

Sonderdruck aus

MITTELLATEINISCHES JAHRBUCH

Internationale Zeitschrift für Mediävistik und Humanismusforschung

Revue internationale des études du moyen âge et de l'humanisme

International Journal of Medieval and Humanistic Studies

Rivista internazionale di studi medievali e umanistici

Als E-Journal ab Band 1 (1964) verfügbar unter
mjb.hierseemann.de

BAND 58

JAHRGANG 2023

Heft 1



ANTON HIERSEMMANN · VERLAG

STUTTGART · 2023

INHALT

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| BETTINA WAGNER, Nachruf: Nigel F. Palmer (1946–2022) | 1 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---|

MISZELLEN

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| SHANE BOBRYCKI | |
| A Latin Pun from the First Plague Pandemic | 4 |
| VIVIANA KLEINLERCHER | |
| Das Fragment B7 (Ovid, <i>Tristia</i> 4,10,7–35; 4,10,39–67; 5,3,41–5,4,3; 5,4,15–35) der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol in Innsbruck. Datierung, Edition, philologisch-historische Einordnung | 12 |
| JOEL VARELA RODRÍGUEZ | |
| Algunas fuentes no identificadas en los sermones del Códice Calixtino | 43 |

AUFSÄTZE

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| OLIVER HUMBERG | |
| Das <i>Latinum Ydeoma</i> des Schlesiers Andreas Hündern (um 1493, ge- druckt um 1503 in Breslau). Kritische Edition mit Beigaben zum litera- rischen und biographischen Umfeld Hünderns | 58 |
| CAMILLE GERZAGUET | |
| La chaîne biblique d'Hélishachar de Saint-Riquier: pour un nouvel exa- men de l'hypothèse de B. Bischoff | 108 |

PROJEKTVORSTELLUNGEN

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| DUANE HENDERSON | |
| »Möchte doch Jemand die mittelalterlichen Cataloge zusammenstel- len ...« Die Bemühungen um ein Korpus von mittelalterlichen Bib- liothekskatalogen und die Online-Datenbank »Mittelalterliche Biblio- thekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz« | 138 |

BESPRECHUNGEN

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Anecdota rustica. Textus minores ad aedificationem pertinentes prout in codicibus saec. VIII–X asservati sunt (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 311), cura et studio Javier Soage, Turnhout 2022 – besprochen von Lukas J. Dorfbauer | 151 |
| Walahfrid Strabo, De imagine Tetrici. Das Standbild des rußigen Dietrich (Reichenauer Texte und Bilder 16), eingeleitet, hg., übersetzt und kommentiert von Tino Licht, Heidelberg 2020 – besprochen von Peter Orth | 157 |
| Visio Godeschalci. Il mondo e l’altro mondo di un contadino tedesco del XII secolo (Per verba. Testi mediolatini con traduzione 37), edizione critica, traduzione e commento a cura di Rossana E. Guglielmetti e Giorgia Puleio, Firenze 2021 – besprochen von Marina Giani | 160 |
| Michel Scot, Liber particularis, Liber physonomie (Micrologus Library 93), édition critique, introduction et notes par Oleg Voskoboynikov, Florence 2019 – besprochen von Eleonora Andriani | 163 |

fronte (2–109) e, in appendice, la traduzione di B (111–132), condotta da P. sul testo di Assmann. L'edizione è corredata di note esegetiche (133–227), sede di puntuali analisi dei singoli passi sotto il profilo stilistico-retorico e letterario, in cui si dà ampiamente conto tanto dei motivi popolari che vi si riverberano, quanto del contesto storico-letterario in cui il redattore A era immerso. Tra i numerosi elementi di originalità della redazione A – sottolineati vuoi da G. in questa sede, vuoi nell'introduzione – si segnala in particolare l'affiorare di elementi propri del folklore germanico reinterpretati in chiave cristiana, come l'albero di tiglio da cui pendono delle calzature, distribuite da un angelo alle sole anime caritatevoli; la brughiera di spine che dilania le piante dei piedi di coloro che si astengono dal compiere atti di misericordia, o il fiume di lame che scarnifica coloro che calpestarono strade interdette da un banno. Dal punto di vista formale, il racconto di A risulta particolarmente ben riuscito per una mescolanza di stile sostenuto, ricco di similitudini e riferimenti eruditi, e tratti di vivace realismo quotidiano, che aprono scorci sul tenore dei colloqui tra redattore e visionario. Chiudono il volume gli indici dei nomi e dei testi anonimi, dei luoghi e dei manoscritti.

L'elegante traduzione italiana, che esalta l'intrinseca godibilità della *Visio*, e i suoi complementi esegetici, esito di un'indagine profonda, esaustiva e metodologicamente rigorosa, mettono il lettore in condizione di poter apprezzare a pieno quest'opera, esaminata in tutte le sue sfaccettature, senza lasciare zone d'ombra. Si noti infine che, oltre a costituire un punto di arrivo nella storia degli studi su questo specifico resoconto, il volume offre di fatto anche una sintesi globale sul genere visionario, indagando in maniera trasversale temi e motivi comuni a tutte le visioni latine predantesche.

Marina Giani

KU Leuven / Università degli Studi di Milano
marina.giani@kuleuven.be / marina.giani@unimi.it

Michel Scot, *Liber particularis*, *Liber physonomie* (Micrologus Library 93), édition critique, introduction et notes par Oleg Voskoboynikov, Florence 2019 (SISMEL. Edizioni del Galluzzo), VIII + 416 S.

One of the most prominent intellectuals in Western Europe during the first third of the thirteenth century, Michael Scot (d. ca. 1235) has elicited much attention in the most disparate scholarly fields from, to name only a few, the history of philosophy and the history of science, to the history of art and the history of medieval political thought. His biography, almost inextricably entwined with his legend as a magician, is most notably marked by his association with the cathedral of Toledo, the papal curia and the Hohenstaufen court

in Sicily. In Toledo, Michael actively took part in the Arabic-into-Latin translation programme to translate the texts by Aristotle and Avicenna initiated by Gerard of Cremona and Dominicus Gundissalinus, thus starting off a translation activity which he later continued to pursue in Italy. However, besides being a translator of texts from Arabic into Latin, Michael Scot was also an original author. It is at the request of Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (1194–1250), into the service of whom he went in about 1220, that he wrote his most famous work: the *Liber introductorius* (*Li*).

The *Li* is a medieval encyclopaedic trilogy, written in Latin and intended to disclose the ›secrets of the philosophers‹ to those who were embracing the study of the astral sciences. It includes a long general introduction, the *Prohemium*, and three books: The *Liber quatuor distinctionum*, the *Liber particularis* and the *Liber physonomie*. The *Liber quatuor distinctionum*, the largest of the three books of the *Li*, consists of four parts (*distinctiones*), the fourth of which is missing in the extant manuscripts of the work, except for a section devoted to the soul which is only found in one witness (i. e. El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, f. III. 8. Excerpts of this section were published by Piero Morpurgo as part of his articles: ›Fonti di Michele Scotto‹ [1983]; ›Le traduzioni di Michele Scotto e la circolazione dei manoscritti scientifici in Italia Meridionale: la dipendenza della Scuola medica Salernitana da quella parigina di Petit Pont‹ [1987]; ›*Philosophia naturalis* at the Court of Frederick II: From the Theological Method to the *ratio secundum physicam* in Michael Scot's *De Anima*‹ [1994]). This first book of the trilogy begins with an account of the Creation and touches upon various topics ranging from astronomy and astrology, to cosmology and music. The second book, namely the *Liber particularis* also deals with cosmological issues, but includes accounts on meteorology and *mirabilia mundi* (i. e. world wonders). Dealing partly with the same issues, these first two books appear indissolubly bound, but the relationship between the two remains to be further investigated. Overall, whereas the *Liber quatuor distinctionum* is characterised by a certain looseness and lack of organisation, the *Liber particularis* appears as a coherent text with a better structure and a more thorough treatment of the topics. The *Liber physonomie* concerns physiognomy and represents the third and final book of the *Li*; this book has experienced a publishing history much more fortunate than the other two books, as it appears in no fewer than 20 editions by 1500.

The *Li* has been handed down to us in different versions, through several manuscripts of various lengths that in some cases appear incomplete and interpolated by means of a number of inserts from the work of other authors. The editorial process of the *Li* has often been rather fragmentary, with only small portions of the work being published, mostly as excerpts in scholarship. The book under review constitutes the first editorial effort to include the

complete edition of the second and third book of this trilogy. Indeed, before the edition prepared by V., only excerpts of the *Liber particularis* were edited by Charles Homer Haskins and by Piero Morpurgo. The excerpts published by C. H. Haskins in 1924 in his ›Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science‹ correspond to the incipit, part of the prologue and the ch. 88.1–88.4, 98, 109.11–109.13 and 109.20 according to the chapter numbering adopted by V. (63, 65, 219–223, 240–241, 262–264 and 269). The text edited by P. Morpurgo in his article of 1983 ›Il *Sermo suasionis in bono* di Michele Scoto a Federico II‹ corresponds to the ch. 88.5–88.14 according to the chapter numbering adopted by V. (224–232). Similarly, only a section of the *Liber physionomie* (in V.'s book: ch. 41–47; 345–354) received an edition, in 1919, by Arthur Heinrich Querfeld as part of his dissertation.

V. states in the preface that the present book is the result of almost twenty years of work, spanning from his doctoral dissertation defended in 2006 at the École des hautes études en sciences sociales in Paris. An edition of the *Liber particularis* on the basis of three manuscripts (i. e. Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Canon. Misc. 555; Milano, BA, L. 92 sup.; Città del Vaticano, BAV, Rossi 421) firstly appeared in 2014 in the ›Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge 81‹ and has been revised and augmented by one manuscript (i. e. London, Wellcome Institute, 507) in the edition included in this book. Meanwhile, the edition of the *Liber physionomie* is also carried out on the basis of these four manuscripts and includes, as part of the collation, the Venetian edition of 1477 by Jacopo da Fivizzano.

In V.'s book the edition of the *Liber particularis* and the *Liber physionomie* is preceded by an introduction (3–4) and a three-fold overview on Michael Scot (›L'œuvre de Michel Scot‹; 5–61) comprehending the following subsections: ›La carrière méditerranéenne d'un traducteur‹ (6–35), ›L'espace doctrinal et littéraire du *Liber introductorius*‹ (35–50); ›Les manuscrits‹ (50–61). The first section of this overview consists of a biographical outline of Michael Scot intertwined with his production of translations and original works. After making a short reference to the legend of Michael Scot as a magician (6), V. explores Michael's origins and education (6–8), deals with his translations (8–26) and works of dubious attribution (26–35) in the framework of his stays in Toledo, Bologna and his connection to the papal curia and the court of the Emperor Frederick II. The second section is an exploration of the *Liber introductorius*, starting with an assessment of the genre of the work (35–37) which V. suggests to be a »didactic sum, for an all-encompassing purpose, that is, to enclose under the aegis of the astral science several learnings about the universe« (36–37). V. then (38) provides a dating hypothesis for the composition of the *Li*, placing it in the timeline of Michael Scot's affiliation to the Court of Frederick II, as well as for a first intervention on the *Li* by an any-

mous redactor, placing it in the mid-1250s; this is then followed by an account on the transmission and circulation of the work (39). In the next few pages V. clarifies the role of the two works edited in this book within the project of the *Li* and particularly the relationship between the *Liber quatuor distinctionum* and the *Liber particularis* (39–40). He also treats the linguistic and stylistic aspects of the work (40–43) which he links to the ongoing ›secular challenge‹ (›défi laïque«, 43) of the Swabian court (43–45); engages with the dialogical aspects of some parts of the *Li* referring to similar works (45–47); points to its secular and clerical reach (47–49) and provides a few considerations on the circulation of the text and the different reach of the three books constituting the *Li* (49–50). The last section deals with the manuscript tradition of the *Li* and particularly that of the *Liber particularis* and the *Liber physonomie*. V. treats the circulation of the manuscripts and the issue of the versions in which the work was transmitted (50–55). He specifies that in carrying out the edition of the second and third book of the *Li*, his aim was »to provide an edition of a version that circulated in Northern Italy after 1300« and »without claiming to arrive to an ›Ur-text‹« (55–56). He also provides an overview of the four manuscripts used for editing the *Liber particularis* and the *Liber physonomie* and on the edition of the fifteenth century that V. included in the collation for the edition of the *Liber physonomie* (56–61). This section, which also deals with the orthographic rendering of the texts edited (59), ends with a *Conspectus siglorum* of the witnesses used for the edition (61).

This long preface (›L'œuvre de Michel Scot«, 5–61) is then followed by the edition of the *Liber particularis* (63–269) and the *Liber physonomie* (271–385). In the edition of these two works, chapter numbers are added for readability, two apparatuses are included, one for the variants and one for the sources, the references to secondary literature (e.g. 231–232) and passage clarifications or topic expansions (e.g. 76, 142, 233). The editions are then followed by a bibliography (387–398) consisting of two separate sections for printed sources (›Sources imprimées«: 387–389) and studies (›Études«: 389–398). An index is then provided (399–415) including an index of names, places and sources (401–405) and an index of the topics covered (407–415).

This book constitutes an enormous achievement and provides a solid ground on which generations of researchers can carry out various investigations on the work of Michael Scot and the textual tradition of the *Li*. In particular, with the edition of the *Liber particularis*, it becomes easier to establish and understand the relationship between the *Liber particularis* and the *Liber quatuor distinctionum*, which on the contrary still remains unedited. I would also like to draw attention to the fact that by reading the edition of the *Liber particularis*, one comes across a few passages referencing that fourth *distinctio* of the *Liber quatuor distinctionum* which is missing in the extant manuscripts. Indeed, in

referring to the fourth *distinctio* Michael even provides short excerpts of the text and one may wonder if by paying closer attention to these references we could get closer to finding this missing part of the *Liber quatuor distinctionum* (e. g. 196, 294, 347).

Again with respect to the tradition of the *Li*, I believe that the book under review would have benefitted from a more detailed investigation of the tradition of the two works edited. Indeed, many of the arguments proposed by V. on the redactional issues of the *Liber particularis* are the same Gundula Grebner brought forward in 2008. Moreover, V. does not dwell on the redactional issues of the *Liber physonomie* which, to my knowledge, have never been addressed in great detail. The reviews of V.'s book by Barbara Obrist (2020), Lisa Devriese (2021), and David Juste (2021) have already highlighted some incompleteness or inaccuracies in the manuscript tradition taken into account. B. Obrist pointed out that, contrary to V.'s claim, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, f. III. 8 does not include the *Liber particularis*. I suspect that this statement is the result of a confusion between this manuscript and El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, e. III. 15, which does contain the *Liber particularis*. L. Devriese has observed that there are manuscripts containing the *Liber physonomie* which are not discussed in the book, namely: Città del Vaticano, BAV, Reg. lat. 1151; Paris, BnF, lat. 3660A; and Padova, Biblioteca Antoniana, 616 Scaff. XXIII. Similarly, D. Juste has drawn attention to two manuscripts that should have been taken into account, namely the abovementioned Escorialensis e. III. 15 for the *Liber particularis* and Bologna, BU, 1598 (824) for the *Liber physonomie*. Except for the Bologna manuscript, the manuscripts pointed out by L. Devriese and D. Juste are included in the survey on the tradition of Michael Scot carried out by Silke Ackermann as part of her PhD thesis in 1987. On this note, I would also like to point out that the incipit of the *Liber particularis* matches the entry in the catalogue of incipits of mediaeval scientific writings by Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre for Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana 921 (T&K, 275). A last remark that readers might find helpful is that V. refers to the Città del Vaticano, BAV, Rossi 421 as to »Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rossi IX 11«, which I believe is the shelfmark by which the manuscript was formerly identified (i. e. *olim* IX 111, not 11).

With regard to the sources underpinning the text, the author did not provide in his preface a very comprehensive account and judging from the apparatus, not many sources have been identified. In the prologue of the *Liber particularis*, Michael Scot lists a number of authorities (64), one of which is »Abohalli«. This is particularly interesting, as in 2016, Dag Nikolaus Hasse (»Stylistic Evidence for Identifying John of Seville with the Translator of Some Twelfth-Century Astrological and Astronomical Texts from Arabic into Latin on the Iberian Peninsula«) provided evidence that Michael Scot was the trans-

lator of Alhazen's *Liber Aboali* and one may wonder if Michael Scot employed his own translation for the *Li*. On this note, in 2018, Andrea Tabarroni has also provided interesting evidence that Michael Scot's relationship to the first three books of Aristotle's *Meteora* in the *Liber particularis* is regularly mediated by the *De impressionibus aeris* by a certain *Magister Sturio* of Cremona. However, I recognise it would have been difficult for V. to be able to include this discussion, given how close in time V.'s book and A. Tabarroni's contribution were published. Nevertheless, the author was still able to reference this article (»La logica in Italia prima di Pietro Ispano: i *Tractatus* di Storione da Cremona«) in the book under review (53, n. 150). Moreover, V.'s work does not deal with Michael Scot's reception in later authors. A significant case in terms of immediate posteriority is provided, for instance, by the encyclopaedia *Liber de natura rerum* (ca. 1230–1245; perhaps until 1256) of the Dominican encyclopedist Thomas of Cantimpré (d. 1272). Indeed, in the treatment of the regions of the air in the XVI book of the *Liber de natura rerum*, Thomas of Cantimpré includes lengthy quotations of the *Liber quattuor distinctionum*.

For the sake of completeness I would like to point out the following corrections (checked against the base manuscript selected by V., namely Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Canon. Misc. 555 for the edition of both texts) of the very few typos spotted in the edition of the *Liber particularis* (131 = *erum* for *verum*; 175 = *plu* for *plus*; 224 = a missing period after *Continuatio* followed by a capital letter) and the *Liber physonomie* (299 = *oc uli* for *oculi*).

These observations, however, do not in any way diminish the importance of the book nor its achievements, and I would like to congratulate V. for the uniqueness of the endeavour and praise him for providing a text which is easy to navigate and explore. Although the *Liber quattuor distinctionum* still awaits a complete critical edition, with the present book we are a step closer to the complete edition of the *Li* and this is an enormous milestone which is of great importance to many scholars from different fields.

Eleonora Andriani

CNRS, Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes (IRHT, UPR 841)

eleonora.andriani@irht.cnrs.fr