Ebersberg, OSB). Enlarged, with 101 chapters, including an enlarged Marialia section; ends « *De venustate... mox sentitur. De hoc require in capitulo de gratia etc.* ». The same version appears in Clm 7245, 9005, 21075, 26694; similar versions appear in Frankfurt Leonh. 6 and London Wellcome 508. MS. seen.
- MS. 7245 ff. 1-120 (1453; « scripsit Johannes Gundlöder tunc tempore prior... »; Fürstenzell, O. Cist.). Enlarged; ends *De venustate*, f. 116 (cf. Clm 5976; ends with a different *exemplum*), followed by three other chapters, *Ymago*, *Virtus*, *Voluntas*, ending « ... et si quem inique vovisti nefacias ». MS. seen.
- MS. 8970 ff. 1-70 (1422-24; Franciscans, Munich). Enlarged; ends « ... sola erit celestis desiderii et amoris anime ». Cf. Frankfurt Leonh. 6. MS. seen.
- MS. 9005 ff. 115-203^v (s. xv; Franciscans, Munich). Enlarged; incomplete, ends, « *De venustate... raso dum panno duro et aspero conferatur de hoc...* ». Cf. Clm 5976. MS. seen.
- MS. 12296 ff. 238-271 (ca 1446; Augustinian Canons, Regensburg). MS. seen.
- MS. 18388 ff. 1-106^v (1471; written by Oswald Nott; Tegernsee, OSB). Attributed to Pope John. Enlarged, beg. « Summi michi... Philosophus... », ends « ... Castigo corpus meum et in servitutem re etc. ». Cf. Clm 3775. MS. seen.
- MS. 21075 ff. 325-364^v (1442; Thierhaupten, OSB). Enlarged; ends « ... mox sentitur. De hoc require in capitulo de gratia ». Cf. Clm 5976. MS. seen.
- MS. 23973 ff. 1-30^v (s. xv). Incomplete, ends « [*De humilitate?*]... Sol igitur inspectus de uno visum... ». MS. seen.
- MS. 26694 ff. 58-91 (1460-62; written by Johannes Stebmiczer de Eger). Enlarged Marialia section; ends « ... mox sentitur. De hoc requierendum in de gratia. Et hucusque de venustate dicta actaque sufficiant ». Cf. Clm 5976. MS. seen.
- MS. ger. 663 ff. 1-112 (1448). Enlarged; beg. « Summi michi... Philosophus... », ends « ... corpus meum in servitutem re etc. ». Cf. Clm 3775. MS. seen.

- Opava, Statni Archiv MS. 235 ff. 116^v-161^v (s. xv; Cathedral, Olomouc). Beg. « Incipit liber qui intitulator lumen anime editus a fratre ordinis predicatorum ubi naturalia pulcre cum rationibus et auctoritatibus sanctorum et aliorum doctorum moralizata probantur utilia ad predicandum. Philosophus... ». The same prefatory note appears in Opava 578. Ends « ... lux radiusque solaris maior fetor quarum fuerat inde sentitur ».
- MS. 505 ff. 22-45 (1357; written by Thomas de Nycholspurk; Cathedral, Olomouc). Attributed to Pope John. Beg. « Ad legendos itaque capitulum... Philosophus... ». Cf. Admont 649.
- MS. 578 ff. 96-186 (s. xv; Cathedral, Olomouc). Beg. « Incipit liber qui intitulator... Philosophus... ». Cf. Opava 235. Ends « ... celesti virtute et odorem quasi balsamum non mixtum odor meus etc. ».
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS. lat. 3497 ff. 1-94 (s. xiv ex.; written by a Carthusian of St. Salvatorberg, Erfurt). Enlarged; ends « *De fundamento...* in eternum hec sola mater domini permanet salvatoris ». Cf. Erfurt Ampl. qu. 156, which contains two additional extracts beyond the end of the Paris text. MS. seen.
- Praha, Knihovna Metropolitni Kapituli MS. 520 ff. 26-50^v (1367; written in Prague).
- Universitni knihovna MS. 48 ff. 275-311^v (1466-72; written by Crux de Telcz). Beg. « Mundi substantia elevat cor... Philosophus... »; a similar rubric appears in Praha 2522, Wien 4289. Ends « *Homines arboribus comparantur...* fructu perpetue felicitatis ut pretactum est »; cf. Berlin th. fol. 240. Portions seen on film.
- MS. 194 ff. 181^v-204^v (s. xv, ante 1442; bequeathed to the monastery of Trebnitz, O. Cist., by Johannes de Stropnicz, protonotarius of Rosenberk, 1442).
- MS. 413 ff. 132^v-151^v (s. xiv-xv). Ends « ... fructu perpetue felicitatis ut pretactum est »; cf. Berlin th. fol. 240; « et est finis excerptorum libri luminis anime de naturis appropriando per totum quem magister et dominus Albertus, qui et librum magnum de naturis dicitur edidisse ». Portions seen on film.
- MS. 469 ff. 203^v-235 (s. xiv; Prague). Ends « *De certamine...* susceptiva sola erit celestis desiderii et amoris »; cf. Frankfurt Leonh. 6. Portions seen on film.
- MS. 948 ff. 1-62, 112-113 (1434; written by « Mathias notarius in Curim »). Ends « ... tormentum et molestia principis infernalis »; cf. Mainz I 206. Portions seen on film.
- MS. 1846 ff. 1-62^v (s. xv). Ends « *De habitationibus...* Hec hucusque de valle sufficiant in s. s. amen. etc. Explicit liber qui dicitur speculum anime et sic est finis illius operis ». Portions seen on film.
- MS. 2522 ff. 182-213 (1385; Bohemia; s. xvii, « Hic liber... plus quam duobus seculis conservatus erat in regia curia civitatis Hradistii montis Tabor... »). Beg. « Mundi substantia elevat cor... Philosophus... »; cf.

- Praha 48. Ends «... ut pretactum est»; cf. Berlin th. fol. 240. Portions seen on film.
- Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek St. Peter MS. b. IX 1 ff. 120-157^v (s. xv; St. Peter, OSB). Also contains *Lumen anime* B-2, ff. 95-113^v. Seen on film.
- Strasbourg, Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire MS. 86 ff. 49-86 (s. xiv). Attributed to Pope John. Beg. «Ad sequens... Philosophus...»; cf. Admont 649. MS. seen.
- Trier, Stadtbibliothek MS. 2066 ff. 251-290^v (1486; written by Johannes Pilter; Eberhardsklausen near Trier). Contains one added chapter, ff. 289^v-290, «*De delitiis voluptatum*. Plinius in speculo naturali: Tigre est animal velocissimum...», ends «... ne in corde suo per amorem valeant nimium pullulare». Portions seen on film.
- Tübingen, Kgl. Wilhelmsstift MS. Gb. 692 ff. 1-90^v (ca 1468; St. Martin, OSB, Wiblingen). Enlarged, beg. «Summi michi... Philosophus...», ends «... et in servitutem redigo etc.». Cf. Clm 3775. Portions seen on film.
- Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek MS. 4289 ff. 50-92^v (s. xv; Bohemian). Beg. «Mundi substantia elevat... Philosophus...»; cf. Praha Univ. 48. Incomplete, ends «... in calore autem et estu maxime per comparisonis...».
- MS. 4603 ff. 270-295 (s. xv; belonged to Thomas de Wuldersdorf, 1478; Collegium ducale of Vienna).
- MS. 4609 ff. 121-174^v (s. xv). Attributed to Pope John. Ends «... in ligno voluit mori».
- Schottenkloster MS. 263 ff. 174^v-216 (s. xv; Schottenkloster, OSB). Seen on film.
- MS. 390 ff. 205^v-236 (s. xv; Schottenkloster, OSB). Slightly enlarged, with Marialia at the end. Ends «... multum pingwis». Seen on film.
- Wilhering, Stiftsbibliothek MS. IX, 75 ff. 19-60 (s. xiv, the date 1369 added to colophon; Wilhering, O. Cist.). Seen on film.
- MS. IX, 83 ff. 116^v-165 (1425; written by John Pencz of Newnkirche St. Gall). Ends «*De ydolis*... et ipsa capacitatem forma». Cf. Linz XI 114, which contains two further chapters. Also contains a C-variant, ff. 16-116, which likewise appears in Linz XI 114. Seen on film.
- Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek MS. Guelf. 695 Helmstedt ff. 75-146^v (s. xiv, «anno milleno trecento tercio sep.»; North German). Beg. «Ad sequens... Philosophus...»; cf. Admont 649. Enlarged, with an enlarged Marialia section at the end, followed by a large block of additional topics, unalphabetized, ending «*De quiete*... nunquam in perpetuum degustabit». Seen on film.
- MS. Guelf. 77.9 Aug. fol. ff. 1-96 (s. xv; North German). Ends «... sacrum flamen in secula seculorum». Cf. Marburg 51. Portions seen on film.
- MS. Guelf. 83.17 Aug. fol. ff. 201-239 (s. xv; codex contains another work dated 1433 at Brandenburg, f. 80^v). Ends «*Ymber*... in nobis ma-

neant concupiscentie carnalis nostre ». Followed by a *Lumen anime* M, ff. 239-266^v.

- MS. Guelf. 511.2 theol. fol. ff. 5-69 (s. xv; probably South German). On f. 40, «... frangit ut habeat in futuro sic sperans, ut supra. Explicit lumen anime ex diversis libris comparatum. Sed ad huc restant aliqua pretermisssa in vero ordine, que hic post finem sequuntur. Et primo capitulo de altitudine. Avicenna de diluviis: Alti montes... », ending f. 69, «... spiritualiter habemus propter quod det nobis deus regnare secum in perpetuum ».

See also:

Variants of *Lumen anime* C.

Combinations of B and C.

Extracts and fragments,

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. theol. qu. 43

Mainz, Stadtbibliothek MS. I 208.

Lumen anime M (*Marie*).

The following manuscripts contain several different works, all of which provide *exempla* from natural history which may be used to describe the Virgin.

- Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 308 ff. 442-448 (s. xv; Admont, OSB). Contains 18 chapters, only the first 12 pertaining to Mary. Beg. « *Maria comparabitur umbri*. Umber igitur maiores scillas mittit aque... », ends « [*De capite*?] ... omnis abbatis clarioris supersit quam in subditis sanctitatis ». Also contains a *Lumen anime* C, ff. 406-441. Seen on film.

- Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt MS. Amplon. qu. 83 ff. 232^v-275 (1460; written by Nicolaus de Campis at Erfurt). Begins with a brief prefatory statement, « Ad extollendas gloriosissime dei gen. V. M... ». Text beg. « *Aurum*. Egidius in commento super mineralium Avicenne: Aurum circa ortum dei frigescit ex natura... », ends « ... tu ergo nobis pares oculis ignem nobis infinite excitas caritatis ». Similar versions appear in Wolfenbüttel Guelf. 42.12 Aug. fol., Guelf. 69.23 Aug. fol., Guelf. 83.17 Aug. fol., and probably Guelf. 69.18 Aug. fol. Contains a *Lumen anime* B-variant, ff. 1-232. Portions seen on film.

- Greifswald, Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität MS. 1033 ff. 1-48? (s. xv).

Beg. « *Celum*. Philosophus in primo rethorice: Celum attrahit sibi ignem a se... ».

Portions seen on film.

- Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Universitätsbibliothek MS. 502 ff. 289-305 (s. xv; compiled by Franciscus, OFP; Büch, O. Cist.). Beg. « Philaretus in tractatu de naturis morborum: Pedes infrigidati frigoreque... », ends « ... clauso limpidius specula ». Portions seen on film.

London, British Museum MS. Add. 22668 ff. 85^v-89 (s. xiv; belonged to Johannes Polonus; flyleaves contain documents from churches in Wladislawon and Plotzk, Poland). Rubric, *Lumen anime circa hoc dulcissimum nomen iocundissimumque Marie*, appears also in Wolfenbüttel Guelf. 69.18 Aug. fol. The first of the text is lacking, beg. «[*Maria balsamo comparatur.*] ... putre faciam conservat balsamum sed retentem...», ends «... avis oculos suos claudit inferiorem palpebram elevando. Require de sanctis». MS. seen.

Maria Saal, Archiv der Dechanten MS. 5 ff. 225-230^v (1448; bequeathed by Petrus Seyboth de Jawor to St. Nicholas, Strasbourg). Beg. «*De celo. Philosophus in quarto rethorice: Celum quidam velocitate sui...*». Incomplete; ends «*De ponte et Maria. Fontinus in ponte super maior pina...*». Seen on film.

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek MS. Guelf. 42.12 Aug. fol. ff. 201-236 (s. xv in.). Beg. «*Aurum. Egidius in commento...*»; cf. Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83. Also contains a *Lumen anime* B-variant, ff. 1-195^v, likewise found in Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83. Seen on film.

— MS. Guelf. 69.18 Aug. fol. ff. 245^v-253^v (s. xv; front paste-down contains a notary's note involving a Praemonstratensian house near Quedlingburg, dated 1432). Rubric, *Lumen anime circa iocundissimum dulcissimum nomen Marie*; cf. London B. M. Add. 22668. Beg. «*Ad laudes excellentissime Marie virginis diversarum rerum naturas...*», ends «*Umbra... autem alti monti icte nisi (?) universi. De hoc lylii, iiii^o*». This seems to be selections from the version represented by Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83. Seen on film.

— MS. Guelf. 69.23 Aug. fol. ff. 156-184 (1413). Beg. «*Aurum. Egidius in commento...*»; cf. Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83. Seen on film.

— MS. Guelf. 83.17 Aug. fol. ff. 239-266^v (s. xv; codex contains another work dated 1438 at Brandenburg, f. 80^v). Beg. «*Aurum. Egidius in commento...*»; cf. Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83. Also contains *Lumen anime* C, ff. 201-239.

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka MS. I F. 52 ff. 64^v-72 (s. xv in.; given by Gregor Pistoris of Lüben; Augustinian Canons, Żagań, Silesia). Beg. «*Incipit lumen anime circa hoc nomen excellentissimum Mariam... De celo...*», ends «... Sic quanto magis laboramus sanctitatem beate virginis exprimere tanto magis deficimus. Amen solamen etc. Explicit lumen anime». Probably the same version as that found in Wrocław I. Q. 344.

— MS. I Q. 344 ff. 1-9^v (s. xiv ex.; Augustinian Canons, Żagań). Beg. «*De celo. Phylaretus in tractatu de naturis morborum: Enitente quidem atque rutilo facto celo...*». In addition to Marialia, it includes on ff. 5^v-8 «*capitulum de spiritu sancto..., capitulum de passione christi..., capitulum de apostolis*». Ends «... fideles plurimi si advenerint de suis suppliciis elevatur etc.». Similar to I. Q. 469, and probably to I. F. 52, I. Q. 412, and Maria Saal 5. Also contains other Marian *exempla*, ff. 189-193^v, beg. «*Hic*

- beata virgo iterum multis comparatur. Sancta et intemerata dei genitrix... », ends « ... in nobis operatur singula ergo singulis reddantur ».
- MS. I. Q. 412 ff. 150-163 (1425; written at Domutsch; codex contains three texts written at Erfurt). Beg. « Maria celo comparatur. Efferendas itaque huius excellentissime virginis... », ends « ... Sic Maria extramontana anime fumigationem elicit dulcedinis et gratie sempiternae. Ad quam nos dignetur perducere qui sine fine v. et r. in ethere ». Probably similar to I. Q. 344.
- MS. I. Q. 469 ff. 181-192 (1415; written by « Michael Irste [de Munstirberg] cappellanus in Nossyn »; Dominicans, Breslau, 1485). Beg. « Maria celo comparatur. Phylaretus... ». In addition to Marialia, it includes ff. 187-192 « capitulum de spiritu sancto..., De passione christi..., De natiuitate christi..., De ascensione..., De apostolis..., De defunctis... ». Ends « ... de suis suppliciis elevatur ad dominum. Quod nobis prestare dignetur pater et filius et s. s. ». Cf. I. Q. 344. Seen on film.

Licht der Seele.

- Prologue, « Von Himmel sennd mir Herr dein krafft... ». Text, « Der naturleich meister spricht in den sechsten von den tyerenn. In allen toten... ». Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. Ger. fol. 1159 ff. 1-89 (1430; written by Nicolaus Stein de Augusta).
- MS. Ger. fol. 1313 ff. 1-116 (s. xv; f. 324, « per me Johannem Taufkircher... », 1469; St. Peter, OSB, Erfurt).
- Innsbruck, Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum MS. FB 1064 ff. 1-173 (s. xv; perhaps 1426?).
- Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek MS. Altd. 9 ff. 133-217^v (ca 1430; South Tyrol near Bruneck and St. Lorenzen in the Pustertal).
- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. ger. 47 ff. ii-iv, 1-117^v (s. xv, ante 1466; written by Leonardus Eglinger of Munich; Tegernsee, OSB). Ends « begird vnd lieb. Amen. Deo gracias ». MS. seen.
- MS. ger. 389 ff. 1-192^v (1429; written by Mich. Pechlinger of Nürnberg; belonged to Hartmann Schedel). Ends « begird und lieb. Amen. Deo gracias ». MS. seen.
- Wilten, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 310 ff. 218-306 (1426-28?; written by Johannes Wetzler; Wilten, O. Praem).

Variants of *Lumen anime* B.

I. Prologue, « Summi michi (prologue of *Lumen* B)... ». Text beg. « Amor. Gregorius super Ezechielem: Anima sine amore... », ends « Zelus... amore sponse cum sponso dicitur esse. Spiritus dei gratia semper maneat nobiscum ».

Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt MS. Amplon. qu. 83 ff. 1-232 (1460; written by Nicolaus de Campis in Erfurt). Also contains ff. 232^v-275 « Secunda pars luminis anime », i.e., a *Lumen anime* M. The same

combination appears in Wolfenbüttel Guelf. 42.12 Aug. fol. Portions seen on film.

Klagenfurt, Studienbibliothek MS. Pap. 139 ff. 1-181, 223-224^v (1419; codex contains a Czech word, in a 15th-century hand; Jesuit College, Klagenfurt, 1603). Omits final chapters, ends « *De universitate... creavit et ipsum pariter universum* ». The same explicit appears in Erlangen 613 (variant II). Seen on film.

Praha, Knihovna Metropolitni Kapituli MS. 507 ff. 1-218^v (1409; written by Johannes Rost de Salczungen).

— MS. 524 ff. 1-80^v (s. xiv; belonged to Johannes Herttemberger de Cubito). No prologue. Incomplete, ends « *De spiritu sancto... et disponunt ad influxum dulcedinis superne* ». Portions seen on film.

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek MS. Guelf. 42.12 Aug. fol. 1-195^v (s. xv in.; binding by Tider Woltmann, Braunschweig, ca 1436-1455). Contains additional extracts from a *Lumen* text, ff. 199^v-201. Also contains a *Lumen anime* M, ff. 201-236; cf. Erfurt Ampl. qu. 83. Portions seen on film.

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka MS. I. Q. 15 ff. 91-127^v (s. xiv; Cathedral of Neisse). No prologue. Ends « ... sua vescit aliquid et dulcescit sic ».

— MS. IV. Q. 147 ff. 270-347^v (s. xv; codex contains the date 1471, f. 222; Corpus Christi Church, Breslau). Incomplete, ends « ... estimetur ad contactum cere cerieque dul... ».

II. Begins « *De abstinentia*. Hugo de sancto victore: Miram sibi virtutem abstinentia vendicat... ». There is no standard ending.

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 613 ff. 1-281^v (1451; written by « Martinus de alto de Dresden » for « inclitus princeps dux Conradus et dominus Olsinczensis [Olsm(u)czensis?] »). Beg. « Summi michi (prologue of *Lumen B*)... *De abstinentia*. Hugo... », ends « *De universo ... creavit et ipsum pariter universum* »; cf. Klagenfurt 139 (variant I). Portions seen on film.

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka MS. IV. F. 45 ff. 1-114^v (s. xv in.; « per Andream ducis Henrici »). Ends « ... requirantur in capitulo de accusatione. Et hec dicta sufficiant ».

III. Wien, Dominikanerkloster MS. 165 ff. 2-184 (s. xv; bequeathed by « Petrus [Wakcher] plebanus in Waring »; Dominicans, Vienna). Beg. « Summi michi (prologue of *Lumen B*)... *Abiectio*. Plinius in speculo naturali: Cumque spina dorsi... ». A few of the opening chapters of *Lumen anime* A are added to the B text, ending « *De cogitatione... elemento que et plenarie reperies in registro etc.* ». The B text of this manuscript is probably derived from either Wien 1417 or Wien 2310, standard B texts. Seen on film.

Variants of *Lumen anime* C.

I. Begins « *Amor*. Ptolomeus almagesti: Primo (or: Amor est) ignis quidem regionis etheree... ». There is no standard ending.

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. theol. fol. 706 ff. 184-222^v (s. xv; Carthusians, Erfurt). Ends « ... talis res visa quelibet apparebit. Sed de hoc require supra ». The same ending appears in Frankfurt Barth. 140 and in Praha 1042.

Frankfurt a. M., Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS. Barth. 140 ff. 38-105^v (1410; « per Andream militem locatum in Smedebergh »; St. Bartholomew, Frankfurt). Contains 64 chapters. Ends « *De venustate*... talis res visa quelibet apparebit ut supra patuit ». Cf. Berlin th. fol. 706.

— MS. Praed. 22 ff. 345-392^v (1465-67; written in Erfurt; Dominicans, Frankfurt). The first chapter beg. « *Anima*. Plinius in libro de septem mirabilibus mundi: Qui ad aquilonem navigant... », followed by « *Amor*. Ptholomeus almaiesti primo ignis... ». Ends « *Virginitas*... obsessis corporibus exierunt ».

Linz, Stiftsbibliothek St. Florian MS. XI 114 ff. 1-106^v (s. xv; St. Florian, CRSA). Incorporates some materials from *Lumen anime* B as well, including the final chapter (from B's *De adventu Christi*) which ends « ... mox sopor irruit et sompnus nigrui sempiternus ». This same version appears in Wilhering IX 83. Also contains a *Lumen anime* C, ff. 106^v-160, which likewise appears in Wilhering IX 83.

Mainz, Stadtbibliothek MS. I 228 ff. 2-63^v (1438; « per fratrem Joh. Oppenh. ordinis carthus. »; Carthusians, Mainz). Ends « *Ungento comparatur Maria*... in mayo iuventutis et prosperitatis hominis infinita consolationis est et gratie et virtutis ». Portions seen on film.

Praha, Knihovna Metropolitni Kapituli MS. 1042 ff. 1-36^v (s. xiv). Ends « *De venustate*... talis res visa quelibet apparebit. Sed de hoc requiritur supra... tabula et registro ». Cf. Berlin th. fol. 706. Seen on film.

Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS. Vat. lat. 1112 ff. 85-87 (1380; written by Nicolaus Desweibart in Vienna). An extract of three chapters only, *Amor*, *Altitudo*, *Affluentia*, beg. « Ptholomeus almaiesti: Primo ignis... », ends « ... in lumine nequaquam videmus ». Seen on film.

Wilhering, Stiftsbibliothek MS. IX 83 ff. 16-116 (1425; written by John Pencz of Newnkirche St. Gall). Begins with a brief prologue, « Incipit liber qui dicitur lumen anime vel liber exemplorum distinctus per capitula... », similar in wording to the prologue of Erfurt Ampl. qu. 168, a *Lumen anime* C. Ends « ... mox sopor irruit et sompnus nigrui sempiternus ». Cf. Linz XI 114. Also contains *Lumen anime* C, ff. 116^v-165, which likewise appears in Linz XI 114. Seen on film.

II. Strasbourg, Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire MS. 59 ff. 326-367 (ante 1423; bequeathed by « Bernardus Wernyng alias de Bochorst decanus sancti Martini monasterii »; Frenswegen). Based on a *Lumen anime* C similar to Frankfurt Leonh. 6, this version has the chapters completely alphabetized, beg. « *De abbate*. Philaretus in tractatu de naturis morborum: Accipite quidem langwido..., *De abyssu* (= Quomodo Maria comparatur abyssu)..., *De accessu*... », ends « *De yride* (= Quomodo Maria comparatur yride)... omnem desiccari de nobis fomitere presentie concupiscentie et ardorum ». MS. seen.

Combinations of B and C.

I. Prologue, « Summi michi (from *Lumen anime* B)... ». Text beg. « *De amore*. Avicenna libro quarto de diluviis: In profundo igitur fonte si quis steterit... ». There is no standard ending.

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS. 3044 ff. 1-227 (s. xv; St. Nicholas, OSB, Andechs). A large version of this combination, the present volume covering only the chapters *Amor-Gula*; on f. 225^v, « Explicit liber septimus secundum ordinem alphabeti in G. Incipit liber octavus secundum ordinem alphabeti scil. H in uno alio ffolumine ». The second volume has not been found. MS. seen.

Praha, Universitní knihovna MS. 1811 ff. 1-228^v (s. xiv-xv; given to the Bohemian National Library by Petrus Stupna). Ends « *Xpus*... resiliit in abyssum. Unde Crisostomus..., Augustinus... clausis hostiis ». A similar ending is found in Wrocław IV F. 44. Portions seen on film.

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka MS. IV. F. 44 ff. 1-136^v (1375; Dominicans, Breslau). Contains 111 chapters. Ends like Praha 1811, save that the final extract is lacking: « ... resiliit in abyssum. Unde Crisostomus in sermone... in eo operatur mentis corporisque sanitatem. Et sic est defectus istius capituli ». Seen on film.

— MS. IV Q. 69 ff. 1-260^v (1374; written in Lossen « per manus et non per pedes »; Collegiate Church, Głogów). Ends « ... eterne ad devincendum viros suggestionis maligne sempiterni etc. ».

Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 104 ff. 1-126^v (s. xv; Zwettl, O. Cist.). Contains 207 chapters. Beg. « Summi michi... *Apes*. *Apes* secundum Isidorum... *Amor*. Avicenna libro quarto de diluviis. In profundo... », ends « ... non solum homo ad imaginem dei creatus dicitur sed angelus ». Seen on film.

II. Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek St. Peter MS. a. II 22 ff. 1-119 (s. xv; codex contains materials dating from 1433 and 1470; St. Peter, OSB). Prologue: « Summi michi (prologue of *Lumen anime* B)... ». Text beg. « *De altitudine*. Philosophus sexto animalium dicit, in cunctis... », ends « *De sompno*... hominem excitavit a saporem quam ondit philosophus ». Contains 113 chapters. Seen on film.

Extracts and fragments.

- Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS. A. VIII 13 ff. 228-245^v (1451; Dominicans, Basel). Beg. « *De alacritate*. Aristotiles in libro problematum: In risu sanguis recedit a corde et ex valde risu homines sepe suffocantur... », ends « *De confessione*... confortativa confortant applica ut scis etc. Ista collegi ex libello dicto lumen anime... ». Extracts from *Lumen anime* B. MS. seen.
- Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek MS. theol. qu. 43 (Rose 761) pastedown (s. xiv-xv). Evidently a fragment of *Lumen anime* C, from *De castitate* to *De delitiis*.
- Mainz, Stadtbibliothek MS. I 208 ff. 233^v-234^v (s. xv; Carthusians, Mainz). The *tabula*, only, of an enlarged version of *Lumen anime* C. Seen on film.
- Melk, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 1840 ff. 248-251 (s. xv; Melk, OSB). Beg. « Omne venenum consumitur humoris super infusione acetii... », ends « ... ecce karitate in humilitatem et patientiam vobis relinquo ». Brief random extracts from *Lumen anime* B. Seen on film.
- Praha, Universitni knihovna MS. 702 ff. 1-298^v (s. xiv). Extracts from one or more versions of *Lumen anime*; the extracts are presented partly at random, partly in chapters, beg. « Aristotelis in problematibus: Homo cibatus levior est... » (from B, ch. 5), ends on f. 226^v « *De carne*... sunt condigna premiorum nisi intentiva extirpentur carnalium nostrorum (?) ». Expliciunt reportata de libro qui intitulatur Lumen anime ». There follows on ff. 227-298^v a different set of extracts from a *Lumen anime*, beg. « *De abbate*. Philaretus ysagoge in de regimine sanctitatis: Omnem dolorem... ». Portions seen on film.
- Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek MS. M II 369 ff. 1-53^v (1479; written by Ulrich Sattner of Regensburg for Bernhard von Rohr, Archbishop of Salzburg). Copied from the *editio princeps* (Augsburg, Anton Sorg, 1477). It contains Farinator's prologue and Farinator's indexes, only. Portions seen on film.
- Strasbourg, Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire MS. 20 f. 181 (s. xv; Cistercians, Maulbronn). Extracts from a *Lumen anime* text, version unidentified.
- See also:
Manuscripts listed in note 117, above.
- Unclassified *Lumen anime* texts.
- Dresden, Secundogeniturbibliothek MS. fol. 7 ff. 140-175 (s. xv; Carthusians, Erfurt). Beg. « Alexander super tertium Metharorum: Natura hec est siderum... », ends « ... celisque continuisque non ». MS. destroyed in 1945.
- Graz, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 687 ff. 1-112^v (1378; written by Johannes presbyter; Praemonstratensians, Niederdonau; Cistercians, Neuberg). Beg. « *De scientia*. Laudemus creatorem omnium ob diversitatem celorum

- ac multitudinem syderum... », ends « *De b. virgine... per omnes modos quemadmodum prius tactum est. Explicit liber lumen anime...* ». Contains 16 chapters. Possibly not a *Lumen* of this tradition.
- Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska MS. 2068 ff. 171-321 (1476; written by Stanisław z Górek, d. 1501; Kraków University?). Beg. « Summi michi (prologue of *Lumen anime* B)... *Capitulum de adulatione*. Ambrosius in Exameron: Apis mel gerit in ore, venenum vero in extremitate caude... »; derived from *Lumen anime* B, ch. 17 med., *De adulatione*. Ends « ... pro dignitate tuenda honoribus totum datur sanctitati nichil etc. ». Possibly a B-variant, or a large collection of B extracts.
- Magdeburg, Dom Gymnasium MS. 135 ff. 1-268 (1455; « memoria magistri Petri Roden », 1483). Beg. « Summi michi pontificis (prologue of *Lumen anime* B)... ». This manuscript was presumably destroyed with the library, in World War II.
- Merseburg, Domstiftsbibliothek MS. 31 ff. 254-296 (1417). Beg. « *Amor. Philaretus in tractatu de naturis morborum...* », ends « *Ymber... aut ymber in meridie et convincitur (?) in media nocte* ».
- Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka B 1607 ff. 70-86 (s. xv in.; Bernardina church library, Breslau; city library, Breslau). Beg. « Incipit tractatus qui dicitur lumen anime. Euntes in mundum universum predicate ewangelium omni creature id est humano generi... », ends « ... vel in gratiis sacramentalibus vel in earum equipollentibus excellenter et plenarie possedissee etc. ». Probably not a *Lumen anime* of this tradition.

Texts entitled « *Lumen anime* » which are not of this tradition.

- Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 483 ff. 119-184 (s. xiv; « per manus Johannis »; Klosterneuburg, CRSA). Beg. « Medici dicunt sangwis puerorum sanat a lepra... », ends « ... Dicit Plinius: Folia fructus et radix herbarii (?) et totum quod in ipsa est ». f. 184, « Explicit lumen anime... ». This collection cites different sources and employs different topic-headings from the *Lumens* A, B, C and their variants. Similar to Wien Schottenkloster MS. 125. Seen on film.
- Wien, Schottenkloster 125 ff. 109-199^v (s. xv; belonged to Johannes Oppnweyler de Haylprunna). Beg. « Sangwis parvorum sanat hominem a lepra... », ends « ... Accipiet secundum suum laborem. Expliciunt naturalia deo gratias. Explicit liber qui intitulatur lumen anime ». Cf. Klosterneuburg 483. Seen on film.

See also:

- Unclassified *Lumen anime* texts,
 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek MS. 687.
 Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka B 1607.